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Abstract

With the discovery of the earliest known manuscript version of *Et les chiens se taisaient*, we learn that Césaire had started thinking about the theater earlier than had been assumed, and most important, that he had originally envisioned this work as a historical drama based on the Haitian Revolution. “Migrant Textuality” explores the several versions and fragments of the play—from the manuscript to its last authorial instantiation in *Œuvres Complètes* in 1976—in order to shed light on the author’s troubled relationship with the history the play refers to and the historical circumstances of its production, and to outline a topology of the many migrations of text and documents in this monumental work. The first chapter reconstructs the genesis of the manuscript by careful analysis of the textual and material evidence. The second chapter grounds the first generic shift evinced by the work, from manuscript to the first published version in the poetry collection *Les Armes miraculeuses*, in the context of authorial responses to shifting editorial environments in the American hemisphere. The third chapter, “Legology,” departs from the particularity of the text to theorize textual blocks in general. The fourth chapter advocates for a form of reading that oscillates between macro- and microscopic approaches, using the topologies created in the previous chapter as proof-of-concept. The critical/digital work of the dissertation lays the foundation for a future digital edition of Césaire’s powerful poetic study of the radical anti-colonial rebel.
To Laurell.

I am indeed lucky, as you point out, to have met you.

(Everybody else, I still love you)
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Introduction: What text?

In one of those ironic twists in the annals of literature, Aimé Césaire worked on *Et les chiens se taisaient* more than on any other text throughout his writing career only to have it be his most neglected. We can understand why the text was so important to him. In all the different versions that come down to us, published or unpublished, the central figure in the text is a rebel who takes an uncompromising stance against the powers that bind him. For Césaire, the poet and the anti-colonialist, this antagonism was at the core of his output. He was aware of it too. This is clear from his interview with François Beloux in 1969:

> Ce texte présente pour moi une profonde importance : parce que c'est une pièce très libre et située dans son milieu — le milieu antillais. C'est un peu comme la nébuleuse d'où sont sortis tous ces mondes successifs que constituent mes autres pièces.¹ (28)

For many reasons, we should take Césaire at his word. At the most basic level, the most recognizable themes in his work are already prefigured in this blend of poetry and drama: anti-colonialism, freedom, revolution, nègre, words/weapons, and Haiti. Even more important for the purposes of this dissertation is the dichotomy he sets up between freedom and situatedness. Cesaire’s response to Beloux sanctions a reading of the text where this dichotomy becomes the central question. But how can a text be both free and situated? Some might rightly build an answer out of Césaire's notion of poetic freedom as a miraculous weapon against the colonization of the mind ("Poésie"). Such a commendable effort
already bares the seeds of my answer: freedom, as the virtue of a text, can only be situated.

The *nébuleuse*, an astronomical soup of clashing dust and gasses, can be read as a metaphor for atelier, as workshop more than work, but also as a distant and diffuse birthplace in need of navigation. The bewildering shift of *Et les chiens se taisaient* from a very situated historical play about the Haitian Revolution (1941-1943) to a highly iconoclastic lyrical oratorio about the figure of the rebel (1946), later re-situated for a larger market for books and stagings (1956) provides an exemplary case for exploring the tension between textual freedom and situatedness, and by extension, the genetic process that will characterize the rest of Césaire’s works.

A timeline of events and documents surrounding the working and reworking of *Et les chiens se taisaient* shows two major clusters of events, representing the two periods of intense activity when the major transformations of the text were made (“Timeline”). The first period extends from 1941 to 1946. In these years, Césaire created the historical drama based on the Haitian Revolution that introduces the title *Et les chiens se taisaient*. In 1944, he begins to transform this work into the “oratorio lyrique,” that will represent its first published version as part of the poetry collection *Les Armes miraculeuses* (1946). In the second period, from 1954 to 1956, he develops the two other major versions of the work: the collaborative piece created with Janheinz Jahn, *Und die Hunde schwiegen* (1956), distributed and performed in Germany, and the “arrangement théâtral” published in Paris (1956). In a dizzying chain of textual events, these
four major versions trace a journey from historical particularity to an oneiric
universalism and onto what we may be tempted to call a reconciliation of the two
in the attempts to stage it at the height of the anti-colonial movement of the 1950s.

Addressing questions of particularity and universality in their story-lines,
the dramas gathered under the rubric *Et les chiens se taisaient* were produced
under very “situated” social and historical conditions. Aimé Ferdinand David
Césaire —now canonized, pantheonized, just Césaire— had to negotiate many
different editorial horizons before his texts opened to a world market for literature
and ideas. As expected, the drama of that emergence also bares the scars of these
shifting contexts. The freedom of the artist is here as elsewhere tempered by the
playing field.

Navigating through the textual fields opened up by Césaire's texts is the
purview of the new bibliographer, not the philosopher, even as the former stops to
ask for directions from the latter. At the dawn of the digital age, as we remediate
the ambiguities of the world of print and manuscripts to the object-oriented world
of computers, we are strategically poised to map these textual, “playing fields.” In
the following work, I set out to design, under the sign of *Et les chiens se taisaient*,
a series of topological spaces and vectors, called for and contributing to our
insurgent new philology (McGann “Philology”).

New bibliographers? New philologists? I use the words interchangeably
throughout, often without the “new,” to refer to a coterie of jack-of-all-trades,
with an ancient and strong calling, as Jerome McGann recently put it, “to
preserve, monitor, investigate, and augment our cultural inheritance, including the various material means by which it has been realized and transmitted” (“Our” 13). We, the philologists, are not limited to the classics departments of yore. Neither are we positivists. On the contrary, we practice a science of exceptions and ambiguities as the present work will testify.

And you can find us everywhere now busy remediating, curating (i.e. caring for), reassembling and disassembling our material inheritance with different degrees of self-awareness and mastery of our craft. Intimately familiar with the dangers of oblivion, we place philology above theory or philosophy. Our goals align inversely—since he rejects instrumental reason—with Césaire's own poetic recuperation of a memory of exile, enslavement and rebellion, lost or in danger of being so, and not surprisingly. As McGann reminds us in the same interview:

the simplest way to specify the relation of philology to poetry is to call attention to a basic double commitment each makes: to memory, their common mother, and to what Blake calls ‘minute particulars.’ (13)

The newness of our philology can be traced, in one strand of thought, to the publication in the early ‘80s of D. F. McKenzie's Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts and McGann's The Textual Condition. More recently, McGann has opened bibliography to topological analysis by adapting the work of Chilean biologists Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela on auto-poetic systems to D.
F. McKenzie's explosion of the notion of text to include all recorded forms of memory, including oral traditions.

Auto-poetic systems are, by definition, closed systems that produce their own conditions for existence. Living beings are as good an example as any, “Los seres vivos son redes de producciones moleculares en las que las moléculas producidas generan con sus interacciones la misma red que las produce” (Maturana 93). In this sense, an auto-poetic system can be said to be a unified topological space. Texts are such systems. Any “reading” generated from/for a text preserves the enclosed system and it constitutes the conditions for future generations. In this scene of self-sustaining infinity the question of the quid adopts increased urgency: what text?

One of Jerome McGann's “behaviour dementians” frames the question for us, “the primal act of autopoetic connection is the identification or location of a textual element to be ‘read’” (“Marking”). In other words, how do we choose a text before we even “read” it? Where is the text in relation to others? Again, what text? We pause here at the apositive “or” dividing “identification or location” to acknowledge that textual identity is determined by location (i.e. situatedness) and vice versa. In close kinship with the psychoanalytic question “Che vuoi?”, “what text?” is the engine of our scholarly desires to locate or identify, freeing us inside a series of labyrinthine stabilities and catastrophes in René Thom's topological sense of the words.
Yet, we do not despair before the *quids* of text, both particle and wave, and, “massively addressable at different levels of scale” (Witmore). We strategize. Pragmatically and procedurally, the following work domesticates the question by limiting its answers to a particular subset of the philologist's desires. How does a text become another? How do *Et les chiens se taisaient* and its *quids* transform from 1941 to 1956 to the present? Obviously, the question forces us to engage with the philosophical tradition of repetition and difference, becoming and being, even as we insist on a philological solution.

If texts are anything, they are reproducible. Whether any token *a* is its avatar *a* or not, *a* can be repeated, and in repetition *a* traces a path for us, and with it a field opens up. Our desire, our gaze is channeled between these multiple locales where the identity of *a* oscillates. The philologist spends much of her time on earth riding these tracks from point *a* to point *a* to point *a*, surveying the land along the way. After centuries of travel, we have already packaged and labeled much of our text to good effect — book, poem, song, manuscript, page, paragraph, refrain, anaphora, quote, word, syllable, rhyme, webpage, essay, line, etc. What we have ignored, on the other hand, has been reduced to all-encompassing and equally indefinite *blocks of text*, or as I call them, *legos*.

As part of the following work, using Césaire’s drama as our playing field, I tackle the philologist’s backlog by using two bi-directional strategies. On the one hand, I argue that anonymous repetitions can and should be identified or located by a specific set of comparative and (de)formative procedures. On the other, I argue that the textual artifacts defined by traditional bibliography\(^\text{10}\) can be
reduced to the status of the erstwhile anonymous block. Both arguments intersect at and outline a subset of textual topology that I playfully call *legology*: the study of anonymous blocks of text.

If indeed the methods I introduce in my work might be usefully applied to textual fields other than the ones justified by the Césaire signature, they are nonetheless a direct result of Césaire’s colossally complex textual scene. The early transmission history of *Et les chiens se taisaient* provides the best atelier for the topological work that I advocate here because of two important features. First, the texts go through a series of transformations characterized by a significant number of internal rearrangements or transpositions —where many blocks of texts await to be identified or located; and second, because the work and its affiliate fragments are circulated and (re)contextualized across a vast network of editorial environments spanning three continents.

As a result, the chapters that follow explore many different, but ultimately overlapping fields of repetition-with-a-difference, each linked to a particular set of material circumstances. The chapters proceed roughly in chronological order through the history of the text, starting with the typescript of the drama and ending with the Jahn collaboration. Without a doubt, the following represents the most comprehensive and accurate account to date of the transmission history of *Et les chiens se taisaient*. On many occasions, I use my approach to set the record straight on several spurious dates previously assigned to the documents I examine. Consequently, this work also hopes to contribute to bibliographies of Césaire.
Directly linked to the methodologies and the history of the text that binds the chapters together, I offer a set of readings on several questions posed by critics for which philology can provide unique and fresh answers. In Chapter 1, for example, I address the question of the mutating role of History and theatricality in the transition from typescript to print by reconstructing the stages of composition using codicological and historical evidence. The question of situatedness is explored in more detail in Chapter 2, where I defend the theory that all texts are adapted by default, using book history and bibliographic analysis to make my case. In Chapter 4, I use the legograms developed in Chapter 3 to explore several questions about the role of repetition, erasure and the formation of episodes in the drama.

Our new philology does not divorce itself from hermeneutical questions, but rather grounds them in clearly defined procedures and material realities. I revisit the debate of History and theatricality in Césaire in Chapter 1, or the question of the universal and the particular in Chapter 2, because I recognize how important those questions are for those who would not self-identify as philologists, but even more so to demonstrate, as many of my predecessors have in the past, that the desires and practices of philology are ultimately interpretative.

Finally, but no less important, this work is the prelude to a scholarly digital edition of Césaire’s work built on the topological spaces I describe. Originally planned as the centerpiece of the dissertation, this editorial work has grown in complexity as a result of the insights that follow. Such an edition cannot
be the work of one person anymore, and I hope the present work might serve as the right lure to those who would collaborate with me.

The multiple lines of entry into this work testify to its proliferating and intersecting audiences: Like Césaire, I introduce myself on a textual field that is diffuse and disjointed: Caribbean studies, textual criticism, digital humanities, Césaire specialists, hemispheric studies, la critique génétique, historians of surrealism and modernism, critical bibliography, Afro-diasporic studies, historians of the book, postcolonial studies; all represented in one way or another in my first set of readers. Many of these audiences are only casually acquainted with the work of the others, and in some cases not at all. Unlike Césaire, I don't have the benefit of the geographical limitations, or blindspots as I call them, attendant to print culture: once published online this work is potentially accessible by anyone with an Internet connection.

If I had to choose one audience for whom I wish this work had the most impact, it would have to be emergent Caribbean scholars. Although we have a long and serious philological tradition, from Pedro Enríquez Ureña at the beginning of the 20th century, to Jean Jonaissant at the beginning of the 21st, our thinkers and scholars have for the most part gravitated away from philological concerns. Our archives lie in shambles as a result. Again, I hope my work convinces you to join me, as new philologists, to simultaneously study and curate our fragile heritage.
Chapter I: Nebula

Unpacking the Typescript

~1941: Circumstantial evidence

We have reason to believe that Césaire started work on, “...Et les chiens se taisaient”\(^{11}\) sometime in 1941, during the height of l’amiral Robert’s repressive regime in Martinique. The major indication comes from the text itself. Defying his captors, Toussaint Louverture, the main character of the early version, asks them to spit on him, “l’épais crachat des siècles/ mûri/ en 306 ans”\(^{12}\) (76). Rewinding from 1941, this odd number gives us 1635, the year Martinique and Guadeloupe were appropriated in the name of the French Crown by Pierre Belain d’Esnambouc. The “thick spit,” aged 306 years, could reasonably refer to the time that Martinique has been under French domination.

The number 306 could also point to 1492 if we date the years back from 1798, the year that Toussaint signed the treaty with the English, which falls within the fictive timespan covered in the play and which the first act mentions. One reason to prefer this interpretation would be Toussaint’s address to “Colomb” in the early parts of the play. The problem is that the number 306 comes from a scene in Acte III, when Toussaint is in prison in the Jura Mountains, or as the historical record would have it, in 1802. Furthermore, the anachronism of the first interpretation plays well with other anachronisms meant for a Martiniquan
audience, as we shall see below. Nonetheless, we don’t need to decide one way or the other categorically, since both calculations work.

A couple of years before 1941, Césaire had returned with his wife Suzanne to Martinique from his student years in Paris, where his, “Cahier d’un retour au pays natal” had just been published in the journal *Volontés*. As soon as he returned, he began to teach secondary school at the recently opened Lycée Schoelcher in Fort-de-France. In April of 1941, almost a year after Petain came to head the *État Français*, and under the direction of Suzanne and Aimé Césaire, René Ménil, and Aristide Maugée, the first issue of the journal *Tropiques* would see the light of day. Soon after the publication of *Tropiques* No1, the *Capitaine Paul Lemerle* would anchor in Martinique, bringing with it André Breton, Wifredo Lam, Claude Lévi-Strauss, Victor Serge, and a host of other intellectuals fleeing the war. Césaire would meet Breton and Lam soon after their arrival in Martinique in one of the most famous chapters of twentieth-century literary history. These new friendships, forged in a matter of a few precarious weeks, would soon become avenues for collaboration, but even more importantly perhaps, they would allow Césaire to project his artistic ambitions outside the confines of Vichy’s Martinique.

From 1940 to 1943, Martinique went through a period of “intense invention,” as Edouard Glissant put it in an interview, which can be clearly linked to the political, social and economic conditions brought on by Petainiste ultraconservative colonial policies. As Eric Jennings has recently argued, rather convincingly, this “form of colonialism steeped in social-Darwinist determinism
and rooted in a reductionist, organic understanding of other, usually ‘primitive,’
societies and ‘races’” had many unintended (and thus greatly under-
acknowledged) consequences (Jennings 1). Ideas of hyper-nationalism and
folklorism were quickly reappropriated by the colonized; anti-universalist
discourse became the foundation for particularist strands of intellectual activity;
and last but not least, the harsher policies fueled anti-colonialist sentiment across
the French colonies. The productions of Césaire and his circle during these years
confirm Jennings’ analysis: the journal *Tropiques* makes a nudge in the direction
of folklorism and nationalism, even as early as its first issue;¹５ *Tropiques* also
became a space to discuss and embrace philosophies of difference, including
Frobenius’ anthropology of Hamitics and Ethiopeans (S. Césaire 27-32). In
addition, the rabid censorship under l’amiral Robert's government can be cited as
the main cause for the journal's oblique style, while the regime’s tighter grip on
the black populace accounts for the journal’s hyper-antagonism.

All of the above applies more specifically to the Saint-Dié typescript.
Because it was written in secrecy, its language seems to have been inversely
influenced by the politics of censorship. The typescript makes explicit what
*Tropiques* cannot afford to. With the refrain, “*mort aux blancs*”¹⁶ peppering the
retelling of Haitian resistance against French ambitions, the play attacks head-on
the propaganda machine of colonialism and imperialism, providing a great
counterpoint to the subterfuges and misdirections of the published material of the
time. On the other hand, the typescript still contains much poetry that was typical
of Césaire's contribution to *Tropiques*, effectively creating a tension within the text between the straightforward and the oblique.

Beginning in 1941 and increasingly in 1942, a US naval blockade prevented the Germans from having access to the island (and as some suspect, to a French cache of gold stashed in Fort-de-France). The blockade effectively isolated Martinique. The only form of communication with the outside world came by way of a couple of ships that were allowed passage after an agreement between the United States and l’amiral Robert.\textsuperscript{17} Correspondence was then carried by post and sometimes by intermediaries. This situation must also be taken into account when we try to understand Césaire’s strategies of publication and composition once he began corresponding with Lam in Cuba and Breton in New York. Undoubtedly, the access to external editorial environments becomes even more vital under the watchful eye of state censorship.

The play evidences a struggle between the freedom to speak frankly without censorship and the idea of a poetry free from traditional form and subject. Under censoring eyes the text desires to speak directly to the subjugated audience. We see this directness play out in the drama when Toussaint addresses the rebellious crowds. On the other hand, the freedom that Césaire seeks in poetic language cannot be reduced to direct address for long. As a result, the trope of freedom is caught in a bind—the freedom to speak publicly versus poetic freedom.
Undoubtedly, this drama could not see the light of day in Martinique during the rule of l’amiral Robert, but the possibility of it being published was nevertheless present to Césaire thanks to his lifelines in Cuba and New York. As I will argue below, the historical bent of the drama seems stronger in its earlier stages, when the play can only dream of a public, than in later ones, when a public emerges.

1943: The completion of the typescript

As opposed to the beginning, we find more precise information about the completion of the typescript in a cache of letters from Césaire to Breton housed at the Bibliothèque Littéraire Jacques Doucet. The first of these letters to mention the play is dated September 22, 1943. Césaire notes he has just finished, “un drame nègre.” A letter dated November 16, 1943 announces the impending arrival in New York of a package containing, “un recueil possible de poèmes ainsi qu’un drame: Et les chiens se taisaient.” The next letter from Césaire, announcing the arrival of some supplementary pages for “Et les chiens se taisaient” consisting of the short text “Intermède” (17 Jan. 1944). The Césaire documents at the Fonds Yvan Goll in Saint-Dié des Vosges, where the typescript is housed today, do not include this shorter piece. This suggests the possibility that sometime between November and January, Breton lent Yvan Goll the typescript.

The story of how Goll became involved in the editorial life of Césaire in New York has been superbly narrated by the scholar and former curator of the Goll archive, Albert Ronsin in his 1994 article “Yvan Goll et André Breton.”
After making peace with Breton many years after their (actual) fisticuffs over which one of them first used the word *surréalisme*, they both began collaboration on a special issue of Goll’s journal *Hemisphères*, at the end of 1943 and the beginning of 1944, around the time Césaire sent his typescript.

Both Goll and Breton had spent time in the Caribbean en route to New York, both had something to say about it as each had “discovered” a black poet. Goll found Nicolás Guillén and Breton found Aimé Césaire. Issue 2/3 of *Hemisphères* would include Breton’s introduction to Césaire, “Un grand poète noir,” Césaire’s own “Pur sang,” and an announcement on the back cover for an upcoming edition of Césaire’s “Cahier d’un retour au pays natal”; translation by Yvan Goll. Good relations between Goll and Breton would not last long after this initial collaboration. In May of 1944, while working together on the translation of the *Cahier*, they had another final falling out.

The correspondence makes clear that the relationship between Breton and Goll was above all editorial. This is evident from Breton’s business-like responses to Goll and Goll’s constant editorial proposals to Breton. Breton doesn't seem to have respected Goll’s artistic opinion, nor to have valued his friendship. Given the nature of their collaboration, and the fact that Breton was already using Goll to publish Césaire, it seems probable that Breton’s loaned the *Et les chiens se taisaient* typescript in hopes that Goll would adopt the project. The publication, of course, never materialized, and Goll never returned the papers to Breton, despite the latter’s repeated requests and the intercession of their mutual friend Robert Lebel. In his last letter to Goll, Breton reminds Goll that he has asked for the
typescript of *Et les chiens se taisaient* three times already (12 Dec. 1944). That is the last we hear of this typescript until 2008, when the footnote in Ronsin’s article prompted me to travel to Saint-Dié.

Because the dossier Césaire at the Fonds Yvan et Claire Goll does not include the short piece “Intermède,” we can safely conclude that the integral Saint-Dié typescript was part of the package that Césaire announced in mid-November of 1943. This is also our safest date for the completion of this version since we find no evidence of editorial intervention from Breton or Goll. In the next chapter, I argue that the play was accompanied by two other texts, *Tombeau du soleil* and *Colombes et menfénils*.

When we consider the size of the typescript (107 loose leaves + title page), the completion date also reinforces the idea that the text was begun in 1941. A text of this size is larger than all of Césaire’s combined output up to that date, from his first journalistic pieces in Paris as a young man, to the 1939 edition of “Cahier d’un retour au pays natal,” to his contributions in *Tropiques*.23 Considering the enormous dedication that made him such a successful and beloved teacher (Ngal 111-113) and his already substantial literary activity in *Tropiques*, we cannot but be astonished by this hitherto unknown work, undoubtedly, his most ambitious effort to that date.

**The pieces of the puzzle**

The main set of clues about the composition of the Saint-Dié typescript comes from the different pagination schemes added and deleted throughout its
pages. To supplement our study of the pagination, we will also examine very closely the different sorts of paper, carbon paper, writing utensils, page layouts and the content itself. The result of our traditional analysis leads to a method of decomposition into smaller structural units—blocks of text—that enable the sorts of arguments I make below. These reconstructions also represent the first modality of the dissertation's methodological contribution.

Except for the content, all of the material evidence is detailed and organized in the codicological table in Appendix I. All of the rows represent a page. These are organized from top to bottom in the order in which they are found today in Saint-Dié des Vosges. This order also corresponds to the pagination labeled MAIN. The columns consist of the pagination schemes found throughout the typescript, the kind of material support used, the instruments of revision, and finally one column marked LAYOUT to indicate whether text was cut short half-way through the page or whether it reached the end.

The text as we find it is composed of 108 loose pages, including the title page. I recognize a total of four (or five, depending on how you look at it) different types of paper. I have marked these as Paper A, A+, B, C and D in Appendix I. The most common type is Paper A, thin, of a yellowing white hue (21.6 x 28 cm) (Figure 1.A). Those pages marked A+ in Appendix I have sheets of the same material as A, except they are slightly larger. Paper B and C belong to two self-contained segments in Acte I. Paper B is thin and pink (21.6 x 27.8 cm). The twenty leaves made of this paper are only found towards the beginning of the play as it stands now. Paper C follows Paper B in the current pagination,
and it is thin and white with a light blue tint (21 x 27 cm). Last, but not least, Paper D seems to have been introduced at a late stage of composition, and mostly appears in revisions made to Acte II. This paper is thick, white and also yellowing, at times with rough-hewn edges, indicating the leaves came from a larger sheet (22.4 x 28 and 21.6 x 28 cm).

![Paper A, Paper B, Paper C, Paper D](image)

**Figure 1.A**

The typescript seems to be, for the most part, a carbon copy of a missing original, and traces of carbon paper are visible on almost every page. At least two kinds of carbon paper were used: blue and black (Figure 1. B and 1.C). The traces of carbon paper residue in the typescript vary in intensity; at some points the paper is very dirty at others very clean. As Appendix I indicates, none of the patterns align with other patterns we find in the pagination schemes, neither with the type of paper nor with the type of revision instrument.
The text was also revised using a variety of instruments. All of these are catalogued in Appendix I according to the pages in which they were used. Finally, some pages end halfway through. I mark these in the codicological table because they often give us clues about the insertion of a page in a previous sequence, and because sometimes they serve to isolate blocks of texts that work as independent units.

In total, we can count ten different pagination schemes spread throughout the typescript. The schemes are numerated using a variety of writing tools at the
top of the pages. Some pages have several sets of numbers on them. Except for
the library’s numeration, all numerations seem to come from Césaire’s hand. The
last numeration added by Césaire determines the actual order of the pages as we
find them today (MAIN in Appendix I, far-left column). In the following
narrative, this numeration will provide our canonical reference and will be
indicated by a page number in parentheses. The page sequence established by
MAIN is reinforced by the added pagination of a Saint-Dié des Vosges librarian,
which I assume to be Albert Ronsin. I’ve divided the rest of the numbering into
two groups, early and late. The late paginations (Late A, Late B and Late C)
begin when Late A introduces a continuous numeration that encompasses and
organizes most of the text as we find it now, going from Late A 1 to Late A 103.
The early ones (Early A, Early B, Type, Early C and Early D) mark a period of
reorientation and experiment, where whole sections will change relative position
or be heavily revised. The different pagination numbers also provide us with the
principal criteria for re-organizing the text into smaller blocks to help us orient
our genetic analysis of the text.

Figure 1.D - From left to right: Early B, Late A (MAIN), Saint-Dié
Figure 1.E - Early A

Figure 1.F - Early Type, Early C and Early D

Figure 1.G - MAIN written on top of Late B

Figure 1.H - Late C (MAIN)
In order to best understand the process by which we arrived at the current pagination, I have created a visualization in the form of Appendix II, using all of the information (paginations, patterns) in Appendix I to reconstruct the order of composition of the pages in the typescript. As in Appendix I, the rows in Appendix II represent individual pages. In this case though, the order of the pages from top to bottom is relative, in the sense that the numbering system found on the farthest left column stands for different orders at different periods of time. Each of the colored columns in Appendix II represents the state of the text at different stages of development, extending from left to right from the earliest pagination (Early A) to the final pagination (MAIN). For example, under the column labeled Early A, the colored cells represent only a total of 18 pages. In my estimate, these pages were the first 18 to be written. All other cells in this column are empty because at this stage nothing else existed. The page numbers belonging to each stage are written in black in the columns immediately to the left. The numbers in gray correspond to either missing pages or page numbers marked in an earlier pagination scheme, which are assumed to be inherited from the current pagination scheme. Missing pages are devoid of color. Below I provide rationale for the genetic reconstruction of Appendix II.

As I suggested, the most likely candidate for the first segment composed by Césaire corresponds to the 18 pages marked Early A (23-40). The handwriting used for this pagination is different from Césaire's usual handwriting, and it can be found on the top left of its pages, very close to the corner. The pagination comprises a segment of 18 pages marked from 1 to 20, with pages 3
and 4 missing. To reiterate, the pagination is indicated on the table by the black numbers to the left of the Early A column. The segment begins without the heading “Acte” written at the top of page 1, as all other pages marked 1 (or the equivalent in the continuous numeration) do. At this early stage, we have no evidence that Césaire envisioned his work in progress as a three-act drama. The kind of paper used, Paper C, is also not present in any other scheme. Only in one other case does a specific kind of paper correspond to a specific pagination scheme, Paper B and Early B.

Three features of the content also suggest that Early A was the earliest segment: a) Page 1 begins with stage directions that set the scene, “à Saint-Domingue” announcing the general setting for Acte I and II; b) The episodes in the segment roughly align with the early period of the Haitian Revolution; and c) The segment contains the least amount of poetic interventions by Toussaint, the chorus and/or the reciters of all the drama, providing the most straight-forward episodes of the whole. If indeed Early A was the first batch composed, this last feature suggests that the original orientation of the drama gravitated towards a popular theater. Even if it remains to be seen whether the completed text is suitable for the stage or not, this segment would certainly be the most accessible to the general public, even if that public was inaccessible because of censorship.

Next in the genetic order we have Early B. All the pages with Early A numbers (23-40) were shifted down in the overall structure of the text by the insertion of those pages marked with pagination Early B. The strongest evidence comes from the fact that Early B is only separated by a difference of one from the
final numeration. As opposed to the pages of Early A, the pages of Early B remained approximately where its own numeration indicated they should be.

In addition, circumstantial evidence suggests the Early B pages were composed after the pages of Early A were finished. If we were to claim that Early B was composed prior to Early A, then we would have to conclude that Early A was not meant to be the beginning of Acte I. The evidence does not support this conclusion. The reader will remember that Early A begins with the number 1 and at no point until Late A does this change. Why would Césaire begin at number 1 what will be page 23 if he had meant for this new text to be a continuation of Early B? Perhaps Early A was written as an alternative beginning to Early B. After all, both retain their low numbers until Late A. Perhaps Early A was meant to be the beginning of Acte II. The problem with these hypotheses is that the internal evidence within Early A, analyzed above does not support them. A much simpler explanation is that Early B was written after Early A.

Furthermore, as we shall see below when we take a closer look at the content of Early B, its historical action followed at one point the historical action of Early A, before falling prey to the mighty pencil.

Neither can we at this point prove with empirical certainty that the Early B pages were composed before any of the others, though that order of composition also seems likely. Present in Acte I only, the numbers of Early B were written in pencil on the top-left corner, going sequentially and uninterrupted from 3 to 23\(^2\) (2-22). Just as in Early A, the pages of Early B correspond to the same type of paper; in this case, a very distinct pink paper, Paper B. The next
pagination in the series, *Early Type*, provides further reason to believe that *Early B* should come second in the series. The numbers of *Early Type* were typewritten on the top-left corner of the page. This pagination can be found exclusively in segments belonging to *Acte II* and *III*. If *Early B* was written after *Early Type*, I don’t see why it would not have followed suit and marked its pagination in type as well. The pages of *Early B* more probably were written as those of *Early A*, before the final structure started congealing, leaving the pagination blank during the typing, and adding it later in pencil, after the overall edifice started to take shape.

*Early Type* will eventually be replaced by *Early D* and *Early C*, with pagination now written on the top-right corner. Since we can be fairly certain all other paginations inhabiting the same pages as *Early Type* are posterior to it, we can be confident that *Early D* and *Early C*, which overlap for the most part with *Early Type*, mark a later stage of development in the structure of the text. Top-right pagination for *Early B* would have aligned it more with this middle period. The case being the opposite, the top-left pagination groups it with the earlier stages. Since *Early Type* was also marked in the top-left corner, albeit with type, it was probably meant to be brought in sync with *Early B*.

Regardless of the placement of the pagination, if *Early B* was written after *Early Type* (still a possibility), this means that it was not written with a clear sense of where it belonged, even after the overall structure was becoming clear to Césaire. It would also entail that Césaire started using Paper A to compose *Early Type*, then switched to Paper B to compose this strange section without a home,
to return to Paper A for Early C and Early D, leaving the pink paper behind. This seems unlikely. The more reasonable conclusion is that the pages of Early B were written before the composition of Acte II and III, and therefore before Early Type, Early C and Early D.

Thus far, while arguing for the position of Early B in the sequence, we managed to place Early Type, Early C and Early D as well. As we approach Late A —where Césaire unites all acts under one sequential numeration for the first time— we should note that all three acts follow a different genetic pattern (Appendix II). Acte I and Acte III are different from each other in that the first joined two blocks of text sequentially, like cutting a deck of cards, while the last intercalated text in the crevices of an early structure, like shuffling it. Acte II evidences a much more complex genetic process. While Acte I and Acte III attain their stability soon enough, after Late A the middle act continued to be reworked, prompting changes in what was clearly meant to be a final sequence. Notwithstanding, by the time we arrive at Late A, the text has clearly achieved a structural landmark.

Although the changes to Acte II could be considered minor in relation to the whole text, they are not so relative to Acte II itself. As you can see from Appendix II, the changes after Late A comprise about 1/4th of the final text of Acte II. Several of these changes are also attempts at reframing the act. Starting with Late A 68, and following with Late C’s 41 series—41, 41’, 41’’ and 41’’’— we see an effort to change the way the act begins and ends.
Determining which came first, Late B or Late C, has not proven to be an easy task. Each of the segments was corrected with a different (and rare) writing utensil, Late B with red pencil, and Late C with a dark pen. However, they both use the same kind of paper that comes into play after Late A, Paper D. Moreover, while both have blocks of pages that relocate before the final organization, the transpositions of the former take place in the middle of the text, while the transpositions of the latter take place around the frame, making it difficult for us to determine their relative order of composition.

Finally, the MAIN pagination adopts most of the numbering of Late A, some of the ones from Late C and Late D, and shifts the overall numeration down to accommodate the extra pages inserted after Late A. This is how we receive the typescript today, despite Césaire’s best efforts to erase all traces of this early work.

On The Practical Uses of Virtual Versions.

After all the pieces of the puzzle have been laid out on the table, and a picture of the different blocks of pages emerges, we can start thinking about each of the stages, represented by each of the columns in Appendix II, as virtual versions of the text. We can define a virtual version as a hypothetical version of the text captured at a given moment in an imaginary genesis and reconstructed from the current material state of a text. A virtual version can be constructed, for example, by choosing the blocks of pages of Early A and Early B, without the
corrections in ink, but with the corrections in pencil. Even if computers make it relatively easy for us to generate many virtual versions, the exercise could still be useful to scholars working without the technology.\textsuperscript{30}

In order to understand the development of the typescript from what I see as its beginnings as a full-blown historical drama to the mixed text we find in Saint-Dié, and as an example of what we can gain from virtual versions, I want to revisit the reconstruction of the genesis, this time focusing on the drama itself.

**Virtual Version A: The Revolution is the Subject**

As noted above, the pages marked with \textbf{Early A} contain the largest number of historical references: names, locales and events which correspond more or less to the early period of the Haitian Revolution. The curtain opens on a plantation in Saint-Domingue (Haiti). A few white girls play outside. The Chorus, a Reciter and a Recitress enter the stage to warn the girls of impending dangers, “\textit{Rentrez chez-vous jeunes filles, il n’est plus temps de jouer, les orbites de la mort poussent des yeux fulgurants à travers le mica blême.}”\textsuperscript{31} The girls respond to the poetical warning in plain French, “C’est une devinette?”\textsuperscript{32} After two further brief exchanges, the girls begin to mock the odd strangers, “\textit{Hou, hou.}”\textsuperscript{33} The mother appears at the door and, sensing the true danger of the situation asks the girls to come inside. Thus begins the earliest form of the drama.

In the next scene, the Chorus, the Reciter and the Recitress bury an imaginary body while reciting the words, “\textit{Adieu, Saint-Domingue.}” The mock burial sets the stage for the carnage that characterizes the drama. Combined with
the preceding episode, these initial gestures set Saint-Domingue as the main subject of the story. This frame is completely different from the one we get in all future versions. For example, as early as Early B\textsuperscript{34} the frame changes to focus on the death of Toussaint (Le Rebelle in published versions). In other words, though Toussaint was an important character from the beginning, the earliest conception of the work suggests a drama centered on the historical event proper.

Another notable feature of Early A is its theatricality. After the reciters bury the imaginary body of Saint Domingue, we have the following stage direction:

\begin{quote}
(A ce moment l’obscurité envahit la scène; des coups de feu; des cris discordants; puis le tapage s’apaise peu à peu; quand la lumière revient, le décor a changé: le camp des nègres au milieu d’une forêt. Chefs nègres et députés blancs en conférence).\textsuperscript{35} (24)
\end{quote}

The instructions are specific to a staged spectacle. Each of the lines refers to sound, lighting or décor, with only one adjective thrown in the mix, “discordants.” Compare the sentence, for example, to a parallel passage towards the beginning of the first published version:

\begin{quote}
(Dans la barathre des épouvantements, vaste prison collective, peuplée de nègres candidats à la folie et à la mort; jour trentième de la famine, de la torture et du délire).\textsuperscript{36} (98)
\end{quote}
These lines, by contrast, do not contain a single element that would facilitate staging in an actual theater, despite the dark appeal of the scene in the reader’s imagination. Even the line “collective prison” is wrested from the stage by the adjective “vaste.” Although I am not interested at the moment in arguing that the typescript is suitable for the stage, something which I believe can only be tested on an actual stage, Early A clearly gravitates towards a theatrical representation. Other stage directions in our virtual version support that conclusion, with a limited amount of (debatable) extra-theatrical elements found on the directions on page 15 (35) and the last page, 20\(^{37}\) (40).

Early A uses two kinds of narrative modes: either the story develops through the action and dialogue of the characters on stage, or it is narrated by the Chorus/Reciter/Recitress trio (CRR). We will shortly come back to the diegetic narrative, one of the keys to unraveling the transition from history to myth in the text. In the mimetic narrative, we count three large episodes. As the white delegates begin to lay their diplomatic traps, Toussaint invites them to address the black troops directly. The crowds seem to waiver after the seductive pleas of the delegates to disarm them, but Toussaint sways them by signaling their devious intentions. Once persuaded of the righteousness of their cause, the crowds unleash their machetes and the refrain which will echo throughout the rest of the drama, “Mort aux blancs!” Death to the whites.\(^{38}\) The delegates are massacred and the rebels descend on the rest of the white population with their sharp response.

After a brief CRR recitation, rife with ghoulish visions of the revolutionary bloodbath, the scene moves to an assembly of planters at Cap
[Français] presided over by the governor. In their arrogance, the white planters continue to underestimate the situation. The governor (Blanchelande in the episode) fails to bring them to their senses. On the streets, passersby echo the haughtiness of the assembly. Soon after, the tumult of the revolution bursts onto the scene. The episode continues with a mock-assembly of black interlopers, or as the text has it, “une séance sinistre et bouffonne pleine d’emphase et de cruauté” (33). The episode ends as another group of rebels walk into the assembly with the head of the governor on a pike.

After another CRR recitation, the final, and rather brief, staged narrative brings us back to the beginning of Virtual Version A, with the mother and the girls now running for cover. The scene quickly changes to a field of slaves who “sing their fatigue” in call and response for two pages. The virtual version ends with a CRR recitation, and what seems to be, at least on the surface, the most extra-theatrical stage direction of Virtual Version A: a ship in distress invades the field of vision, and in the phosphorescent sea an inscription explodes: République d’Haïti. As we will shortly see, this cinematic technique fits a particular theatrical modality available to Césaire in the 1940s.

I summarize these three episodes not only to help the reader enter this difficult text through the most accessible door, but to make a few important points about them in relation to the history of the text. The first point is that Toussaint is not the central figure initially, but rather one character amongst many in a dramatization of events from the Haitian revolution. The second point is that these episodes are meant to suggest the first stages of the revolution: a committee
negotiating for leaders to be set free at the expense of the rank and file, the assembly at Cap Français unaware of the gravity of the situation, the massacre of white populations by revolted slaves, when slavery itself reigned supreme in Saint Domingue —in brief, the most basic retelling of the early stages of the revolution.

Other details which barely catch our attention confirm that we are dealing with the early days of the revolution. During the assembly of planters, the governor warns that, “Toussaint et Boukmann ont constitués une armée.” 41 This places us around the year 1791. 42 Notice also that at the end of Early A 2 (24), a paragraph was marked for deletion with red ink. The lines in question were to be delivered by a second French delegate, who was to propose freedom for the leaders. At this point, two pages are missing from Early A, pages 3 and 4. As the action returns on Early A 5 (25), Toussaint asks Dessalines 43 to stand back (also erased with red ink). This suggests that the two missing pages carried details of the negotiations between the white delegates and other leaders besides Toussaint; Dessalines being the one who survives by name. The historical Jean Jacques Dessalines was involved in the revolution from the start, and his appearance here is consistent with the history of the early revolution. Leaving aside for now the historical incongruities that students of the revolution will immediately recognize in these dramatizations, these effaced leaders further testify to Toussaint’s marginal role in this virtual version.

Towards the end of Early A, during the last recitation, the Reciter announces that Sonthonax has opened the prisons, armed the slaves, and opened the doors to several important cities. This refers no doubt to the most famous deed
of the Civil Commissioner, Léger-Félicité Sonthonax, to declare an end to slavery in Saint Domingue under the pressure of revolutionary forces. This places the end of the segment around October 1793. In retrospect, Virtual Version A forms a non-Aristotelian\textsuperscript{44} dramatic unit which can be said to follow a chronological order consistent with the historical record.

Nothing within Early A would place the action outside the span 1791-1793, except for one anachronism which deserves brief notice since it reinforces the third point I want to make: mainly that at this stage of its development the work is oriented towards the theatre. I am referring to the song “À la Martinique,” hummed by one of the voices on the street outside the assembly of planters on page 13\textsuperscript{45} (33):

\begin{center}
\begin{quote}
\textit{À la Martinique, Matinique, Matinique}
\textit{c'est ça qui chic...}\textsuperscript{46}
\end{quote}
\end{center}

This character is paying homage to the famous café-concert singer Felix Mayol, who popularized the song in France at the beginning of the twentieth century. The complete version tells the story of a black man from Martinique who falls in love with a flower shop attendant and becomes a boxer to satisfy her demand for jewelry and pretty dresses. The song was originally composed in English by George M. Cohan, the “Yankee Doodle Dandy,” for an American minstrel show (“À la Martinique”). Not surprisingly, the lyrics rehearse several racist stereotypes of the time. What is more important to us is that Césaire makes a direct reference to Music-Hall, and an indirect reference to minstrelsy. How
familiar this song was to Martiniquan audiences is difficult to ascertain, especially when we consider the song was already thirty years old by the time our text was produced. This is, nevertheless, a familiar theatrical gesture. Paired together with the slave song towards the end, the performance echoes and demands a stage.

The next theatrical detail that deserves attention is an odd stage direction on Early A 19. The Recitress narrates: 300,000 rebels attack the city, white crowds jam the main gates, trying to reach the ships in the harbor. A stage direction interrupts the narration, “A mesure qu’elle parle, tout cela se dessine sur l’écran.” This stage direction will later be erased by pencil. While it lingered there, however, it opened up the text to an intermediation that hardly belongs in a closet drama.

The use of the screen to project images and, more important, film on the theater stage can be traced back to the “cinemagician” Georges Méliès at the beginning of the century, but it is Erwin Piscator who will make it a prominent theatrical practice in 1920s Weimar Germany. Although several critics have pointed out the Brechtian inflections in Césaire’s theater, very little attention has been given to Brecht’s collaborator and friend Piscator, who developed a different conception of Epic Theater from Brecht, one that depended on stage machinery, film projectors, large crowds on stage (Sprechchöre), and a political style marked by didacticism and documentary modes.

In the absence of documentary evidence, I find it difficult to ascertain whether Césaire knew the work of Piscator (or Brecht) during his years in Paris.
Piscator remained in Paris to avoid Stalin’s Great Purge for the two years that Césaire was a student at the École Normale Superieure, but (to my knowledge) he does not seem to have staged or published while he was there. Much more likely, Piscator’s innovations came to Césaire’s attention via Paul Claudel’s *Le Livre de Christophe Colomb*. Although the latter drama was not staged until much later, the book was published by Gallimard during Césaire’s years in Paris, with two runs in 1933 (one with illustrations by Jean Charlot, the other *sans*) and a reprint in 1935. Claudel was so taken with Piscator’s experiments that he had asked him to collaborate on *Le Livre de Christophe Colomb*. That collaboration never took place, but the influence of the one on the other remains evident (Plana 147-148).

The resonance between Césaire’s and Claudel’s own “théâtre total” seems over-determined: an evident overlap between the *dramatis personae*, early traces of similar techniques, and more importantly, perhaps, a dialectical negation of Columbus in *Chiens*, who will become the explicit nemesis of *Early B*. I refer the reader to Ernspeter Ruhe’s “L’Anticlaudelianus d’Aimé Césaire” for a superb tally of the echoes and responses. For our purposes, what should draw our attention is the use of the screen in Claudel’s drama. The screen is present from the beginning of his play, “*au fond de la scène*” arguably serving a dramatic, didactic, and choral role, in Brecht’s acceptation. Although Claudel invokes the screen more often than Césaire’s lone example, their functions overlap. Here is an example from Part I, scene x of *Le Livre*, “*Tout cela apparaît mélangé sur l’écran*” (46). Both Césaire and Claudel —using almost the same formula— project on a screen whose function is both mimetic and diegetic, and whose main
trope is the χορός, here understood not as a separate role within the drama, but the corralling of all roles singing in unison. In other words, for Césaire and Claudel, the chorus sings in chorus with the screen.

This brings us back to the late stage direction in Early A where the words, “République d’Haïti” are projected onto a phosphorescent sea and which, as already noted, seems to belong to later developments of the text. Presumably written before the pencil corrections that will excise most of the work’s theatricality, this stage direction elicits the phantasmagorical return of the earlier screen. The projection of letters itself being a famous Piscator technique, the soon-to-be un-mountable stage direction becomes a moment of negotiation between the stage and the poetry that will characterize future stage directions. The transition from the stage to the poetry marks a replacement of the mechanical (i.e. the screen), for the imagination, and as a consequence, from the theatre to the text.

As I pointed out above, the Chorus and the Reciters intrude between the dramatic episodes, establishing a rhythm of sorts between them and the action. As Virtual Version A begins, they engage with the girls on the stage, but besides this brief metalepsis, they remain outside of that action. Their words, nevertheless, are in constant dialogue with the events being dramatized on stage. For the most part, these intrusions from CRR consist of narrative or commentary. Though they speak in a highly elliptical poetic idiom, CRR is clearly describing and referring to events which are either being already depicted on stage or are related to it. In this sense, the role of the Chorus does not depart substantially from the chorus in classical Greek theater. On the other hand, the introduction of a
Reciter and a Recitress does modify somewhat the traditional role of the κορυφαίος. Nevertheless, in their triangular dynamic, CRR echoes the strophe, anti-strophe and epode of the ancient plays.

Although the Greek tragedy that should elicit most of our comparative attention is probably Prometheus Bound, our chorus goes beyond the role of the Chorus of Daughters of Oceanus and their relationship to Prometheus—at least at this stage of the composition. I would tentatively suggest that the Chorus of Virtual Version A is more like Sophocles’ Chorus in his Theban plays since it represents the polis, speaks prophetically, and has a direct relationship to the central character.

Once the episode with the delegates begins, after the two missing pages and after Toussaint invites the delegates to address the crowds, the Reciters barge on the scene to foreshadow the response of the crowds and the bloodbath to come:

Déjà le silence empoisonne chaque fibre
Des gestes hiéroglyphes avalés à moitié signalent
Les jachères et les semis de cadavres.\(^3\) (25)

After the crowds have raised their war cry and the episode with the delegates ends, CRR takes over the narration of the event:

Le récitant: Un coup de sifflet... Les nègres sortent des broussailles avec une grande clameur. Les coutelas s’abattent et se relèvent et s’abattent dans le moulinet de
These two examples support an important point about the history of the text, perhaps the one with the most repercussions. The first example, which we could call proleptic, and the second, which we could call diegetic, both refer to the action on the stage, to an unfolding plot for which they are a doubling of sorts (in the same way that the screen was a doubling of the Chorus). This crucial function of the Chorus will soon change, and as all reference to historical events is eventually lost and the plot reduced almost to the point of stasis, we will end up with a much more poetic choral function. While the Chorus of the print versions can be quite baffling—and has been for readers—seeing the earliest form of the Chorus in action can provide a useful point of departure for us to understand its future avatars.

The principal theme of the Chorus in Virtual Version A is the revolution itself, and most of their diegetic recitations describe the epic events that cannot be represented on stage. This reinforces two of the points that we made above: that the revolution is the subject of Virtual Version A, and that at this stage of composition, diegesis and mimesis supplement each other in traditional ways. Finally, and providing a certain level of internal coherence, the Chorus opens and ends this segment, first to bury the old Saint Domingue, and as the act comes to a close, to welcome the Republic of Haiti.
Virtual Version B and C: Toussaint King

*En me renversant, on n’a abattu à Saint-Domingue que le tronc de l’arbre de la liberté des noirs ; il repoussera, parce que les racines en sont profondes et nombreuses.*

Attributed to the historical Toussaint Louverture.

Virtual versions do not need to be constructed out of one pagination scheme alone. In fact, we could create virtual versions that are not defined by pagination schemes at all. To be precise, the most useful virtual versions for us are reductions of a given historical document to the blocks of text encompassed by one or more discrete codicological or bibliographic features because they allow us to test plausible genetic paths. This excludes free-form recreations of the text. In theory, we could reconstitute texts in infinite ways, à la Césaire. Notwithstanding, for the idea of a virtual version to remain useful for genetic analysis, we must limit our recreations to plausible states of the existing document. A virtual version made up of only handwritten revisions, for example, might provide an interesting source for data mining, but would not constitute a plausible state of the text.

As I will argue in more detail in Chapter 3, our reorganizations should be accompanied by a clear and meaningful set of rules justifying the new formations. Although text in general can be said to be marked up by different codes, we reconstitute that mark-up by a set of exhaustive rules or algorithms that in turn define the contours of the new blocks of text. Those rules find their basis in a
number of dimensions: codicology (Chapter 1 and 2), bibliography (Chapter 2), hermeneutics (Chapter 1, 2 and to a lesser extent, 3), string-comparison (Chapter 3), and many others. Regardless of the criteria, the imperative remains for us to be purposeful, explicit and rigorous in our method of selection.

In the following, I use two pagination schemes and all revisions made to it to construct two virtual versions, which I will then use to further explore the erosion of the historical referent in the genesis of the text and the rise of Toussaint as the central figure of the drama.

I call **Virtual Version B** the text paginated with the number set labeled **Early B**, without revisions. This also means that we are to take the text without the pagination itself, and assume that the pages were meant to follow **Early A**. To construct **Virtual Version C**, I want to take all the pages in **Early B** together with the first page added during **Late A** and all the revisions made on the combined text. In other words, pages 1-22 of MAIN in their current state. The first page, added by **Late A**, was written to replace what was originally **Early B** 1 and 2 (now missing), and conforms very well with the rest of **Early B**. Together they form a coherent, analytical whole.

At some point, **Virtual Version B** was set during the middle period of the Haitian Revolution, with references to Toussaint’s takeover of the Spanish part of the island, the defeat of the British forces, and an enactment of Toussaint’s capture. From an historical point of view, this is the most confused and confusing segment. In a later revision, all references to the middle-to-late period of the
Haitian Revolution will be erased, and with a few masterful strokes, Césaire will bring the action to the early period of the French Revolution, the temporal setting of Virtual Version C.

If we take Virtual Version B by itself, the action takes place sometime during Toussaint’s campaign in the Eastern part of the island (1801):

*Le choeur: Mon oeil se dore de visions souveraines..... Toussaint fait son entrée solennelle à Santo Domingo.....Le cavido lui remet les clefs de la ville.*

(11)

Even though they are framed as a vision, while the action remains solidly within a coherent temporal framework, these lines can be interpreted as the sort of typical *pragmatographia* found in Virtual Version A. The fictional timeline will soon change, and with it the rhetorical and poetic function of similar lines. In the meantime, we can already hear the potential for disassociating the action on the stage from the pseudo-historical narrative built into the diegetic function of the chorus in Virtual Version A. Once you remove the mimetic action on the stage that authorizes and gives meaning to them, lines such as these transform into a peculiar form of detached *ecphrasis*; soon enough, when the geographical and historical references disappear as well, these ostensive lines end up being removed completely or disfigured to refer to a vague archetypal history of the African diaspora and colonialism. My next chapter explores this phenomenon in the context of Césaire's international audiences.
At some late undetermined moment in the genesis of the typescript, the temporal progression of **Virtual Version B** undergoes a radical shift. On the first page of **Late A**, the type sets the scene geographically, “*La scène est à Saint Domingue.*” Césaire will eventually add, “*à l’époque de la Révolution française*” by hand next to it. In order to make the rest of the text conform to this new temporal reorientation, Césaire will make use of his pencil. The first such revision comes on **Late A 2 (2):**

> *Le Chœur: Hurrah. Les Anglais sont perdus... Nos batteries d’approche balayent leurs remparts; nos batteries de brèche sont installées... Saint-Marc craque... comme un vaisseau pourri...*  

The rest of the pencil revisions will continue in the same spirit. On **Early B 14 (15)**, at the end of **Early B**, the last line changes two times, making things even more complicated: “... *La Grande Révolution de Saint Domingue continue a commencé—vient de commencer*” (22). At one point in the line the revolution continued, at another it had begun, and finally it had *just* begun. To accommodate this recasting, many internal changes had to be made, most notably, the grammatical tense, which changes in several places from *passé composé* to *futur simple*:

> *Toussaint: J’aurais amené j’amenerai ce pays à la connaissance de lui-même, je familiariserai—erais cette terre avec ses démons secrets allumé j’allumerai aux cratères d’héloodermes et de cymbales les symphonies*
We should note in passing that this can be used as further evidence that **Early B** was written after **Early A**. The tense is adapting to the temporal model established by **Early A**. In the first version of **Early B**, the action follows **Early A**, therefore the past tense is appropriate. As the timeframe moves to the French Revolution, the tense appropriately changes to the future. The passage refers, of course, to Toussaint’s past or future involvement in the Haitian Revolution. Several other changes will confirm this temporal reorientation, with the strange consequence that the narrations of CRR become *proleptic*, or as I have no reservations calling them, prophetic.

The most salient aspect of **Virtual Version B** is perhaps the introduction of Toussaint Louverture as a central character. This virtual version unfolds in four distinct episodes. We do not know exactly what the first two pages of **Early B** contained. When the action resumes on **Early B** 3 (2), the Reciter and Toussaint have the stage.

The Reciter begins with a trope, prevalent throughout the drama, that I would like to call for now—with apologies to T.S. Eliot—*the revolutionary correlative*: a poetic vision of violent/revolutionary phenomena, drawing its vehicles from nature. It is safe to say that these tropes characterize a large part of the poetry of CRR and Toussaint, and we will have more to say about them later on. Here is the example that opens **Early B**:

*d’un enfer inconnu, splendide parasité de nostalgies hautaines...*  
(14)
En marge des marées sautillantes, je marche sur l’eau des printemps tournants ; j’aperçois très haut mes yeux de sentinelle.
L’insomnie à toute épreuve grandit comme une désobéissance le long des tempes libres de la femme à l’emphore, verseau, verseau tempête de germes, bouilloire.\(^\text{(2)}\)

Toussaint Louverture trails these lines by making himself the locus of the violence, in a poetic sequence where he becomes intertwined with the landscape around him. On the next page, the scene is grounded roughly at the moment when the city of Saint-Marc surrenders and the Reciter announces the arrival of the messenger of the king\(^\text{62}\) who would have a word with Toussaint.

In the next episode, Toussaint encounters three, “voix tentatrices”\(^\text{63}\) who offer him riches and titles, in a scene reminiscent of the temptation of Christ, but more to the point, the temptations of Job. The theme of temptation will become the dominant structuring feature of all published versions of the text, with other lures confronting the Rebel. Already in the typescript we have several such encounters, the delegates of Early A being the first. Much can be said about this particular episode in Early B where the would-be devils comment on the seductiveness of (their) language. In terms of the history of the text, the scene is important because it will reframe/reinforce the scene with the delegates of Early A, as a scene of seduction. Furthermore, this scene sets up a struggle between the ornate words of deceit and the avowedly truthful poetry of Toussaint. Once this struggle is in place, it becomes possible to read the whole drama as a battle for words themselves.
Following the temptation, Toussaint and CRR will engage in a series of long exchanges over freedom, truth, revolution, sight, and a series of other dominant themes. The result of this long exchange is that we start moving away from any purported historical action to a poetic recasting of the hero as the center of the revolution. CRR declares Toussaint a king, and in the same breath, CRR predicts his death. Toussaint accepts his fate and vows to die “naked.” Just as he laments that his message might fall on deaf ears, he meditates on the reverberation of radical action. This is also the episode where Toussaint names his enemy as “Colomb” and addresses him in lines of exquisite anguish.

In the final episode, Toussaint confronts the crowds. They arrive on the stage ready to burn him. Rabble-rousers attempt to convince them that Toussaint is putting their lives in danger (yet another temptation), but Toussaint is able to sway them to the fight at hand by harshly scolding them for their cowardice. At the end of the episode the revolution continues, or is about to begin, or has just begun, but it is no longer the central focus of the play. The internal struggle of Toussaint the hero has taken over, and with this twist, historicity (and chronology) begin to erode.

**Virtual Version D: The concise drama.**

I would like to end my analysis with one more virtual version. It goes without saying that many other constructions can help refine our genetic analysis of the typescript. In fact, by ending our analysis of virtual versions here, we are ending in the middle of the process that produced the typescript as we know it. I
encourage the future student of the text, using the tools and precedents that I have laid out, to generate their own intermediary steps and perhaps correct or offer an alternative to my narrative.

Let us define Virtual Version D as those pages organized around and up to Early D (including Early A, B, Type and C) and excluding the extra-typographical revisions. To construct Virtual Version D we will also assume that those pages marked Early B have not received their pagination yet, and follow the pages marked with Early A. This effectively organizes the action in Virtual Version D chronologically, starting with the early days of the Haitian Revolution, moving on to the defeat of the English, and ending with Toussaint’s death in the Jura mountains.

Two features stand out in Virtual Version D: a) Four sections all roughly about 20-26 pages long (Early A and B are considered here different sections). This contrasts with the three acts of the final version of the typescript, averaging 35 pages an act; b) and following from (a), Virtual Version D is a coherent, albeit shorter, drama. In order not to repeat myself unnecessarily, I will just focus on Acte II and Acte III since we have studied in some detail the substance of Acte I (Virtual Versions A and B).

Here is a schematic view of the plot of Acte II and III in Virtual Version D divided by episodes:

I. Acte II (Saint Domingue)
a. A parade of officials and clergy praise Toussaint. The latter responds with disdain and turns the crowds against the hypocritical elites (42-46).

b. A group of white passersby complain about being ruled by a black general (48-50).

c. Toussaint expresses his dissatisfaction to CRR, who try to reassure him of his accomplishments (51-53).

d. White armies debark, leading to a new stage of the revolution: After a failed meeting with “Parliamentarians,” a new confrontation begins between the black armies and what is implied to be the armies of Napoleon (58, 60-61).

e. Toussaint’s troupes are forced to retreat to the bush to engage in guerilla warfare (62-63).

f. Over a scorched land, Toussaint sings of doubt while CRR sings the devastation (64-66).

g. The Acte ends with an encounter between Toussaint and a set of underground and celestial voices prophesying Toussaint’s imprisonment and death (67-68).

II. Acte III (France)

a. (In prison) Toussaint encounters his jailers (74-75).

b. Toussaint resists the offers of the messenger of the consul (78-80).
c. Toussaint confronts his son, who has been educated in France and tries to convince his father to compromise with his captors (85-88).

d. Toussaint is tortured and dies at the hands of his jailers (96-101).

As the reader can see, when we bring these episodes together with those of Virtual Version A and B, we have a coherent story. With the exception of the order of the segments in Acte I, we also have the general structure of the final version of the typescript. What additions come after Virtual Version D are mostly local. Césaire will reframe Acte II several times, and the general tenor of the drama changes as the CRR plays an increasingly central role next to Toussaint, but the overall edifice remains the same.

The theme of temptation that will characterize all of the published versions of the drama is already dominant at this stage. The major difference between the typescript and the published versions is that temptation does not only present itself to Toussaint, but to the crowds as well. The steadfastness of Toussaint/Le Rebelle in the face of temptation contrasts with the crowd’s vulnerability, for which Toussaint plays the role of Platonic educator. In this sense, the typescript explores the Promethean theme more thoroughly than the published versions by staging several encounters between Toussaint and the crowds. Later versions will rely more on the structure of Prometheus Bound, with Le Rebelle bound in prison from beginning to end, making the promethean figure the center of our attention at the expense of the event.
Although Virtual Version D already evinces a shift in emphasis from the historical narrative proper to the heroic and poetic subject, the text preserves history as a referent. Critics have remarked, and this can be readily verified, that Césaire was not very rigorous in his citations. Because he is oftentimes inaccurate, especially in his reconstruction of the events in our text, we are left wondering whether the problem lay with his sources or whether he was actively engaging in myth making.

An effort is currently underway, most notably under the initiative of Professor Jean Jonassaint of Syracuse University, to try to reconstruct Césaire’s readings on the Haitian Revolution based on clues found in his œuvre. One of the most fascinating features of our typescript—especially the beginning segment of Acte II, which comes into play in Virtual Version D—is the presence of quotes (not always in quotation marks) from historical sources. These quotes are placed in the mouth of a series of random characters and, of course, no citation is given.

Here are two references I have been able to identify:

2è orateur: Gloire à Toussaint Louverture, le Spartacus noir, le nègre prédit par Raynal pour venger les injures faites à sa race.

(42)

This line comes at the beginning of the episode, after the first orator has praised Toussaint for delivering the land from the tyrannical English. Ironically, the line comes from the British evangelist Marcus Rainsford's An historical account of the
black empire of Hayti (1805). Here are Rainsford’s words: “General Laveaux called him ‘the negro, the Spartacus, foretold by Raynal, whose destiny it was to avenge the wrongs committed on his race’” (247).

The next exact match comes in quotes:

*Le grand Maitre de l'Université: Gloire et reconnaissance à Toussaint Louverture éducateur du peuple! Libre à un Villaret-Joyeuse de fermer les écoles dans la Martinique voisine et de déclarer cyniquement: “L'ignorance est un lien nécessaire pour des hommes enchaînés par la violence ou flétris par les préjugés”.*

The quoted lines came originally from the Capitaine-General of Martinique and Saint-Lucie, Louis Thomas Villaret de Joyeuse, in a proposal to close down the schools under his jurisdiction. The original document was first published in 1861 in Augustin Cochin’s *L’Abolition de l’esclavage*. Other nineteenth-century books dealing with the question of slavery will reprint the lines, and I have not been able to determine whether Césaire copied it from Cochin or from later reprints of Villaret’s communiqué. The important point is that Césaire is using verbatim quotes from historical sources. This sort of “documentary” approach was also one of the main innovations of Piscator for the theater, and reinforces some of the points we made earlier about Césaire’s use of avant-garde techniques. Although, as Attilio Favorini has demonstrated, the so-called documentary theater can be traced back to the Greeks, its modern incarnation in the work of Brecht and
Piscator links it directly to questions of social justice, the role of crowds on stage, and other features more appropriate to Césaire’s drama.

Before moving from the typescript to the many other subsequent transformations of the text, we should briefly note one last feature of Virtual Version D. As Appendix II shows, Acte III is about half of what it would be when we reach pagination Late A. At this stage, it ends with Toussaint’s death and not with Dessalines continuation of the revolution. It is also missing a couple of recognizable episodes, especially the hallucinatory intrusion of “Le Grand Prohibiteur.” In a sense, the last minute addition of the Dessalines episode confirms that before sending the text to Breton, Césaire continued to see the historical narrative as a coherent frame for what was surely becoming the drama of Toussaint’s struggle.

The setting and action of Acte III will, for all intents and purposes, replace the historical settings in the published versions. Even as the typescript comes to its current state, the structure of the final act already echoes the overall structure of the text: Toussaint must ward-off the temptations coming from the enemy (the messenger), from his own people (his son), and from a divine being (the Holy Virgin). This simple structure of temptation, condensed in the third act, will carry over in all other reincarnations of the drama. The echoes in both structure and theme will eventually allow Césaire to bring all the action to the prison cell and leave the Haitian Revolution behind.
Toussaint Louverture and the Haitian Revolution were evoked as early as the 1939 version of the “Cahier d’un retour au pays natal.” Considering the importance of these two themes, their elision in the 1940s should still give us pause. In 1960 Césaire will publish his biography of Toussaint, *La Révolution Française et le problème colonial*, which doubled as an analysis of the revolution, and which was an important contribution at the time. Soon thereafter, his first successful play, *La Tragedie du Roi Christophe*, resumes the story of the revolution where the narrative of the typescript leaves off. Though we have seen how Césaire began to distance his text from history, understanding the reasons must wait for my next chapter.

Through systematic codicological and textual analysis, I have argued that the shift away from the events of the revolution and the transformation of Toussaint Louverture into an abstract Rebel began while the typescript was being drafted. The argument means to demonstrate the value of using rules-based virtual reconstructions for the study of complex modern manuscripts. In the next chapter, we will take a broader perspective on some of the themes explored in this chapter, in an attempt to answer the why and not the how of Césaire’s move away from history. To accomplish our goal, we will address more familiar, and therefore less controversial, textual units (the book, the poem, the article, the preview, etc.) and their attendant geo-temporal complexities. In other words, we will move away from the decomposition and comparison of the one document with itself, to the comparison of many documents with each other.
Chapter II: Adaptation

The significance of an adaptation can only be understood in relation to the total biology of the species.

Julian Huxley, *Evolution the modern synthesis*.

The wondering text

Césaire’s relationship to the international surrealist movement remains largely understudied and has been in some cases a source of acrimony amongst scholars who fail to reconcile this period with his more accessible militancy of the 1950s-60s. Notwithstanding, little doubt remains now that Césaire was published in surrealist contexts in Buenos Aires, Santiago de Chile, New York, and Paris during the 1940s. The question remains whether Césaire’s work was determined or not by surrealism. At the core of the question is not simply an innocent stocktaking of the writer’s influences, but a tug-o-war for the political identity of Césaire and the philosophies he is supposed to endorse with his writings.

Césaire’s texts from this period do not help provide a clear answer for several reasons. First of all, Césaire remains a unique voice amongst his surrealist peers, most notably in his use of an imaginary drawn from the historical experience of Africans and the African diaspora. His distinctiveness should not surprise us once we acknowledge that the surrealist movement was already very
heterogeneous, both ideologically and artistically, even amongst those who draw from a solely European imaginary. Furthermore, Césaire’s major works of the time, the 1947 editions of Cahier d’un retour au pays natal (CRBR, CRBO) and the 1946 edition of Les Armes miraculeuses (AM46), which includes the first published version of Et les chiens se taisaient (Ch46), both contain material that was composed before and after Césaire met Breton. This complex situation proves to be a blessing in disguise, for it undermines all attempts at reductionism by either camp: those who would have him out-surreal Breton and those who would prefer to ignore his affiliation to the movement.

A close study of the textual evidence and Césaire’s editorial adventures during the war period moves us away from questions of an essential Césaire—questions that are futile—to more pertinent ones about adaptation to particular editorial and textual environments. While I do not believe that the “author function” is radically insidious, as Foucault would have it be, and even if I join those who call for a decentralization of its role in bibliography and literary history, I do take to heart Foucault’s premise that the author serves to organize, after the fact, a diffuse mass of discursive (read textual) events. If that diffuse mass of texts, in need of organization, constitutes the ground out of which the author function sprouts, by extension, other organizational principles, and with them other functions, become possible. We think right away of a textual function (the Text helps organize textual events), a social function (context helps organize textual events), an institutional function, a reader function, etc.
Once we consider that the names of texts accompany the names of authors across different and semi-overlapping geographies and temporalities, we are not too far from realizing that authors and texts function differently according to their environments. The symbolic constellations radiating from the notion of adaptation are apt to describe these processes.

The task of this chapter is twofold. First, to lay the groundwork for a re-evaluation of Césaire as a function of, “the free circulation, the free manipulation, the free composition, decomposition, and recomposition of fiction [actual texts],” and of those texts as functions of the particular place and time where they erupt, interrupt and adapt. Secondly, what we seek then is not the real Césaire, nor the real Et les chiens se taisaient, but a series of "historical meanings," to borrow from D. F. McKenzie, where author and text are but functional nodes in interlacing unstable ecosystems that also include us as readers.

When McKenzie famously declares in his Panizzi lectures, “any history of the book [...] must be a history of misreadings,” he implies that textual fields are marked by a series of localizable (as opposed to definitive) readings, from the author’s writing as reading, to the editor’s intrusions as reading, to our own critical discourse as reading (25). In doing so, he opens the door for us to oscillate between bibliography and critical discourse, effectively blurring the boundaries between the two:

With that last example [from Congreve], it could be argued that we reach the border between bibliography and textual criticism on the
one hand and literary criticism and literary history on the other. My own view is that no such border exists. In the pursuit of historical meanings, we move from the most minute feature of the material form of the book to questions of authorial, literary, and social context. These all bare in turn on the ways in which texts are then re-read, re-edited, re-designed, re-printed, and re-published. If a history of readings is made possible only by a comparative history of books, it is equally true that a history of books will have no point if it fails to account for the meanings they later come to make. (22)

In other words, we depart at the end of existing trajectories. When we look back at the actual texts that form part of the phylogensis of what we now call *Les Armes miraculeuses* and *Et les chiens se taisaient*, we are inevitably oriented by our own position in the post-publication history of the 1946 edition. Before 1946, the identity and stability of individual items, large and small, remained in flux. We deal, in a way, with what Marta Werner, *a propos* of Emily Dickinson's late writings, called, “contents without a book” (5). Unlike Dickinson's “radical scatters” though, Césaire’s texts more often than not orient themselves towards a bibliographic telos, theater included. Nevertheless, despite the clear desire for a public, the fragments and collections of the 1941-1946 period are characterized by bibliographic misdirection: promises of things to come, rearrangements, tentative titles, “fragments,” etc.
The study of the textual situation, of the variations and textual blocks that decompose and recompose *Les Armes miraculeuses*, including the first published fragments of *Et les chiens se taisaient*, provides us then with an excellent laboratory to test the idea that textual migration or transposition across different environments is invariably accompanied by a process of *adaptation*, both Darwinian by simple analogy to the *ludo magister* played between species and environments, text and context, and as an explosion of the literary variety, usually reserved for generic shifts and trans-mediatic phenomena.

This study is indeed enriched by the fact that the work of *Et les chiens se taisaient* continues down a spiral of strange generic and mediatic crossovers beyond 1946, becoming eventually an *arrangement théâtrale*, a collaborative work, a radio-play and a short-film. At the broadest level, the study of the adaptations provide a window into the continuing formation of transnational, multilingual publishing networks in the middle of the twentieth century that prefigures the global market for anti-colonial and postcolonial literature. More specifically, I propose that we understand textual transformation as a process determined by the adaptation of addressable textual units to different *editorial* and *textual* environments, rather than as a shift in what we would call a coherent poetics born out of the author’s purported artistic integrity or journey of self-discovery.

To follow D. F. McKenzie’s call to collapse, “the border between bibliography and textual criticism on the one hand and literary criticism and literary history on the other” (23), and to take to heart the notion that text is at
heart a trans-mediatic phenomenon, forces us to work at the interstices of many disciplines and privilege, by default, the relational over the ontological. My notion of adaptation, McKenzian in essence, blurs the boundaries between adaptation understood as a textual phenomenon (e.g. shifts in genre, shifts in meaning attendant to transpositions, etc.) and adaptation understood as an historical phenomenon (e.g. shifts in readings attendant to different production loci). Adaptation unbound becomes the quintessential form of textual relation, tracing the paths as we explore the textual condition, without necessarily forcing a choice between the will to taxonomy and attention to material reality, and/or between a-temporal and geo-temporal relationships.

As I've been suggesting thus far, I recognize two broad environments where adaptation takes place under similar topological conditions: Textual and editorial. By textual environment, I mean simply the aggregate of addressable and embodied textual units (i.e a poem in a journal, a stanza in a poem, a fragment in a stanza, etc.). Potentially, all real texts can be remediated to become part of a larger text *ad infinitum*. In other words, texts are not only contained by material boundaries (i.e. binding, pages, screens, etc.), they can also be contained by other texts. This rather obvious observation has several peculiar implications if the concept of adaptation is to remain useful at all. In brief, it is of the nature of text to be both species and environment, depending on how we address it.

In my next chapter, we will explore textual environments, the problem of addressability and the fundamental auto-poetic practice of transposition in more detail. Furthermore, I will expand on the distinction between environment and
text—the scroll and the lego, as I call them—with the understanding that the one can always become the other. In the meantime, we can work with the provisional notion that a semantically coherent textual sequence is to be considered a block of text or lego when we find two different states of that sequence with different bordering texts, or contexts. Therefore, when we say that a given block adapts to a new textual environment, we mean it informs and is informed by its new context. These same blocks, sometimes carrying an identity, sometimes anonymous, adapt also to editorial environments.

By editorial environment I mean three things: first, the set of pressures born from the different publishing houses, peers and potential audiences; second, the material constraints of the medium; and third, the exigencies of genre-specific editorial projects. 69 In our particular case, the text of the typescript is not only transformed to appeal to a new audience, it moves farther away from a potential local stage to become an integral part of a Gallimard collection of poems, Les Armes miraculeuses: different audiences, different genres, different material circumstances. 70

As I suggested above, at the most fundamental level, both of these environments, editorial and textual, entail adaptation. A textual sequence, for example, can adapt to a new venue or a new genre as much as it can adapt to another textual sequence. But the kinship goes beyond simple isomorphism: the one is not a metaphor for the other, nor is the fact that they provoke graphable topologies enough. Inasmuch as texts do not exist outside of material reality, and inasmuch as that material reality is determined by particular editorial
considerations and projects, the two are bound together procedurally. Instead of claiming direct causal links between one and the other, though—a very difficult case to make either way—I argue that the editorial and the textual participate in a mutual process where both perpetually feed each other. Along these lines, in this chapter I explore the hypothesis that the manipulation of textual fragments that characterizes Césaire’s authorial practice from 1941 to 1946 is informed in several important ways by the particular dynamics of a set of francophone editorial environments of the World War II period and vice-versa.

Partly in order to further refine my use of the notion, partly in order to distance myself from these approaches, I feel the need to address other disciplinary uses of the notion of adaptation briefly before returning to the study of the Césaire materials. 71 The history of adaptationist approaches, taking their cue from biology and exclusively devoted to literature, can be dated back at least as far as Darwin’s contemporary, Hippolyte Taine. Many variations on the theme have surfaced since, none truly achieving academic prominence until recently. Two contemporary schools of literary thought have made Darwin relevant again within the humanities.

The first of these schools, “Literary Darwinism,” exemplified by the work of Carroll, Cooke, Easterling, et al., argues for a causation model that aims to link literary production to cognitive processes understood under the frame of the materialist and evolutionary theory of mind (Carroll). Not only does this form of thinking inherit, without resolving, all the problems of the intentionalist school,
albeit from a “scientific” point of view, it ultimately fails to explain the meaningful relationships that texts have with each other and the editorial circumstances of their production. Although motive or intention plays a role in any artistic endeavor, any theory of literature would be incomplete without an understanding of the networks—human, material and textual—that shape and give meaning to it. In this regard, the insights of Action-Network Theory—Callon, Latour, et al.—which assigns agency to nonhumans and humans alike, can be an appropriate corrective for the yearnings to limit the study of literature to biological imperatives (Latour). Although I don’t resort to ANT directly in this study, the reader will notice some overlap between our conceptual apparatuses.

The second of these schools, and perhaps the most influential today, we could call somewhat loosely the “distant-reading” school, exemplified by the work of Franco Moretti, the Stanford Working Group, the Genre Evolution Project and others. The well-known aims of this school, to distance analysis from the individual text and vet large collections using a medley of statistical approaches and visual rhetoric, share the use of biological and environmental categories as analogies. Although we have much to learn from these “macro-economic” approaches, as Matt Jockers recently re-baptized them (Jockers), the current models on offer pose several problems, all deserving critical attention beyond the scope of the present work. I will limit my critique to a few observations.

Perhaps the most famous example of the type of work carried under the banner of distant-reading is Moretti's study of literary devices in detective novels
coupled with data about the literary market, in which he argues that the genre
developed to favor certain devices that were rewarded with purchases by the
reading public (72-76). Moretti’s use of the Darwinian model of adaptation
foregrounds the notion of the survival of the fittest. This is the first point of
departure from my model, in which texts do not adapt to new environments in
order to survive. Instead, I make the more radical claim that texts adapt by
default. Put differently, no text (or literary device) ever survives a re-
contextualization intact, and vice-versa, no context remains intact.

Because texts are actualized in topological spaces, they can be exactly
located in fields where all adjacent points to it are immutable. In other words, a
copy of *Et les armes miraculeuses* radiates a series of adjacent points, some
pointing to the textual fragments from which it is assembled, some to the specific
geographical coordinates of its appearance, some to the other copies, some to the
particular readings which it engendered, and so on and so forth. Whether any
given adaptation is a “success” or a “failure” is irrelevant.

More importantly, the main problem with the Moretti approach is the
disregard for the determining role that materiality plays in the production of
meaning, literary devices included. Paradoxically, at the moment when the
distant-readers turn their lenses on large bibliographies to draw their conclusions,
bibliographic difference is lodged into an artificial *ceteris paribus*, as texts are
divested of their rich contexts purely as linguistic phenomena. Although I explore
a purely string-based approach in my next chapter, I keep coming back to the
material reality of the documents at hand. Studies completely divorced from
materiality will not do when we hold as a self-evident truth that all text is embodied.

Paradoxically, as attention is reoriented towards literary markets and Culture writ-large in the Moretti approach, the complex interactions between author, editors and audience are flattened to sustain the fiction of a discrete totality. Should we not prefer then the working notion of open environments writ-small, in which commerce plays one role among many, such as ideology, material constraints, accidents, etc.? More important still, as we will see shortly in the case of Césaire’s editorial vagabondage, markets and cultures don’t take kindly to borders.

I don't mean to say that the study of literary markets, lemmas, devices and genre is useless. I would neither dismiss quantitative methodologies or visual rhetoric. Quite the contrary, what I do propose is to actively oscillate at all distances from literature, close and distant, without losing sight of bibliographic reality. Let us call this tempered opportunism, oscillatory materialism. The present work hopes to demonstrate by example that we can be all the more rigorous, and our explanations all the more vital, when we stop limiting ourselves to fixed-distance models. Meanwhile, the one and the many that is literature remains our subject of conversation.
The francophone "Culture of Reprint": Fragments of *Tropiques*

A syncretic artifact is not a synthesis, but rather a signifier made of differences. What happens is that, in the melting pot of societies that the world provides, syncretic processes realize themselves through an economy in whose modality of exchange the signifier of there—of the Other—is consumed ("read") according to local codes that are already in existence; that is, codes from here.

Antonio Benítez-Rojo, *The Repeating Island*

The trajectory from the early inklings of the typescript to the first published version of *Et les chiens se taisaient* is marked by the transition from one editorial environment (local, Vichy Martinique) to another, (surrealist/francophone international), even as the lines between the two become blurred. This movement in turn carries with it an intermediary series of editorial ventures that eventually lead to the publication of the *Cahier d'un retour au pays natal* and of the poetry collection *Les Armes miraculeuses*, in which *Et les chiens se taisaient* occupies about half of the total number of pages. These other two editorial projects must be studied in conjunction with the materials belonging to the drama proper. In the same way that we cannot understand the first published version of the drama without taking into account its place in a collection of poetry, we cannot understand how the text evolved without understanding how that same collection evolved. Fortunately, the period from 1941 to 1946 provides
the richest trove of genetic materials for the Césaire scholar, even if paradoxically it is the least studied.

Reacting to the received notion that *Tropiques*, and as an extension, Césaire, was already surrealist before the fateful meeting with Breton in April, 1941, Michel Hausser compares the first two issues of the journal to argue that any overt transition begins with the second issue. As he argues, though, the entrance of surrealism comes, “*par la petit porte, ou si l’on accepte cette autre métaphore, ce n’est qu’un greffon*” (245). The estimation that surrealism has been “grafted” on to *Tropiques* seems apt.

![Figure 2.A - Relative frequencies of the words vie, l’homme, surréalisme and breton in Tropiques](image-url)
As Figure 2.A suggests, neither the word *surrealism*, nor the name Breton appears in the first issue. What we have instead is a journal that overtly embraces the fight for cultural autonomy, placing Man and Life at the center of its ideological thrust against Cartesianism and instrumental rationality. In this sense, like surrealism, the journal begins in line with kin modernist projects that decried Western civilization’s perceived moral decline. Although a cannibalization of surrealism will eventually help mediate the journal’s thinking on cultural independence, mostly through the championing of (semi-)automatic poetry, the marvelous, the imagination, dreams, madness, etc. as conduits to (Caribbean) Man’s authentic Life, these last two, *l’Homme* and *la Vie*, pervade the lexicon of the journal.

Hausser argues justly, and my reading concurs, that for the writers of *Tropiques*, surrealism provides more of a methodological toolkit than an agenda: the target remains elsewhere (248 - 249). Our intent in this section is not to find the philosophical essence of the journal, but rather to explore its editorial agenda and production to provide a survey of the environment of Césaire’s early publications. From the opening gambit of the first issue, Césaire lays out a program for the journal that will remain consistent until the end:

l'atrophiement monstrueux de la voix, le séculaire accablement, le prodigieux mutisme. Point de ville. Point d'art. Point de poésie.

Point de civilisation, la vraie, je veux dire cette projection de l'homme sur le monde; ce modelage du monde par l'homme; cette frappe de l'univers à l'effigie de l'homme.\textsuperscript{75} (“Présentation” 5)

This sentiment is also shared by the other two main contributors of the journal, Suzanne Césaire and René Ménil. Here is Ménil, also on the first issue:

\textit{Seuls, nous pouvons exprimer ce par quoi nous sommes uniques. Si nous ne voulons pas être seulement spectateurs de l'aventure humaine, si nous croyons qu'il faut payer de soi pour simplement participer à l'humanité véritable, si nous sommes persuadés qu'ici comprendre n'est rien et que c'est faire qui importe, nous savons quelle tâche nous incombe et quelle voie mène à sa réalisation.}\textsuperscript{76} (“Naissance” 60)

Because the goal is to provide an authentic voice, to address a perceived lack, the general tenor of the journal will remain pedagogical: over the years we will see the prevalence of introductory texts dedicated to an exploration of diverse subjects, including the flora and fauna of the region, regional art (or lack-thereof), regional history (including a basic introduction to the history of the slave trade), folk tales, and more \textit{a propos}, a set of accessible works of literary theory meant to set the critical stage for the rather difficult poetry of Césaire. For this last purpose,
several entries by René Ménil, Suzanne Césaire and a direct study by Aristide Maugée constitute the first set of important criticism of Césaire’s poetry.

Not only does *Tropiques* feel the need to provide an authentic voice, that voice must serve as a way for Martinique, and by synecdoche the Caribbean, to enter the “human adventure” as an equal. Although the emphasis is on those inheritances and experiences which are particular to Caribbean *Man* and *Life* (African inheritance, slavery, colonialism, etc.), at no point do we hear a call for a separation from the whole of humanity along racial lines and/or a contestation of universal History as a valid category. This is a far cry from Edouard Glissant’s critique of a History-cum-Totality that subordinates non-Western histories (141), or Walter Mignolo’s conception of, “spatial confrontations between different concepts of history” (67). For the *Tropiques* group, History must simply be supplemented, perhaps revolutionized, but the idea that History has universal import and sway remains unquestioned. We must read Césaire’s defense against charges of racism lobbed at him in this light, “*Mais les faisant, mon cœur, préservez-moi de toute haine/ne faites point de moi cet homme de haine pour qui je/n'ai que haine*”77 (*Cahier* 23). This distinction becomes important when we consider Césaire’s choice in the *editio princeps* for history-as-residue over the typescript’s history-as-referent.

Before getting bogged down in Hegelian conceptions of the “concrete universal”—posthumously sanctioned by the *Tropiques* group—I would prefer to ground these yearnings for universality in the editorial practices of the journal. If the early evolution of *Et les chiens se taisaient* is defined by a movement from
historical particularity to a more universally accessible text, this new universalism is not any less particular to the editorial horizons that inform it, *Tropiques* included.

According to the colophons, the journal was printed first at the “Imprimerie du Courrier des Antilles” from issue N°1-5, and at “Imprimerie du Gouvernement” from N°6-7 onwards. The bibliographic kinship between the two seems to indicate the difference is merely titular. The historical record is not clear on the change from *Courrier des Antilles*, an imprint associated to an independent journal and *doodooist* literature, to a governmental vehicle.

“Our imprimeries du Gouvernement” or government presses were common in the history of French colonialism. The one in Martinique had been a mainstay of colonial administration since 1859, when it was commissioned by the colony “en régie” from private owners (Annuaire 42). For decades the press was responsible for government publications and publications of local interest. The press remained active at least until the publication of *L'affranchissement des esclaves aux Antilles Françaises* by Pierre Baude in 1948. The disappearance of the press can be linked to the *loi de départementalisation*, a consequence that Césaire maneuvered to counteract at the national assembly in 1950 (“Discours” 3755 – 3758).

Césaire’s efforts attest to the importance that such ‘imprimeries officielles’ played in the cultural life of the French colonies. This close link to the government also implies that the specter of censorship was directly linked to the production of the journal during the Vichy regime. All the more astonishing then
that the editorial team seems to have had such control over the design of the journal, as well as its content. Considering the main purpose of the press, the use of available materials to blow an avant-garde horn speaks of the resourcefulness and gumption of that intrepid band of young editors.

The design of the journal supplements its propédeutique tendencies and the search for authenticity moored in the universal. The semi-square cut of the pages, the use of a motley assortment of bold fonts for section headings, the overabundance of white space and section breaks, spacious line breaks, and the consistent use of a set of New Caledonia for the body, all betray a modernist aesthetic which privileges the short burst over the sustained effort.

Notwithstanding, I fail to see any Caribbean specificity in the design of the revue of the sort we find in future Caribbean journals. Though the limitations in design may be ascribed to the material constraints attendant to the war period, the choices made by the editorial team seem to establish a dialogue with other journalistic projects of the twentieth century, in particular with the French tradition of la petite revue and the cahiers, akin in many ways to the anglophone “little magazines.”

In his attempt to reconcile Anglo-American modernism with the European avant-garde through their shared use of medium and technique, Daniel Bennett rightly suggested a few decades ago that, “the literature and poetics of the fragment were produced for and by the little magazine” (480). While Bennett seems to ignore the longue durée of the “fragment” as an important form in literary history—European and otherwise—or the birth of a critical discourse
around fragments within the Jena group—which still haunts our critical thought—
his point is well taken that the little magazine produces specific kinds of
fragments. I would go further and claim that Tropiques produces its own specific
fragmentations, informed at all turns by bibliographic and editorial pressures
particularly to the publication.

The issues were divided in thematic sections, ranging from 2 to 5
depending on the issue. An unnumbered appendix usually followed with revues,
notes and nouvelles. From the first issue several offerings were presented as tastes
of things to come or parts of an absent whole: A. Césaire, “Fragment d’un poème”
(N°1); R. Ménil, “Naissance de notre art” (N°1); A. Césaire “Fragment d’un
poème: Le Grand midi (fin)” (N°2), A. Maugée “Poésie et obscurité” (N°2); to
name a few. Promises of content-to-come rarely materialize in subsequent issues.
Other offerings came as evident variations on a theme: the contributions by René
Ménil, Georges Gratiant, and Georgette Anderson are exemplary in this regard.
By implication, we must consider the journal an atelier as much as a vehicle for
cultural renewal. Furthermore, we are reminded that the journal catered to the
sample as opposed to the full-fleshed work. For prose, this meant that ideas had to
be communicated succinctly; for poetry, it meant long pieces like the Cahier d’un
retour au pays natal were out of the question, even in serialized form.

The compromise over material limits went only so far, though. A generous
use of white pages to separate the larger sections and enough white space to allow
Césaire’s poetry to play with line layout betray an opposite tendency in the
journal to offer a particular reading experience. Ironically, the ubiquitous empty spaces only serve to reinforce the sense of fragmentation.

Since many of the short essays were meant as introductory pieces to other authors—local and international—the quote is perhaps the most prominent feature of the journal’s prose, in particular the block quote, oftentimes separated from the rest of the text by white space or an intervening curt interpretation. Furthermore, we can interpret the small samples—which helped introduce several authors to the *Tropiques* audience—as variations of the quote, adapted and apt for the constrained pedagogical environment.

Nothing in the journal indicates that copyright was respected by the editors, who reprinted samples from recent publications without regard for the Berne convention. The liberty to reprint, to quote via fragments, could be explained by the isolation of the island during the war, the scant communication to and from, the priorities of their legal system, etc. These would be good alibis indeed if we did not find similar practices in the rest of the francophone journals of the period. Most likely, the practice is due to the fact that international copyright law was still not observed universally and to the nature of the francophone journalistic projects themselves.

As we will soon see, this “culture of reprint” will be accompanied by acute self-awareness of the geographically distributed and non-overlapping audiences which fostered the use of recycled material, with important implications for Césaire’s writing and its genesis. The “culture of reprint” also provides the ideal
editorial environment for us to model and address textual blocks (whether they are bibliographic units or fragments) on a network of geo-temporal relations and localities.

The debut proper of *Tropiques* on the international stage must be dated as far back as André Breton’s encounter with the first issue of the journal in a store owned by René Ménil’s sister early in 1941. In all probability, Breton carried with him copies of the journal with him to New York. The first direct evidence that the journal is making the rounds in New York, however, comes from an article by surrealist poet Nicolas Calas in the 1941 October-November issue of *View*. We learn of its existence from Rosemont and Kelley’s anthology, *Black Brown & Beige: Surrealist Writings from Africa and the Diaspora*. Here’s the relevant passage reprinted from the latter:

> When the detestable writings of so many famous authors of our day will have been forgotten and when critics and poets will begin to look for the creative writing of the war period, they will then dig out and reprint, with all the honors due to them, the early numbers of *Tropiques*. I know of no review which can boast of the high quality of this small quarterly French review of Martinique. The fact that such a review can be published is enough to put to shame those artists and poets who today feel discouraged and abandon all struggle, either because the public is not interested in their work, or because they are afraid of the political consequences of their efforts. It is difficult to imagine that conditions anywhere outside
Nazi-dominated Europe could be worse than they are in the Vichy colony of Martinique; as to the cultural conditions of a colony that France has always neglected, from all one hears they are abominable. Yet, Aristide Maugée does not hesitate to defend in *Tropiques* the case of obscurity in poetry, in an article which we hope someday to see published in English. René Ménil writes about “Directions in Poetry,” a most inspired and inspiring article, while Aimé Césaire published a fragment of an admirable poem.

Calas is referring here to issue N°2, where we find the article by A. Maugée “Poésie et obscurité,” R. Ménil’s article “Orientation de la poésie” and Césaire’s “Fragments d’un poème (fin).” Breton (along with Lam and Masson) left Martinique aboard the *Presidente Trujillo* on May 16, and issue N°2 came out in July. I have not been able to verify how the issue made it into the hands of Breton.  

This same issue also published translations of works by James Weldon Johnson, Jean Toomer, and Claude McKay. The last two were alive in 1941, but nothing suggests that their work was published with their knowledge. Although the translation of the Toomer poem, “Chant de la moisson” (“Harvest Song”) is attributed to Eugene Jolas’ 1921 *Anthologie de la nouvelle poésie américaine*, the translation of McKay’s famous poem “À l’Amérique,” (“America”) is left unreferenced. Available in New York somehow, and reprinting works by living writers, *Tropiques* sets in motion a hemispheric gambit beyond theory. That these
living writers were at different points New York residents should not go by unnoticed.

If *Tropiques* N°2 deals directly with surrealism for the first time, N°3 is the first to showcase it. This issue had just been released when Suzanne Césaire sent a letter to Breton, dated October, 1941. According to her, several copies of the number were attached to the letter. A previous letter from Breton had arrived just in time for her to include one of his poems as an illustration for her article “André Breton, poète” (38). The poem in question was dedicated to Suzanne, “Pour Madame.” Breton gave no indication that he meant for this poem to be published, and Suzanne admits to having taken the liberty to do so. Perhaps the best open secret for those involved in editorial projects during the war period, this pseudo-freedom to publish content outside of formal contractual engagements is not without import to the hemispheric orientation of the journal *Tropiques* and the genesis of *Les armes miraculeuses*.

I borrow the term “culture of reprinting” from Meredith L. McGill’s excellent study of the pre-1848 literary scene in the United States, *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting*, to help us describe the editorial environment of international surrealism during the inter-war period. The goal here is not to dwell on reprints (or originals) *per se*, but to, “show the way that the system of reprinting recasts the reading and writing of poetry and fiction” (7). Several important differences should be noted between the American editorial landscape McGill’s study examines and the networks that make up the French expatriate publishing ventures at this period, but some essential similarities
sanction our loan, especially those that allow us to connect editorial environments with authorial practice: a) Publication is for the most part decentralized, with no clear dominant metropolis; and b) “Authors themselves had difficulty determining exactly where, in what formats, and how extensively their poems and tales circulated” (17).

As Rosemont and Kelley have pointed out, surrealist publishers were notoriously inclusive many years before the outbreak of the war forced a substantial part of the French intelligentsia into exile (22-28). By the time War World II had begun, the burgeoning internationalism of the French avant-garde became concretized in editorial alliances across the globe made up of petite revues and opportunities for book-length publications. We should emphasize that this new internationalism was not dominated by surrealism, even if the latter played an important role. In fact, several of the stakeholders in francophone publishing ventures, some of whom will eventually praise or publish Césaire, were openly hostile to surrealism.

The loose network continued for the duration of the war and dissipated only after Paris regained its status as the editorial center of the francophone universe. Regardless of ideological or aesthetic disagreements, the period is characterized by international cooperation among those with access to printing operations. Furthermore, whether allied to surrealism or not, the Free French worked explicitly to give the sense that a French tradition continued and survived outside of France.
While the internationalism of the surrealist publications in pre-war France was indeed inclusive, the new internationalism involved direct collaboration with local editorial traditions in several continents. As a result, several of the publications that will provide a home for Césaire’s material outside of *Tropiques* were bilingual (to varying degrees) and contained contributions from local and international authors: *VVV, Lettres Françaises, Hémisphères*, etc. In order to sustain the project of a France outside of France, these publications engaged in promotional work for each other. Exchanges consisted of advertisements, reviews of articles and whole issues, distribution of copies through the post, and more importantly, reprints and originals from writers affiliated to different editorial geographies. The result is perhaps captured by Juan Suárez’s description of *View,* “a jumble of disordered fragments: articles, interviews, illustrations, reviews, book notices, and reports from the literary and art worlds” (“View”).

In contrast to an editorial center, where a reprint could be easily recognized by a shared audience, the decentralization of the war period generated several editorial blind spots, where a reprint was for all intents and purposes new to different audiences. This situation increases the number and varieties of fragmentation because authors and publishing ventures tended to adapt existing material to the needs of those non-overlapping audiences.

In the absence of enforceable laws or a recognizable protocol, the practice of reprinting was also accompanied by apprehension about where and how texts were reprinted. When Roger Caillois reviews the *Fontaine* N°35 versions of “Un grand poète noir” and “Batouque” for *Lettres françaises* N°15, he complains that
the editors of that journal were defrauding their audiences by claiming that, “La revue ne publie que de l’inédit”\textsuperscript{84} (58). Along the same lines, when Breton (twice) expresses his regret to Goll that he allowed him to publish “Un grand poète noir” in \textit{Hémisphères} N\textdegree{}2-3, he does so because he did not deem it the right venue, and as he (falsely) claims, because it had been published earlier in \textit{Lettres françaises} (Letter 3 Feb. 1944). Interestingly enough, all the Césaire poems published in \textit{VVV} were original, while all the ones published in \textit{Hémisphères} were reprints. Though in principle Breton was not against others reprinting his works, he was careful to print only original work in his venue. Césaire will navigate these divergent editorial attitudes expertly, always informing Breton of the publication status of the texts he sends him.

We must keep these dynamics in mind when we look at the two main strategies behind the \textit{Tropiques} efforts to reach an audience beyond its colonial borders, both exemplified in the letter from Suzanne: a) shipping copies of the journal to various potential allies, and b) printing and reprinting works by living writers, surrealists or not, outside of their immediate circle.

Besides Suzanne’s article, issue N\textdegree{}3 includes poems by Jéanne Megnen, then married to Pierre Mabille, author of the influential “Mirroir du merveilleux.” In fact, Suzanne informs Breton on the same letter that they had received, “des poèmes de Jeanne Mégnen, un texte de Pierre Mabille,” but “Les poèmes seuls ont pu paraître dans Tropiques”\textsuperscript{85} (Letter 21 Oct. 1941). We don’t know exactly how Césaire and the couple were first introduced. Most likely, this happened through the auspices of either Breton or Lam, who both knew Mabille before the
war, and who both had a chance to reacquaint themselves with in Guadeloupe, after they left Martinique in May of 1941, on their way to their different war-time destinations.

Even if the Mabille text could not be published in this issue, two other interventions touching on the marvelous were: René Ménil’s “Introduction au Merveilleux” and Georgette Anderson’s “Maeterlinck et le merveilleux.” The poems by Césaire in this issue, “Survie,” “N’ayez point pitié de moi,” “Au dela” and “Perdition,” in a section entitled “Poèmes” (24-26), and “En rupture de mer morte” in a section entitled “Postface,” were now shorter and more susceptible to surrealist readings (74-76). Finally, the issue contains a review of the surrealist group “Viernes” in Venezuela, praising them for seeking an autochthonous voice through surrealism and chastising them for their rejection of, “les erreurs philosophiques du maître français,” i.e. Breton (“Mouvement” 58).

Overall, issue N°3 reads like a special issue on surrealism. This is not surprising. Issue N°2 had already announced that it would be this way, “Nous nous proposons, dans notre prochain numéro, d’accorder à l’esthétique surréaliste toute l’attention qu’exige son importance” (76). Even if the issue is not subtitled “special,” it is important to mark the distinction here between a thematic issue and a regular issue of Tropiques. If we observe the distribution curves for surréalisme and Breton in Figure 2.A, we will notice that surrealism is not showcased consistently throughout the run of the journal, with two peaks in issue N°3 and N°8-9. The same holds for the journals in New York, where a special issue of Hémisphères on the tropics will later on serve as a platform for
Césaire's work. What makes the issue special for us is not necessarily the thematic coherence, but the fact that N°3 marks the first efforts to adapt the content provided by the local team to direct contributions by living writers outside of Martinique, casting its eyes on North and South America at the same time.

The “Venezuelan” overtures of the issue consist of two sub-sections under the section “Revue des Revues, Nouvelles, Notes.” The first sub-section, under the heading, “I - Lettre Vénézuélienne,” consists of an article on a, “petit livre de Monsieur [René L.F.] Durand” published by Courrier des Antilles in 1941, the same imprint that published the first five issues of Tropiques. The author will later play a minor role in the history of Latin-American letters for his French translations of authors such as Carpentier and Borges, and for his book “La négritude dans l'œuvre poétique de Ruben Dario.” The unsigned review —most likely by Ménil— begins with the revealing question: “Allons-nous, oui ou non, établir des relations culturelles suivies avec nos voisins américains et espagnols ?” The meeting-ground for that relationship is clear:

_Urgence d'autant plus réelle que nos problèmes sont souvent les mêmes que les leurs. Mêmes difficultés rencontrées. Mêmes solutions proposées. Pays coloniaux ou semi-coloniaux, pays qui se cherchent. Cultures qui à travers les pseudomorphoses tendent à affirmer leur originalité propre. Et dans cette fièvre, debout, là 'le nouvel Indien', ici le Nègre nouveau._

(52)
A bold theoretical gesture, but also an extended hand to their southern neighbors in a position to reciprocate. The second article, under the heading “Le mouvement poétique au Venezuela,” isolates their editorial counterpart in Venezuela, the journal Viernes. The editors of Tropiques make sure to affiliate themselves with the essentials of the program of the Venezuelan journal, except for their attempts at distancing themselves from Breton.94 To read the article in the light of a multivalent attempt at internationalization, we can't fail to notice the adroit balancing act needed to adhere to an authentic hemispheric project, while protecting the bonds to “le maître français” (58). Viernes in turn, betrays a similar attitude to internationalization and the thirst for universalism of its neighbor. As William Martínez, Jr. recently put it:

Reinaba el cosmopolitismo, desigual al acostumbrado por escritores modernistas latinoamericanos, el deseo de ir más allá de las fronteras y problemáticas nacionales y enfrentarse a la realidad de la universalidad humana.95 (41)

Sadly, and unbeknownst to the Tropiques group, the journal Viernes would cease publication on May 1941, hardly a month after the first issue of Tropiques goes into circulation and before real collaboration could take place.

Similar outreach efforts will follow in future issues of Tropiques. By the time we reach the last issue, its pages would have featured samples from Jeanne Méguen and Pierre Mabille (Haiti), Lucie Thésée (Guadeloupe), André Breton (New York), Charles Duits (New York), Jorge Caceres (Chile), Lidia Cabrera
(Cuba), Victor Brauner (France), Étiemble (Egypt), Francis Picabia (France), Alejo Carpentier (Cuba) and Pierre Loeb (Cuba). We should also add to this list countless quotes and references across the Atlantic. The result is clear: if the agenda for the *Tropiques* group is overtly determined by a desire for an authentic local voice that could contribute—on an equal footing—to an imagined universal dialogue, the journal actualizes this desire by surrounding the contributions of local writers with a cadre of their luminous contemporaries. Furthermore, each of these entries testifies to the growing reach of the journal.

All the above authors are represented in the pages of *Tropiques* through small samples of their work. But *Tropiques* was not only receptive to imports from abroad. The export business was also thriving, and the same fate awaited Césaire when he began shipping off his material. From the outset, the dominant form of currency remained the small sample or the excerpt, and Césaire built his reputation on these.

Although Césaire had by the end of 1943 two long poems, the “Cahier d’un retour aux pays natal” and *Le Grand Midi*, one drama, the finished draft of *Et les chiens se taisaient*, his journal publications both in and out of *Tropiques* consisted for the most part of promises of things to come, excerpts and small poems. Césaire’s first short poems in issue N°3 will become common practice from that point forward. If we follow the sequence leading up to the end of 1943 the pattern is clear: issue N°4: “Poème pour l’aube” (short poem); N°5: “En guise de manifeste littéraire” (short-to-medium poem); N°6-7: “Entrée des amazones,” “Fantômes à vendre,” “Femme d’eau” and “Tam-tam de nuit” (short poems); and
N°8 “Avis de tir” (short poem). These poems are not only closer to the surrealist preference for shorter poems, they lend themselves better to a possible reprint. The *Tropiques* samples in particular will be reprised in the typescript *Colombes et menfenils* and printed from there in the journal *Hémisphères*.

Leaving “Batouque” aside for now, this practice will remain unchanged until the publication of *Les Armes miraculeuses* in 1946. The same will apply to the small additions to the 1947 versions of the *Cahier* that make their appearance in *Tropiques*. This is also the case for our drama, which will see three excerpts published in *Tropiques* and reprinted elsewhere between 1944 and 1945.

Thus the environment, now the species.

**First as high noon, then as sunset: Le Grand Midi and Tombeau du Soleil.**

*Les Armes miraculeuses* was a lucky accident. We should resist the urge to read it “organically,” in the spirit of the Romantics, or even prefigurally, à la Saint Augustine, and I don't just mean our attempts to reconcile *Et les chiens se taisaient* to the smaller poems in the collection. To be clear from the onset, Césaire worked on several editorial projects during the period 1941-1946, many of them invisible or unrecognizable unless we bracket bibliographic teleology, the idea that fragments only point towards a concrete whole. They are better thought of as organs without bodies. A difficult task, since we find ourselves at the end of
a series of reifications, making sense of the past hindered by a post-bibliographic moment.

In the case of the early Césaire, the textual field can be characterized as a nebulous playground, rife with possibilities, where “fragments” point in many directions. In this section, I work to unravel one of those “roads not taken,” a phantom poem called Le Grand Midi, in order to show Césaire’s nimble efforts to adapt pre-existing texts to new environments, and more importantly, to show how those adaptations, unmoored from absent wholes, remained ambiguous bibliographically, allowing Césaire the flexibility to adapt whole editorial projects to available opportunities.

The story of our phantom poem begins with Aimé Césaire’s first published work on his return from his student years in Paris, the first seed of what will eventually become Les Armes miraculeuses. This first offering comes on the first issue of Tropiques, April 1941, aptly titled “Fragments d’un poème.” The “fragments” will eventually be individuated as “Les pur-sang” in the 1946 collection, but not before undergoing a series of editorial adventures that provide one of the main keys to unlocking the genetic history of Les Armes miraculeuses, and by extension, of Et les chiens se taisaient.

“Fragments,” not fragment, the “poème” of the first issue will be overtly continued in the second issue of Tropiques, July 1941, reprising the title “Fragments d’un poème.” This time, what seems to be a subtitle follows on the bottom of the title page, “Le Grand midi (fin).” This wonderfully ambiguous title
page prompts us to question the relationship between titles and textual sequences, between fragments and the phantom whole, elsewhere.

Is “Le Grand Midi” the subtitle of the larger “poème”? That seems to be the implication of the “fin” in parentheses. Is it just the title of this set of “fragments”? This interpretation seems to be justified by the text under that heading in the 1946 collection. Is “Fragments d’un poème” the title of the two texts combined, and “Le Grand Midi” merely a subtitle? Though the tendency of the journal to portion its fare suggests a simple yes, this remains an intriguing possibility, implying the whole is but shards of a poem. At least the table of contents in the front of the issue would have us believe as much, listing the poem as “Fragments d'un poème (fin).”

The bibliographical status of these fragments becomes even more ambiguous a year later, on the occasion of the first editorial collaboration between Breton and Césaire. Even though the “fin” in parentheses might have suggested that a poem in two installments had been completed, a new text appears on the first issue of VVV, “Conquete de l’aube,” with the following note at the end, “(Extraits inédits du Grand Midi).” Another ambiguous decoy. Excerpts from an unpublished work?

By now, Tropiques was in its fifth issue, and Césaire had published eight other shorter pieces in its pages. Why then does this extra fragment appear in June, 1942 in New York? Only two letters from the Césaires to André Breton survive before this date. The first of these, the letter by Suzanne Césaire dated
October 21, 1941, is the only one to mention the inclusion of an attachment. It seems Breton had proposed to publish some of Aimé’s work prior to this letter, news which didn’t fail to have their effect on the young couple, “Vous devinez sans peine l’émotion d’Aimé à l’idée d’être publié par vous. Il s’en remet entièrement à vous pour tout ce qui concerne la publication. Il joint à cette lettre des poèmes inédits.”100 This letter was sent just before issue N°3 of Tropiques came out.

After a six-month pause, we find another letter, this one from Aimé to Breton, dated April 20, 1942. This letter also seems to follow on the heels of one from Breton. At least during this period of their friendship and collaboration, the evidence suggests Breton was making the initial overtures. Césaire is embarrassed for his long silence and thanks Breton for the poem “Lanterne Sourde,” which arrives just in time to be published in Tropiques N°5.101 At this point, Césaire reveals he is quite conscious of the prospect of internationalization, “Que vous ayez connu, aimé, chanté ce pays, que Mabille fasse des recherches en Haïti, que Lam soit à Cuba, événements que je crois décisifs, en tout état de cause, pour l’avenir des Antilles.”102 This level of awareness of the regional implications of collaboration goes hand in hand with the journal’s strategy to edit on a hemispheric scale. Furthermore, we notice here also a distinction that never seemed to trouble Césaire; while Tropiques championed surrealism as methodology, surrealism will champion the tropics as theme.

The letter also lets us know that Breton has asked Césaire for more poems, this time for the revival of the journal Minotaure (no mention of VVV yet).
Césaire responds that he has no texts ready. This means the text of “Conquête de l’Aube,” which appears in the first issue of *VVV*, most likely came with the batch of poems sent earlier with the October, 1941 letter. This places the “extraits inédits du Grand Midi” at the time of the publication of *Tropiques* N°3. If Césaire had concluded *Le Grand Midi* for a Martinique audience in N°2, it seems that for the benefit of Breton (and his circle) he portrayed a longer poem in progress. By taking advantage of the discontinuous audiences, Césaire effectively extends the genetic life of the poem without appearing inconsistent. This astute use of non-overlapping audiences explains why it took readers and researchers decades to start noticing the enormous disparities found in the different editions of his major works.

That the “fragments” were considered to be part of a larger unity for his immediate audience can be gleaned from the first critical article dedicated solely to Césaire, written by his brother-in-law, Aristide Maugée, for *Tropiques* N°5: “Aimé Césaire, poète.” In the article, Maugée makes constant reference to a poem, “Le Grand Midi,” by quoting freely from both of the “Fragments d’un poème” (16). Since we know that Césaire was involved in all aspects of the edition of *Tropiques*, this misnomer would not have gone unnoticed, especially on the first article published about his writing.

My analysis thus far largely accords with the critical consensus among specialists. Even as early as 1981, Thomas Hale acknowledged the unity of these three fragments in his now classic bibliography (231). We arrive on murkier waters when we seek the next chapter in the history of *Le Grand Midi*. A few
years ago, what was then atelierandrebretton.com made available, among many other invaluable documents, a series of digital facsimiles of Césaire manuscripts that were part of the Breton archive before the latter was auctioned off in 450 lots in 2003. Part of the collection of images can now be found at andrebretton.fr, a sad replica of the proximity these materials enjoyed before the act of fetishistic banality that scattered them to the four winds. On the site we can find a few manuscripts, letters and signed copies of Césaire’s works.

The three most important items in the erstwhile Breton collection, are a collage, titled Tombeau du Soleil (ts.Co), a typescript transcription of the collage with Césaire's corrections (ts.Ts) and a typescript collection of small poems, Colombes et Menfenils (cm.ts), all containing a large portion of the 1946 edition of Les Armes miraculeuses. The editors of the web archive, who excluded the transcription as far as I can see, have assigned all these documents to the year 1945. Furthermore, the two documents entitled Tombeau du soleil were bundled at some point—either by Breton or by a curator—with an envelope dated “24 août 1945.” This date has been accepted unquestioned by scholars.

At least for the collage, the bibliographic, historical and textual evidence suggests another range of dates: November 1943 - January 1944. The first and most salient indication that 1945 is the wrong original date is the fact that most of the content of the two texts, Colombes et menfenils and Tombeau du soleil, is compiled from materials that have been accounted with certainty before October of 1943. In contrast, “Avis de tirs,” “L’Irrémédiable,” “Phrase,” “Les Armes miraculeuses,” and most of the other poems of Les Armes miraculeuses that have
been accounted after October 1943 are absent. The exception consists of a few short fragments (discussed below).

In the next few letters after the original offer from Breton to edit Césaire's poems, the latter will send a few small offerings. We already saw that a small batch left with the first letter, including “Conquête de l'aube.” The third letter in the surviving series, dated January 10, 1943, comes with “5 poèmes.” A set of five poems belonging to this period have been accounted for in the Breton collection, under the redundant title “5 poèmes,” “Annonciation,” “Tam-tam I,” “Tam-tam II,” “Légende” and “Tendresse.” The first three of these were reprised soon after in the next issue of *VVV*, N°2-3, under the generic heading “Poèmes.” Months later, we learn that an intervening letter, purportedly sent October 25, 1942, and eventually returned to Césaire, included an original version of the poem “Simouns” (Letter 22 Sep. 1943). This would have brought the total of small dispatches to three by early 1943.

From January until August, we find a long respite in the correspondence. The next letter is sent in early August, again prompted by a letter from Breton, “Joie de vous retrouver,” writes Césaire. “Seul, le régime que nous avons subi ici pendant trois ans explique la rareté et l’insignifiance de nos lettres [...](depuis *VVV* n° 1, rien, rien, ni le catalogue annoncé, ni *VVV* n° 2, ni le numéro 3, ni livres ni journaux)”110 (Letter 3 Aug. 1943). In his letter, Breton seems to have offered for the second time to publish Césaire’s poems. Cézaire responds with gratitude and promises to organize a set soon, “merci pour l’offre que vous me faites d’éditer mes poèmes – je tâcherai de les réunir au plus vite.”111 Although
Césaire does not reiterate the conditions originally proposed by Breton, his response suggests that we are, at the least, talking about a small collection.

The correspondence intensifies at this point. Soon thereafter, in September, a letter includes an unnamed poem and the text of “Simouns” that was supposedly returned with the letter of October 1942 (Letter 22 Sep. 1943). This is also the letter where Césaire announces that he has just finished a “drame nègre.” “Batouque” and “Simouns,” the last texts in the two maquettes, added to the pre-publication of “Soleil serpent” in Leitmotiv N°2-3 under the title “Colombes bruissement du sang...,” bring the pre-October tally to a close.

From the first column on the left, representing the first published “Fragments” in Tropiques N°1, to the furthermost right column, representing Les Armes miraculeuses, Appendix III schematizes the textual field opened up by the collage of Tombeau du soleil (at the center), both before and after 1943. As the figure makes clear and except for a few exceptions, all of the content of Tombeau du soleil is accounted for before October 1943. Notice also that the sequences in Tombeau du soleil are organized, also with few exceptions, by the order in which they appear first in the chronology, suggesting that order of publication and creation had much to do with the arrangement of the poems in the set.

Appendix III is an example of what I would call a temporal legogram. Allowing us to reconstruct the transmission history of blocks of text, or legos, and traditional bibliographic units together, these geometric visualizations offer suitable representations of textual fields. Because they collapse the distinction
between published and non-published, between wholes and parts, between real and implied texts, and because they establish a temporal, yet non-hierarchical, network of relations, they are closer to the reality of textual transmission than traditional stemmas. In Chapter 3, I study legograms in more detail by focusing on differential legograms, the comparison of only two “scrolls,” but the insights gleaned in that chapter apply directly to the comparison of an $n$ number of them, as in Appendix III.

In the next letter in the archive, dated November 16, 1943, Césaire sends several copies of Tropiques N°8-9, which includes Suzanne Césaire’s article “Le Surrealisme et nous.” More to the point, Césaire promises to finally send a parcel with a large batch of poems and a drama, “Je vous enverrai bientôt par paquet-poste les manuscrits d'un recueil possible de poèmes ainsi qu'un drame : Et les chiens se taisaient.” This is the largest gathering that Césaire has offered so far. At last he has fulfilled his promise to send a collection of texts. The larger package can be explained in part by the regained flow of correspondence in post-Vichy Martinique. In the next letter, January 17, 1944, we confirm that the package was indeed sent. Césaire adds, “un poème (à joindre aux poèmes déjà expédiés)” and “quelques pages supplémentaires pour : « Et les chiens se taisaient ».” What follows next indicates that the collection of poems sent to Breton was indeed what we now distinguish as Tombeau du soleil and Colombes et menfenils.

As we saw in Chapter 1, sometime around 1943, Breton started collaborating with Yvan Goll on a special issue on the tropics of the latter’s
Breton and Goll had each become friends with a major Caribbean poet, Aimé Césaire and Nicolás Guillén to be precise, and each had some sort of revelatory experience while in transit there, the one in Martinique, the other in Cuba. Issue N°2-3 of Hémisphères testifies to the following ratio in the index:

Breton : Césaire : Martinique :: Goll : Guillén : Cuba

Published on April 1944, the entry from Césaire, which follows Breton’s famous “Préface” to the Cahier d’un retour au pays natal, corresponds to the first poem of the Tombeau du soleil series, i.e. a shortened version of the first “Fragments d’un poème.” On the collage we find a title has been added in pencil to the Tropiques text, “les pur-sang [du soleil?]”, only to be corrected in ink to “les purs-sang.” The Hémisphères poem will carry the corrected title (Pu.HE). This version of “Les pur-sang,” though, is not the one we are familiar with today. In both versions of Tombeau du soleil and in Hémisphères, the poem ends abruptly at the line, “aux caroncules crève, la patte levée, le monde...”

If the text indeed dates from 1945, as the claim goes, this means Césaire decided to adopt an abrupt cut in honor of Goll’s editorial choice, while still working on the base text of 1941. Unless we would make a misguided appeal to Césaire’s celebrated sense of humor, this scenario seems highly unlikely. I follow here instead a rather banal principle; when an authorial manuscript and an edited publication coincide for the most part, the former almost certainly precedes the
latter. To deviate from such a principle would require compelling evidence indeed.

If we look at the few variations between the collage version (literally pasted from a copy of *Tropiques* N° 1 with a few corrections in pencil) and the *Hémisphères* version, we notice that the minor differences are editorial in nature. Here we use the word editorial to mean that the corrections were those that are amenable to an editor: orthography, regularization, etc. During this highly volatile period in Césaire’s poetic development, a difference of more than one year would have yielded much more than these cosmetic variations. Why this text evinces the smallest relative variation when we compare it to other pairings in the surviving corpus between 1941 and 1946 can best be explained by temporal proximity and the intervention of a non-intrusive editor or transcriber.

The seven handwritten poetic fragments that follow the recycled first half of “Fragments d’un poème” seem out of place at first in the collage. They are handwritten on a different kind of paper and then pasted in what seems to be the framing paper of the collage. The small texts are a mix of new and old texts. The 2nd, entitled “Investiture,” will appear as an independent poem in the 1946 published version. The 3rd, 4th and 5th have no connections to the pre-1944 record, nor the published version. The 6th and 8th are mutilations from the poem “Histoire de Vivre” in *Tropiques* N°4. The 7th comes from the manuscript “5 poèmes,” where it is titled “Tendresse” and eventually will be integrated in the published version of “Les pur-sang.” All of them will resurface, in the same order and with
hardly any variation, in a typescript found at the Goll archives in Saint-Dié des Vosges.

The 7th fragment provides some helpful clues. The transcription we find in Saint Dié was typed by a very careless hand. Unlike other surviving Césaire typescripts, a major error is corrected by retyping the line below. Unlike other surviving Césaire typescripts, this one does not have any handwritten corrections. Considering no circumstantial evidence suggests otherwise, in all likelihood the Saint Dié transcription does not come from Césaire.

Does the collage of Tombeau du soleil provide the original? The textual evidence seems to indicate that the Tombeau text of the 7th fragment is an intermediate state between the manuscript of “Tendresse” and the Saint-Dié transcription. The variations between “Tendresse” and Tombeau and between Tombeau and Saint-Dié both overlap, but not between “Tendresse” and Saint-Dié. For example, both versions of Tombeau du Soleil and “Tendresse” have “de sang bien frais,” and Saint-Dié has “du sang bien frais”; Saint-Dié and Tombeau have “aux yeux des fleurs,” while “Tendresse” has “aux yeux de fleur.” The transition from “Histoire de vivre” to Saint Dié provides us also with one such instance: “nénuphar,” shared between Tombeau and “Histoire de vivre” becomes “nénuphars” in the Saint-Dié transcription.118

We now have two sets of texts that arrived on Goll’s desk sometime during the early months of 1944,119 both of which follow the same sequence as we find in the Tombeau du soleil papers. It seems unlikely that texts this similar
reached Goll in this precise order in a separate manuscript that has now disappeared. Why assume their existence when we already have a perfectly good match—save for a date on a website or a mismatched envelope?

In a letter from Goll to Breton, dated July 22, 1944, Goll expresses regret over the choice of “Les pur-sang.” He suggests that in the next issue of *Hémisphères*, he will atone with a series of smaller poems. He indeed does. The poems published in *Hémisphères* N°4, “Au dela,” “Survie,” “Poème pour l’aube,” “Soleil Serpent,” “Tam-tam de nuit” and “Femme d’eau” coincide with the shorter poems in *Colombes et menfenils* with only three exceptions. The poems are published in exactly the same sequence as they appear on the typescript—one more, the sequence of the papers is respected. Furthermore, they are all published under the umbrella title, “Colombes et menfenils.” Now we have three sets of texts that coincide with the manuscripts, sequence and content. All together these texts bear the least number of changes in all of the genetic history of *Les Armes miraculeuses*. Given the evidence we can be certain that *Tombeau du soleil* and *Colombes et menfenils*, the holograph, date to the months between November 1943 and January of 1944.

*Colombes et menfenils* is very different than the collage of *Tombeau du soleil*. Its pages are typewritten, though, in what seems to be a similar paper to some of the paper used for chSD. The shared materials suggest temporal proximity. The collection gathers a large number of the small poems published before the end of 1943 in *Tropiques*, the short poem published in Chile, “Colombes bruissement du sang...,” and the slightly longer pieces, “Simouns” and
Batouque.” As I suggested above, the sequence of poems more or less follows the chronological sequence in which they become visible to us in the archive.

Agreeing on an original date for the two sets can help us shed light on the phantom poem, *Le Grand Midi*. The texts under the heading *Tombeau du soleil* include all three previously published texts we linked to the umbrella title *Le Grand Midi*: The two “Fragments d’un poème” and “Conquête de l’aube.” The first two “Fragments” have now been cut and pasted, literally, to produce a different sequence. The seven new fragments have intervened in the middle. The second “Fragments” is not the “(fin)” anymore and its first few lines have now been separated and remixed with the first “Fragments” in a section subtitled “Calcination.” “Conquête de l’aube,” which in the last page is given solely by title and the reference “cf VVV N°1” (Figure 2.D), has now become the finale for the sequence. Combined, we have a remix of the three main building blocks of *Le Grand Midi*, with a few additions and deletions.

In a letter dated May 26, 1944, Césaire will once again refer to these texts as *Le Grand Midi*. The Césaires are experiencing difficult times. They have recently arrived in Haiti for an extended stay. Some indicative lines in the correspondence suggest that their marriage has been under some strain during the past few months. In the May 26 letter, an anguished Césaire claims that the poem has spoken to him in the style of an oracle at a moment of need, “*Nos poèmes sont lucides, nous seuls, sommes aveugles. Je pense à « Batouque », au « Grand midi » surtout, dont une partie a paru, par vos soins, dans Hémisphères*”\(^{122}\) (Letter 26 May 1944). The “part” he refers to is, of course, the mutilated “Fragments d’un
poème,” published in *Hémisphères* N°2-3 under the title “Les pur-sang.” We do know from a previous letter that Césaire read the issue in question (Letter 4 Apr. 1944). Even at this late date, May 1944, many months after Maugée refers to the whole as “Le Grand Midi,” Césaire continues to do so. We are to assume that Breton also knew what Césaire was referring to. Just in the same way that “Les Armes miraculeuses” will be a poem within the collection *Les armes miraculeuses*, “Le Grand Midi” seems to have been a mere section of a larger poem, *Le Grand Midi*.

Césaire continues in his letter to provide Breton with some instructions on how to revise the (larger) poem:

> Aussi vous demanderai-je, si jamais le texte doit être publié aux États-Unis, de supprimer toutes les additions artificielles dont j'ai cru devoir l'alourdir : 1°) les sous-titres (à l'exclusion de « Pur-sang », « Grand midi » et « Conquête de l'aube ») qui seront très avantageusement remplacés par des blancs. 2°) le morceau tardivement – encore qu'à mon sens pathétiquement introduit, où se trouve le nom de Suzanne Césaire. 

The indications point to the *Tombeau du soleil* collage and transcription. The subtitles in question are the new sub-sections constructed out of the two “Fragments” and the header for the handwritten pages: “Calcination,” “Miroir Fertile” and “Investiture.” The “morceau” refers to the handwritten pages with the seven smaller sequences, in particular sequence #6 from “Histoire de vivre,”
written on a different kind of paper than the rest in the collage and with the lines:

“Fenêtres du marécage, fleurissez ah ! fleurissez/sur le coi de la nuit pour Suzanne Césaire.”

What other document can Breton have in his possession which has several subtitles in excess of “Pur-sang,” “Grand midi” and “Conquête de l’aube,” which also has a fragment, “introduced late” (i.e. which stands out), with the name of Suzanne Césaire? This "texte," the corpse of Le Grand midi, rests on the pages of the two versions of Tombeau du soleil.

This brings us to the question of the title. Why do we call this document today Tombeau du soleil? The title is written at the beginning of the collage, right before the section with the subtitle “Les pur-sang” with a hand that does not seem to belong to Suzanne Césaire, Aimé Césaire or André Breton. On the transcription, the title is typewritten on a title page, and crossed out with pen. On the second page, the title is written again by a hand that seems to belong to Suzanne Césaire. Considering that Césaire thought of the set as Le Grand Midi, and that the title is stamped by an unknown hand on the collage, I venture to say that the title was added after the collage was well advanced, even perhaps, after it was completed.

Colombes et Menfenils bears the title in the front of the typescript in type consistent with the rest of the leaves, and thus it can be said to date to the time of creation; Tombeau on the other hand, constantly referred to as Le Grand Midi by those in the know—whether the whole makes “poetical” sense or not—most likely did not have the current title in the early stages of composition. If we could date the transcription more accurately, we would have a more definitive answer.
Alas, the material and historical evidence is inconclusive. The only thing we know with certainty is that the transcription was made after the collage was assembled.

The possibility remains that the transcription was included, after all, with the envelope from August 1945, while the collage was sent two years before. An early version of the “inventaire” listing the two versions of Tombeau du soleil, suggested that the transcription was the item “dans enveloppe à André Breton, 24 août 1945.” Although, without close examination of the artifacts, I have no conclusive evidence that the transcription was not in that envelope, the fact that the post-1943 revisions did not make it to the document at least complicates that theory. As far as we know, the transcription could also be coeval with the collage.

Besides the mysterious handwriting, other clues indicate the title was added in medias res. Underneath it, we find the number ten written in what seems to be the same hand. This number, though, does not correspond to the actual number of sections in the gathering. To wit, the textual segments in the sequence seem to have gone through several reorganizations, judging by the diverging section numbers. Each of the sections or fragments has at least one number assigned to it. Some have several. Table 2.A accounts for all the numerations:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Numeration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Les purs-sang</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investiture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Parce que les jardins…”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Parce que mon beau pays…”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ô retour…”</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Mais qui m’a mené ici?”</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“O Chimborazo violent”</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Et les collines…”</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcination</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miroir Fertile</td>
<td>[5?], 8, 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Grand Midi</td>
<td>[?], [4?], [5?], 8, 9, 10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conquête de l’Aube</td>
<td>4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.A
Although we cannot reconstruct the genetic sequence, as we did for example in Chapter 1 with the Saint-Dié typescript of *Et les chiens se taisaient* using its different pagination schemes, we could reconstruct several hypothetical scenarios, a few of which have ten sections. The different section numbers also testify that the end was closer to the beginning at some point, or in other words, that the smaller poems in the middle were introduced in at least a few stages through a process of outward expansion. If the title was indeed added during composition, it was probably added when the assemblage had ten sections.

To make matters more complicated, a search for the word “tombeau” in all of Césaire’s output before 1946 (or in *Tropiques* for that matter) yields no results. Even though a tomb for the sun seems to belong in Césaire’s imaginary, the unexceptional word *tombeau* is simply not part of his early arsenal until now.

A year before the individuated poem “Le Grand Midi” appears in *Les Armes miraculeuses*, it appears in the same form in the sixth issue of the journal *Confluences* on August 1945. The text corresponds to the “Fragments d’un poème” of *Tropiques* N°2, this time bearing the title, “Le Grand Midi (Fragment).” This suggests that even at this late date, the text had not become an independent unit.

The publication of the poem in *Confluences* also marks Césaire’s debut in post-war Paris. The poem was preceded by an introductory article to “Aimé Césaire et la revue *Tropiques,*” signed by “J.M.,” ostensibly the controversial Jules Monnerot—not an insignificant fact. Although the editorial connection
could be traced back in theory to Breton, we could as easily trace it directly to Césaire. For instance, issue N°6-7 of *Tropiques*, February 1943, opened with a moving “In Memoriam” by René Ménil on Jules Monnerot’s father, the important Caribbean man of letters, Jules Monnerot père.

The textual evidence is very clear on the provenance. The text used for *Confluences* is a reprint of *Tropiques* N°2, the same text that was cut and pasted in parts for *Tombeau du soleil*, now whole again. In fact, the editors of *Confluences* evidently thought it wise to replicate, as much as their materials would allow, the line breaks of the original, hyphens included (Figures 2.B and 2.C). Considering the width of the *Confluences* page was slightly smaller, these efforts lead to some rather awkward design solutions.
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*Figures 2.B and 2.C - Tropiques N°2, p.27 and Confluences N°6, p.617*

The fact that the editors were so careful to reprint the smallest feature of the original raises questions. Why did the title change? Why has “(fin)” been substituted by “(Fragment)”? One possibility consistent with the sequence in *Tombeau du soleil* is that Césaire, aware of the non-overlapping audiences, and
after the addition of “Conquête de l'aube” to the sequence, still reserved the option of a larger poem for a future date, now in a new environment and through other channels. The new title is, of course, just as ambiguous as its predecessors. Is the new “Le Grand Midi” a fragment? or is it a fragment of Le Grand Midi?

The textual differences between the Tropiques and the Confluences texts consist mostly of corrections and new errors, and tell us nothing about the editorial hands that intervened. A comparison of the Confluences text with the corrected copies of Tombeau du soleil disqualifies the latter as a possible source because its corrections do not carry over. Whether via Breton or Césaire, whether the reprint was authorized or not, a year before Les Armes miraculeuses was published the question of “Le Grand Midi” and Le Grand Midi remained unresolved.

In the same month the Confluences text came out, in a letter dated “22 août 1945,” belonging to the envelope now paired to both versions of Tombeau du soleil, Césaire tells Breton he has “écrit quelques poèmes dont une fin nouvelle pour « Conquête de l’aube ».” Indeed, a new version of “Conquête de l’aube” appears in Paris in Les Quatre vents 4: L’Evidence Surréaliste in 1946 (60), with a very different ending than the VVV version. The new text will soon be reprinted in Les Armes miraculeuses.

The collage of Tombeau du soleil actually doesn't have the text of “Conquête de l'aube.” Instead, we find instructions on the final page of the gathering indicating the text should be copied from VVV N°1 (CoVV), with a
minor correction (Figure 2.D). The *Tombeau* transcription (ts.ts) copies the text of CoVV over very closely, even going as far as copying the signature at the end: “Aimé CÉSAIRE/(Extrait inédits du Grand Midi).” The signature is then striken out, suggesting a fastidious or non-French speaking amanuensis typed the document before Césaire revised it. A note below the placeholder indicates the word “frangipane” on p. 40 of CoVV should be corrected to “frangipanier.” The word was corrected in the transcriptions.

We are left with the question, did Césaire send or suggest a new version of “Conquête de l’Aube,” together with a corrected transcription pointing to an old version on the same parcel? Possible, but unlikely. Either way, we can still be certain that the collage of *Tombeau du soleil*—the closest we get to our phantom poem *Le Grand midi*—dates to late 1943, not August 1945.

I hope the extended analysis of the trajectory of the phantom poem not only sets the historical record straight, but helps us to better appreciate how ambiguous naming practices afforded Césaire and his editors the flexibility to reshape texts to adapt to non-overlapping environments (New York, Martinique, Paris, et al.) during this period. If we think of a collection of poetry as a three-tiered bibliographical structure, consisting of fragments, poems and the collection itself—all represented in our legogram (Appendix III)—we see that for Césaire, this structure could be collapsed. *Le Grand midi* is all of these at different stages. In the transformations of *Et les chiens se taisaient* we will see comparable maneuvers.
Figure 2.D - "Conquête de l’aube" placeholder.
Acknowledging that Césaire was working on a major poem other than the *Cahier d’un retour au pays natal* while he was working on *Et les chiens se taisaient* also changes the way we understand the genesis of *Les Armes miraculeuses*. Our correct date allows us to effectively divide Césaire’s work outside of *Tropiques* into three editorial projects by the end of 1943: a) An edition of the *Cahier d’un retour au pays natal*; b) A “recueil possible de poèmes,” including what is now known as *Colombes et Menfenils* and the larger poem in subtitled sections now known as *Tombeau du soleil*, a.k.a. *Le Grand Midi*; and, c) *Et les chiens se taisaient*.\(^{129}\) At one point (a) and (b) were supposed to coincide. Eventually, an expanded (b) and (c) became what we know today as *Les Armes miraculeuses*, while (a) was published in bilingual format in 1947.

We are now prompted to study the common denominator between these disparate projects; an effort to revise, expand and transform previously existing material, belonging to different editorial environments in order to reach new audiences, each of which envelops the documents in situated readings. At the end of 1943, Césaire was revising the *Cahier d’un retour aux pays natal* in ways that we have already started to understand better,\(^{130}\) for a collaboration which had already begun between André Breton and Yvan Goll; the two “maquettes,” *Tombeau du soleil* and *Colombes et menfenils* also fall on the same track, adapting texts which appeared in *Tropiques* in shorter, coherent units, to larger, more jarring gatherings, as we saw above.

We find the works today in their particular shape because a new environment afforded the material conditions for adaptation of previous disparate
editorial projects into book form. This flux, contained by particular editorial conditions, will characterize the rest of Césaire’s writing career. In the next section, we will explore in more detail the hemispheric gambit of Tropiques and the transnational backdrop for these pre-publications as they migrate and adapt from one context to another, slowly coagulating into collections, finally precipitating in Gallimard’s Les Armes miraculeuses.

Breton Adapting, then Queneau

A study of the adaptation of Césaire’s texts to particular contexts during the 1941-1946 period would not be complete without close attention to the role played by Breton-the-editor and Breton-the-author in helping shape and frame Césaire’s diffuse mass of fragments. Without a doubt, and the list of outside contributors to Tropiques reflects this in part, the most effective campaign to internationalize Tropiques in general, and Aimé Césaire in particular, was led by André Breton from New York. The evidence suggests that Breton was the first important figure to actively seek publication venues for Césaire's work outside of Martinique. The Césaires knew this, and the issues and samples continued to arrive with the letters. By war’s end the name Aimé Césaire was already known in francophone literary circles stretching from Chile to Quebec to Algiers.

The senior poet’s role as mediator is confirmed in part by the fact that almost everywhere that Césaire's name appeared in print outside of Tropiques, the name Breton was not far behind. The phenomenon begins with the publication of
the fragment “Conquete de l’aube” on the first issue of *VVV*. The poem auspiciously follows Breton's “Prolegomena to a Third Manifesto of Surrealism or Else,”¹³¹ in which Breton singles out Césaire as the poet of the times, “my friend Aimé Césaire, magnetic and black, who having broken with all old tags, Eluardian and others, writes the poems we need today, in Martinique.”¹³² (20) When Braulio Arenas mentions Césaire for the first time in issue N°2-3 of *Leitmotiv* (Chile, 1943), on the same issue where Césaire's short poem “Colombes bruissement du sang...” appears for the first time (later “Soleil serpent”), he imagines him “en la Martinica encantadora,”¹³³ echoing the title of Breton's homage to the island. The pattern will continue until the publication of *Les Armes miraculeuses*, at which point Césaire's name begins to stand on its own outside of Martinique.

Besides the commerce in fragments, the *Cahier d'un retour au pays natal* plays an important role in the promotion of Aimé Césaire during these years inasmuch as it was highlighted in Breton's seminal endorsement, “Un grand poète noir.” Although a translation by Lydia Cabrera appeared in book form in Cuba, no surviving evidence I know of suggests that Cabrera's text circulated beyond that nation. Breton’s text on the other hand went through at least three journal reprints, including *Tropiques* N°11, eventually serving as the introduction to Brentano’s edition of the *Cahier* in 1947 and finally as part of *Martinique: Charmeuse de serpents* in 1948. The first appearance, in *Hémisphères* N°2-3 is followed by the fragment “Les pur-sang.” The third appearance, in *Fontaine* N°35 is followed by the poem “Batouque.”
Though we can speculate endlessly about the influence of the one on the other—"ces lieux communs obligés de la critique" as Dominique Combe recently noted (365)—we can at least be in agreement that throughout this period, Césaire was more often than not filtered through Breton, and vice versa, Breton was filtered through Césaire. In lieu of the commonplace dialectic that seeks to pull the influence vector in only one direction, I propose instead that we understand their relationship as ultimately mediated, or as I say, adapted.

Besides the promotion via samples and "Un grand poète noir," the evidence suggests that Breton had other ambitions for his young friend. If we can believe Breton, in a letter to Yvan Goll, May 11, 1944, we learn it was Goll who prompted him to write the laudatory piece in the first place as an introduction for the Brentano's edition of the Cahier: "une preface que vous m'avez pressé d'écrire..." As we saw above, we also know that the text had to be revised to reflect the exclusion of other poems that would have accompanied the Cahier. Another letter tells us that Breton also imagined a French-only edition at some point. The picture that emerges is of a larger edited volume with the Cahier as a centerpiece, followed by poems from Tombeau du soleil and Colombes et menfènils. As we pointed out above, the poems will be published not with the Cahier, but with Et les chiens se taisaient. Nevertheless, this episode provides direct evidence that Breton was engaged to help Césaire publish a collection of poems as early as 1943.

In a letter dated April 2, 1945, Césaire informs Breton that he is working to collect his poetry, but he would rather wait until publishing returns to normal in
France, “Mes projets ? Publier un recueil. Mais pour cela mieux vaudrait peut-être attendre la reprise de l'édition française. Qu'en pensez-vous ?”\textsuperscript{134} This request for advice comes as much as a commentary on the printing situation during the war-period, as well as a provocation for collaboration. While Césaire profited from the precarious networks that received his samples, a publication of importance should perhaps be left to the metropolitan center. On August 22, on the same letter where he sent the new version of “Conquête de l'Aube,” Césaire also announced that he had almost finished his drama, “\textit{dont la transfiguration est quasi complète et dont je vous ferai tenir le manuscrit le plus tôt possible}.”\textsuperscript{135} Even as he is “putting the last touches,” only eight months before the book appears, nothing suggests that the drama is to be included with the poems in a possible collection.

Although Breton was affiliated with the \textit{librarie Gallimard}\textsuperscript{136} as far back as the 1920s and after the Liberation became a reader for them (\textit{Histoire} 206), the collection, as we know it, did not come about because of his efforts. Raymond Queneau, who was then secretary to Gaston Gallimard, working independently of Breton approached Aimé Césaire via letter on 25 Sept. 1945 with the offer:\textsuperscript{137}

\textit{[...]}\textit{Après la libération, lorsque j’ai pu reprendre contact avec ce qui s’était publié hors de France; j’ai pu voir que vous réalisiez les espérances que pouvait donner votre premier ouvrage, et j’ai lu avec le même intérêt vos Poèmes publiés dans \textit{“Confluences”} et dans \textit{“Fontaine”}.}
Je serais heureux de pouvoir proposer à Monsieur Gaston GALLIMARD une édition complète de vos oeuvres poétiques

Raymond Queneau had met Césaire while the latter was working with Volontés to publish the first version of “Cahier d’un retour au pays natal.” Césaire jumps on the opportunity to work with Queneau and signs a contract with Gallimard. In another astonishing letter from Queneau to Césaire, dated 18 Jan. 1946, we learn that at one point the “Cahier d’un retour au pays natal” might have been published together with Les Armes miraculeuses:

Je vous prie de trouver ci-joint votre contrat pour : “Cahier d’un Retour au Pays Natal” [...] De toute façon, il n’est pas possible d’envisager la publication de “Cahier d’un Retour au Pays Natal” dans le même volume que “Les Heures Miraculeuses”[sic].

Undoubtedly, the different conditions of publication and the new collaborator will allow for a new arrangement of the poems, a difference that is evident when we compare the published version with the Tombeau and Colombes documents (Figure 2.E). Furthermore, the last minute instability of the collection demonstrates one of the points I’ve argued above: we should not take for granted any internal coherence between the text of Et les chiens se taisaient and the rest of the poems in Les Armes miraculeuses. The rest of the genetic portfolio also recommends we should proceed with caution. From their early beginnings until the end result, the poems belonging to Les Armes miraculeuses are kept separate
from the text belonging to *Et les chiens se taisaient*. If the poems would have been published with the *Cahier d’un retour au pays natal* as Breton originally envisioned, we would be arguing for their internal coherence as well. This is not to say that both sets of texts, the poems and the drama, do not bear the mark of shared editorial horizons and poetic imaginaries.

One of the striking features of the arrangement of poems in the Gallimard edition in relation to the relative arrangement of everything that precedes it is the seeming lack of continuity between the two. At first, everything seems to have been rearranged. However, careful analysis reveals the intimation of a pattern. If all the blocks combined were a deck of cards, we could say that the contents of *Tombeau du soleil* and *Colombes et menfenils* have been shuffled once (Figure 2.1). The two original sequences remain almost intact as they become enmeshed in each other. While we can claim that the new collection undoes the contiguities of the *Tombeau* and *Colombes* assemblages, the new collection preserves their original sequences almost intact.

We saw a similar pattern in the composition history of *Acte III* in Chapter 1, and we will see a similar pattern in Jahn’s construction of *Acte II* in the final chapter. The isomorphism is not coincidental, and goes to show that studies of composition, transmission and transposition share certain characteristics communicable by legograms and the collapse of virtual and real bibliographic and codicological taxonomies to the more encompassing abstract *lego*. 
In all manifestations of our phantom poem *Le Grand Midi*, including the collage of *Tombeau du soleil*, the fragment “Les Pur-sang” comes toward the beginning and the fragment “Le Grand midi,” towards the end. In *Tombeau du soleil*, “Conquête de l’aube” follows “Le Grand midi” only inasmuch as there is an indication on the last page that the poem should be inserted at that point. In the published version of *Les Armes miraculeuses*, “Les Pur-sang” occupies a position towards the beginning, while “Le Grand midi” occupies a position towards the end. This preserves the scaffolding of the earlier project. In the next chapter we will learn to call this structure an expansion or a split. Here already we can see
how the shuffling effect described above necessarily implies at least two expansions.

The earlier collection *Colombes et menfenils* begins with a series of short poems and purportedly ends with the text of “Batouque.” The poems which begin *Colombes et menfenils* gravitate towards the first half, while “Batouque” almost ends the poems section in *Les Armes miraculeuses*. Only two short poems come after it in the collection, “La Femme et le couteau” and “Les Oubliettes de la mer et du déluge” (formerly “Simouns”). In the typescript of *Colombes et menfenils* “Simouns” precedes “Batouque” only inasmuch as there is an indication to include it on a page before the latter begins. In short, the general structure of the poems section in *Les Armes miraculeuses* echoes the general structure of *Colombes et menfenils*. Again, it is almost as if *Tombeau du soleil* and *Colombes et menfenils* were shuffled once before the intervening pre-publications were inserted into the deck (Figure 2.E).

The rearrangement of the blocks of text from the Saint-Dié typescript to *Les Armes miraculeuses* undergo a similar shuffling of the deck, and in a way, the 1946 drama can be retrospectively read as a collection of poems itself. Two of the three blocks of text of *Et les chiens se taisaient* that appear in print between the end of 1943 (when Césaire sends the Saint-Dié typescript to Breton) and April of 1946 (when *Les Armes miraculeuses* is published) will in fact be titled “Poème,” as if the drama itself consisted of poems. All three are a result of the unique editorial environment of the war period. We now turn to them, before tackling the larger set of transpositions from typescript to print.
Three and a half clues: The three pre-publications of *Et les chiens se taisaient*.

We return now to the study of *Et les chiens se taisaient* proper, informed by the complex dynamics described above. The first public announcement that Césaire is working on a drama comes with the publication of “Intermède” in issue N°10 of *Tropiques*, February 1944. At the end of the fragment, we are told that it belongs to “(*Et les chiens se taisaient, drame, intermède entre l’Acte I et II*).” It consists of a series of short speeches by a heterogeneous cast of characters: four *Oracles*, *Les fétiches*, *Le consultant*, *Le Maître de cérémonies*, *Le Clown* and *Des voix*. Except for “the voices,” these characters are mostly foreign to the typescript and the 1946 version. Despite the fact that the text of “Intermède” is completely new in relation to the typescript, judging from the notice at the end we can conclude that the interlude was written while the drama was still divided into acts. The title is as ambiguous as the titles we examined above; referring to an absent whole without clarifying its whereabouts.

A few weeks after Césaire sends the Saint-Dié typescript to Breton, he will send “*quelques pages supplémentaires pour : « Et les chiens se taisaient ».*” (Letter 17 Jan. 1944) In all likelihood, the “supplementary” pages consist of the “Intermède” manuscript, which survives at the Jacques Doucet library in Paris. This text also comes to me through a series of transcriptions, one of which bears a note from the transcriber that the text is to be found inside an envelope dated “18 juin 1944.”
This date is as questionable to me as August 1945 for *Tombeau du soleil* and *Colombes et menfenils*. I find it highly suspect, for example, that the envelope in question is also postmarked from “Lycée Schœlcher. Fort-de-France. Martinique” when Césaire was in Haiti in June. Furthermore, Césaire always announced the arrival of material, and we have no letter from June announcing the arrival of a few extra pages for the drama. If we add to this that in all of the correspondence from Césaire to Breton postmarks usually came one day after the signed date, “juin” is more likely a transcriber’s error for “janvier.” The difference between January and June is important for several reasons: Not only is Césaire in Haiti in June, as we will shortly see, on April 4 he sends a letter to Breton that marks a turning point in the genesis of *Et les chiens se taisaient*. For the sake of this study, I will work under the assumption that the manuscript in the Doucet library predates the publication of the *Tropiques* text.¹⁴⁰

In the 1946 edition, the “Intermède” survives only in fragments. One fragment is made up of a combination of two smaller fragments from the first two oracles, the speech of *Les fétiches*, the short speeches of the second two oracles and the speech of *Des Voix*. These fragments appear in a different relative sequence between p.140 and p.148 of the 1946 text—a perfect reversal to be exact (Figure 2.F):
“Intermède” holds an important structural position in its alleged position in the Saint-Dié typescript, and its rearranged blocks within the 1946 text. In the earlier text, the interlude divides Acte I from Acte II. Both of these acts are structural mirrors of each other: temptation ⇒ battle ⇒ assembly ⇒ folk. The interlude does not read like an Intermezzo to be inserted between acts of an opera seria, but rather like a reformulation of the action of Acte I. The act ends with the words “République d’Haïti” projected on the stage during the early phase of the revolution. “Le coup est vache, Le cordon sanitaire vient d’être débloqué,” begins the Master of Ceremonies in the “Intermède,” signaling to the audience, “Messieurs [et Mesdames],” that an irrevocable event has taken place.
In the 1946 text, the fragments are inserted right after the Rebel's eyes have been gouged, one of the few recognizable dramatic landmarks of the oratorio. The words of the Master of Ceremonies have been omitted, and the visions of the oracles and the fetishes of the birth of a nation now become intertwined with the transfigured vision of the blind rebel and his chorus. The “Intermède” then adapts to the action that precedes it when we read it next to the actual typescript. In contrast, read within *Tropiques* N°10, the text adapts to the journalistic features described above, serving as a non-committal taste of things to come.

We already see in this brief comparative analysis between the block in the typescript and its splinters in *Les Armes* many of the defining characteristics of the transition between the Saint-Dié typescript and the 1946 edition:

a) The assignment of a speech (or parts of a speech) from one speaker to another.

b) The preserved integrity of some speeches, and the breakup of others into fragments.

c) The undoing of dramatic chronology.

d) The loss of reference to the dramatic action.

These four categories are related to bibliography in one way or another: (a) is related to the headings that tell us who is speaking; (b) and (c) are both related to sequence, what is adjacent to what; (d) is perhaps the more complex case, and on the surface it seems to belong solely to hermeneutics, but if we stop a second, we
realize that in the drama-as-text, the action is marked by specific stage directions. While many of the poetic speeches that comment on the action in the Saint-Dié typescript remain virtually unchanged in the 1946 text, they lose their referential function in the absence of descriptive stage directions. In other words, the main transformations come about through sequence, headers and the use of bibliographic markers to indicate (or not) stage directions. The content remained, modular and adaptable.

While the loose network of journals led to a fragmented poetic production, where the identity of textual bodies remained flexible enough to adapt to the exigencies of international collaboration, the pre-published components of the drama emulate this behavior. Even the “surrealist,” i.e. clashing juxtapositions that we find in Césaire’s poetry during this period are no less a result of a mind free of its bonds, than of a careful manipulation of the page under the pressures of editorial realities. The catalyst for this purported shift in poetics is the unstable identity of textual blocks called to serve different functions depending on the occasion. We have already seen many examples of this phenomenon above. “Intermède” is no exception.

That a minuscule interlude doubled as an advertisement for a forthcoming drama should have come as no surprise to a Tropiques audience, or an international one for that matter. As we saw above, many fragments were published as promises of larger things to come during this period. What is remarkable is that Césaire’s does not suggest a future publication. He simply references the work, leaving ambiguous how the full text will be made public or
whether it has been made so already elsewhere. The indication that the fragment belongs “entre l'Acte I et II” should also give us pause. This innocuous bit of information can only have one function in the absence of the parent text: to instruct an editor of the play where to place the fragment. The end result is a textual unit of dubious identity: an advertisement? A last minute submission to the editor? A series of loosely connected fragments? An interludic commentary on a historical drama? A self-contained dramatic poem?

In the same manner that the placeholder “Conquête de l'aube” invokes a ghostly presence on the last page of Tombeau du soleil, the “Intermède,” the many similar examples of promises-of-things-to-come, the fragments and quotes invoke a ghostly presence outside of the actual text. Adaptation then belongs both to the realm of the real and the imaginary. The text that we read next to the original typescript can only be placed there by an act of remediation or transposition, real or otherwise.

Legogrammatic representations of textual fields can take this phenomenon into account to good effect. In this sense, the hypothetical versions of Chapter 1 participate in the same process as the network relations of fragments, blocks, poems, collections, published or unpublished, authorial or editorial represented in Appendix III. A legogram distinguishes actual texts from hypotheses, blocks born out of comparisons, placeholders, texts mentioned in letters, only through the use of levels of transparency. Otherwise, they are all equivalent nodes in textual fields.
The next pre-publication of a fragment associated with the drama adds another level of complexity. Published in issue N°11 of *Tropiques*, the fragment bears the title “Poème” and the following indication in parentheses at the end: “*(Et les chiens se taisaient. Acte I.)*” The issue came out only a scarce three months after N°10, and the second notice of a drama-to-come would have reinforced the first to its audience. In the middle of May, Césaire arrived in Haiti, and judging from the delay of issue N°12 until his return to Martinique, issue N°11 was probably already out, or at least in galleys, before he left for his sojourn. More important, the fragment was published after Césaire had made a pledge to Breton that he would revise the drama.

On April 4, 1944, after reading “*Un grand poète noir*” for the first time in issue N°2-3 of *Hémisphères*, Césaire sends the longest and most effusive letter to Breton found in the archive. In the letter, Césaire offers Breton unequivocal allegiance to surrealism, founded on the idea that, “*surréalisme, liberté, poésie sont trois termes qui n'en font qu'un.*” He seems to have been struck by Breton's reconciliation of black history and surrealism, quoted in full in the letter, “*Si les négriers ont physiquement disparu de la scène du monde, on peut s'assurer qu'en revanche ils sèvissent dans l'esprit où leur "bois d'èbène" ce sont nos rêves, c'est plus de la moitié spoliée de notre nature, c'est cette cargaison hâtive qu'il est encore trop bon d'envoyer croupir à fond de cale*” (Martinique 107-108). As Dominique Combe argues, this reconciliation marks a watershed in the development of Breton's thinking on “revolutionary poetics” and is the site of Césaire's major influence on the older poet (373).
Although we might be inclined to read this passage by Breton as a softening of his stance on the “thème” or the “sujet,” the key here is the transmutation of the theme into an oneric/mythical space. Read this way, the passage by Breton seems to prefigure the transition from the typescript to the 1946 text. Césaire also seems to have interpreted the passage this way.

Before he met him, Césaire tells Breton he was a prisoner of reality, of the *Cahier*, of his “thème.” Now Césaire thanks Breton for the solution, “*Se laisser parler. Se laisser envahir par ses rêves. Se laisser dominer par ses images.* Il n'était plus question de « thèse », ni de « thème ». Il s'agissait tout simplement *d'oser la vie, toute la vie*.”144 Césaire, as Breton above, does not forsake the “thesis” or the “theme” as much as he sidesteps the question for a poetic praxis that is beholden solely to life imagined as a totality. This new proviso allows for history to play a role in a "revolutionary poetics" insofar as the artist rescues it from its proper place, not in history books, but there, where it totters over the gulf: a (collective) pre-conscious in perennial danger of being permanently repressed.

Under the aegis of his renewed vows to Breton and surrealism, Césaire asks him to consider the Saint-Dié typescript only as a canvas:

*Né sous Vichy, écrit contre Vichy, au plus fort du racisme blanc et du cléricalisme, au plus fort de la démission nègre, cette œuvre n'est pas sans porter assez désagréablement la marque de ces circonstances.*

*En tout cas*
1°) je vous demande de considérer le manuscrit que vous avez reçu comme un canevas, avancé certes, mais canevas cependant. Que si vous me demandez pourquoi je vous l'ai si hâtivement envoyé, c'est que je considérais comme urgent de le faire sortir de la colonie et de le déposer en mains sûres.

2°) ce canevas doit être complété et modifié. Corrigé dans le sens d'une plus grande liberté. En particulier la part de l'histoire, ou de « l'historicité » déjà passablement réduite, doit être éliminée à peu près complètement. Vous en jugerez vous-même par les « corrections » que je vous fais tenir par le même courrier.145

(Letter 4 Apr. 1944)

Césaire acknowledges in many ways what I argue here. He is the first to admit that the text he sends bears “the mark of its circumstances.” By implication, Césaire assigns the role of history in literature to extreme colonial conditions, while the role of freedom—sans referent—belongs to an elsewhere. The text is freed from the colony and freed from history—“déjà passablement”—in the same swoop. If we take Césaire’s endorsement of Breton’s adaptation to the dreaded “thème,” we can read Césaire's equation of history-as-referent with unfreedom as a move towards the freedom of dreamscapes, and by extension to the core of surrealism. The poets approach in manifold ways.

Read bibliographically, the consequence is clear: The function of the stage direction which separates poetic observation from the pantomime of historical
events on the stage must be collapsed for direct access to a stage of the mind where history plays out otherwise. To represent this on the material page, stage directions must blend with the poetry, the identity of speakers must be confounded, textual sequence must resist linear history, etc. Blocks of text are dislodged from one context to adapt to another without allegiance. The incredible fragmentation and reorganization that led to the 1946 text, generates the oneiric effect, which was there only *in potentia* in the typescript, and not the other way around. In other words, the cutting, pasting, recontextualizing at the material level, becomes not the result of, but Césaire’s dreamwork itself—and as I suspect, the dreamwork of all textuality.

As expected, the text published in *Tropiques* N°11 in May marks the public debut of the Osirian dismembering of *Et le chiens se taisaient*. “Poème” consists of the aggregation of three separate fragments found towards the beginning of the Saint-Dié typescript. Two of the fragments are typographically continuous, while the third is separated by a dotted line. The fragments come from speeches by Toussaint—though his name is elided in the “poem”—after the Reciters have announced that he will die, “*Hélas. Tu périras.*” He responds by accepting his death, “*Hé bien, je périrai. Mais nu. Intact*” (“Poème” begins where this line ends. Without the acceptance of death to frame it, the text now reads like a poetic manifesto. The central trope is nudity, as the naked I prepares for an “assault” from the naked image. Cobbled up after the letter to Breton, the freedom from constraints called for by the fragment reinforces the missive to Breton.
Like “Intermède” above, this small text is called upon to serve several functions: a) advertisement; b) public reaffirmation to Breton; c) testing ground for the reorientation of the typescript, e) manifesto, and d) poem inside a play, etc. Once the text has served its temporary purpose(s), it will defragment, and the fragments will return to their original position as part of a larger migration to the 1946 text (Figure 2.G). Moreover, a comparison of the relevant variations between the typescript, “Poème” and the 1946 edition, suggests that “Poème” was by-passed altogether in the making of the 1946 edition. This sliver of textual evidence suggests that the major reorganization had not begun in full force in May of 1944.

We learn from Thomas Hale of an article in the Haitian journal *Le Soir* (19 Dec. 1944) advertising the play, “Sur la scène de l’actualité. Prochains ouvrages d’Aimé Césaire,”148 where “un reporter anonyme à Port-au-Prince note que le prochain ouvrage du poète ‘sera un drame qui par sa composition et sa structure est inspiré des tragédies antiques’”149 (261). Almost a year after Césaire sent the typescript to Breton and a few months after he offers a final version, this brief notice lets us know that Césaire is still intent on publishing the text, or judging from the section where the article appears, perhaps staging it. Furthermore, when we consider that the article comes out in Haiti with no indication that the play deals with the Haitian Revolution, we can safely assume Césaire has already
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made true on his promise to Breton and moved away from the original setting of the drama. Whether the anonymous reporter read the work and offered us the first reading of the drama or whether the description comes from Césaire himself remains impossible to determine at this point.

In April of 1945, the first “Poème” will be reprinted in the journal *Lettres françaises*, edited by Roger Caillois in Buenos Aires. As I've documented elsewhere, Caillois and Césaire had a rocky relationship from the start (“Inadvertent”). The publication in Buenos Aires was likely a result of Breton's diligence. The text is reprinted almost exactly from the *Tropiques* version, to the point of preserving the dotted line used by the Martiniquan journal.
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Besides a few insignificant changes, the main difference between the two texts is the absence in *Lettres françaises* of the original notice at the bottom defining the fragment as part of a play. This makes sense considering the fragment was mixed with other poems under the heading “Anthologie de la
Nouvelle Poésie Française. VIII.” The absence of the notice distances the fragment even further from its source, as our “Poème” is now called to adapt to a new environment and serve yet another function: to vouch for the vibrancy of contemporary French poetry after the Liberation of Paris. Considering the text was faithfully reprinted from the original pre-publication and that Césaire did not approve of Caillois, the omission was probably editorial in nature, with the simple goal of adapting the text to the small anthology of contemporary poetry. We should not assume, therefore, that Césaire has desisted at this stage from presenting the drama to the public.

In fact, in the April 2 letter to Breton, where Césaire learned for the first time that an individual named Yvan Goll had his drama, he insists that this version is not to be published, with the implication that another one is already in the offing, “De [Goll] j’espère qu’il aura la délicatesse de ne rien publier, attendu qu’il ne m’a rien demandé, et surtout que je désavoue la version de cette œuvre que vous connaissez.” We learn from these lines, that Breton had not seen any revisions to the drama at this point, and that the typescript was to be considered a “version,” implying another one already existed.

On May 27, 1945, Césaire will be elected mayor of Fort-de-France, and on the 4th of November, to the first Assemblée nationale as deputy for Martinique. From this point forward, the erstwhile teacher, editor and poet will divide his attention to politics for decades to come. On the August 22 letter, where he announced to Breton that the transfiguration of the poem away from the particulars of history was almost complete, he also announces that he has turned
to politics, "Pour me solidariser avec le prolétariat martiniquais, à un moment que je crois capital de son histoire." The schizoid split that would remove history from his poetic output for more than a decade, while reinserting him in that very same history, does not go by unnoticed, and can be explained in part, as I argue here, by the pre-existing split in textual environments attendant to the war years.

The third and final pre-publication directly linked to Et les chiens se taisaient appears a month after the letter to Breton, on the last issue of Tropiques, N°13-14. Also titled "Poème," this fragment is cobbled up from four different places in the typescript, three towards the beginning, one towards the end. Unlike the first "Poème," this one will retain its new arrangement in the 1946 text. Its variants also approach the later text. This fact reinforces the announcement to Breton that indeed at this stage the text is approaching its 1946 form.

The words mostly belong to La Recitante, with a few culled from the Chorus. The first block comes at the moment in the play when the Haitian Revolution has begun; the second while the Chorus is burying the symbolic body of Saint-Domingue; the third during the summit with the white armies; finally, the fourth, towards the end of the play, after Toussaint has died, when Le négrophile has fallen. In short, the original plot does not help us make sense of the condensation. To quote the text, we are reduced to, "ruses savantes des colloques sans rime ni raison aux sables mouvants" (Armes 126). That is not to say that the aggregate of the second "Poème" breaks away completely from the typescript to produce its own coherence. The "poem" is divided into two thematically and
formally opposed halves by an invocation to the dead, “ô morts.” These same words, absent from the original, are the glue that binds all four fragments:

The introduction of the incantation “ô morts” succeeds in binding the fragments to a post-apocalyptic world, now divorced from the carnage of the Haitian Revolution. Where the original ashes belonged to the beginning of the slave revolt, they now reflect on a Europe in ruins. Where the slave and the master are buried in the mock ceremony of the Chorus in the typescript, they now join the ranks of the senseless dead. Where the traps and illusions of the crafty French negotiators threatened to lead astray the crowd of Haitian rebels, they now refer to the political confusion that follows the war. The second half of “Poème” forges a new world of infancy and sorority from the snares and rattles of the old one. In
the typescript, this block belongs to the second wind of the revolution lead by Dessalines; here, it stands alone as a statement of universal hope.

The appeal for an audience coming out of World War II, for which the fragment is adapted, can be imagined. Césaire has already begun publishing in Paris, “Batouque” in Fontaine N°35 and “Le Grand-Midi” in Confluences N°6 to be specific. Following the same logic that made his earlier texts available for reprint, this new text has the potential to be well received by the mourning, hopeful, vulnerable public of post-Liberation France. The reading also confirms that the surrealist agenda that would divorce poetry from historical reference—by bracketing it in the dream world—becomes reabsorbed by the historical conditions of its appearance. The text adapts despite itself.

The reorganization of the fragments around one recurrent word is, of course, a brilliant poetic and editorial feat. Césaire’s use of anaphora and epistrophe has generated many fruitful debates over the years. Nevertheless, these debates have concentrated for the most part on what Zadi-Zaourou would call symbolic and rhythmic functions. Zadi-Zaourou, for instance, finds an affinity between Césaire’s use of repetition and nègro-africaine oral forms (169-175). James Arnold, on the other hand, argues that the connection must be drawn to print predecessors, in particular, to the Christian-socialist poet Charles Péguy (“Beyond” 264). Though order of composition does not belie or support any of these assessments, repetition clearly served an editorial function in addition to any purported symbolic or rhythmic function. In enough cases to give us pause, poetic segments were bound together by repetition after they were individually
composed. Seen from a bibliographical point of view, the spontaneity of the
Césairean “cry” must give way to the chirurgical pedantry of mark-up.

The maneuver, to join together while marking the original boundaries of
blocks of text— a perfect image of the topological fields opened up by
adaptation—will resurface in many different guises in the other 70+
transpositions from the typescript to the 1946 edition, or the 90+ transpositions
from the 1946 edition to the Jahn texts. In the next chapter we explore the
conversation that text has with itself, away from the historical and geographical
considerations of this chapter, to understand, at the most abstract, the topological
fields traced by blocks of text on the move. In the final chapter, we turn to the
monstrous deformations of *Et les chiens se taisaient*, to deduct from legological
comparison, what historical evidence could not provide otherwise.
Chapter III: Legology

A commodity text appears, at first sight, a very trivial thing, and easily understood. Its analysis shows that it is, in reality, a very queer thing, abounding in metaphysical subtleties and theological niceties [...] There it is a definite social relation between men, that assumes, in their eyes, the fantastic form of a relation between things [...] This I call the Fetishism [...] of commodities texts.

Marx... sort of.

Introductory Note

Let it be said that 70+ transpositions is not an easy knot to untangle. Our only hope of understanding the transition from the Saint-Dié typescript to the published version and on to the Jahn collaboration is to find patterns in the complexity. Legograms can help. While we don't strictly need them, without them we risk missing complex patterns and not understanding the role of sequence in the genetic process.

If we depart from any given lego, as a matter of course, all we need to do is follow its link to a source in another document and offer a reading. On the other hand, legograms open a path in the opposite direction. We start with a pattern and move downwards to the lego. If the genetic process is bound up in macro- and
micro-considerations, as I contend, we should allow movement in both directions. I defend this multi-directional movement in the next chapter, “Oscillations,” where I describe strategies for tracing paths between the macro- of legograms to the micro- of the lego and revisit the close reading that haunts our practice as literary scholars.

In this chapter, I want to focus instead on a detailed description of the algorithmic approaches by which I arrive at the legograms. My hope is to contribute a new method to the philologist’s arsenal, while making the larger point that algorithms can staunchly guide us through key operations of textuality, even as we realize (with relief), that human intervention cannot be discarded completely from the affair.

By algorithmic I do not necessarily mean the use of computers. The point cannot be reiterated enough that, given enough time, algorithms can be executed with pen and paper. The legograms I use in this work were all done with a combination of digital tools and painstaking “manual” work. Granted, because computers are amenable to algorithmic approaches, I contend that soon enough I will convince them to replicate my results, even as I save room for human intervention. Let us say that the goal of describing the algorithms I used to sort out intertextual complexities in Césaire (and their limits) is as much the prelude to this machine version, as it is a precise description of a philological method.

Algorithmic approaches to text, I argue, usefully align the tradition of constrained thinking/writing with the need for more precise documentation in our
scholarly practices. On the one hand, we can remain consistent in our approach if we provide a limited set of operational rules against which we temper our desires. On the other, algorithms have the potential to record our scholarly procedures and gestures, even as we become conscious of them in the process of devising those algorithms.

Those who have worked with XML/TEI markup can tell you that part of the initial encounter with the technology almost always involves the recognition of the many prejudices we bring to the text once we are forced to name our blocks. This chapter articulates a similar journey of discovery, this time involving the construction of an algorithm meant to disentangle sequential problems. In that sense, you could say that this chapter is as much a detailed description of a method, as it is a philosophical exploration of what we mean by sequence when we talk about texts.

**Elements**

Let us be done with formalities: *a block of text or lego* is an indeterminate sequence of *graphemes*. Whether we allow the sequence to coil or not, at the most abstract, a lego can be geometrically represented as a rectangle within another rectangle: a *scroll*. As a convention, I will use *legograms* to represent legos and scrolls:
**First Principle of Legology:** A lego can be joined to another lego to generate a larger lego.

We can call the largest possible lego in a scroll a *Text*. At the other extreme, the smallest possible lego is that lego which cannot be composed of the sum of two smaller legos. We can call this smallest of sequences a *monad*. *Legology* is the study of Texts, monads, all the legos in between and textual sequence.

**Second Principle of Legology:** A Text can be divided into a discrete number of legos.

All possible sequences are worthy of address, of course, and there’s the rub. Given a reasonably large Text, we could theoretically extract from it an exorbitant number of blocks. Even if we were only to extract one block out of a Text, the number of possible blocks to choose from equals the *triangular number*:

$$1 + 2 + 3 + \ldots + (n - 1),$$

where $(n - 1)$ is the total number of graphemes.
minus one. If we decided to go all the way and count all possible divisions, (unless my rudimentary mathematical skills betray me) we would end up with a 

_Catalan number:_

\[
C_n = \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n} = \frac{(2n)!}{(n+1)!n!} = \prod_{k=2}^{n} \frac{n+k}{k} \quad \text{for } n \geq 2.
\]

To give you an idea of the magnitude of the Catalan number, notice that a 5-character string could be divided into 42 non-crossing sequences. Try it!

Notwithstanding, the vast majority of sequences extracted using such an indiscriminate approach will likely be useless to scholars. Neither would we find much use for a comparison of two-grapheme with three-grapheme sequences. In short, when we try to isolate monads relying on purely quantitative criteria, we inevitably run into a dead end.

**The first formal question of legology:** What legos?

The answer to that question will depend on our different scholarly goals. For the textual scholar the answer is twofold: a) those legos that are formed from bibliographical cues, such as paragraphs, stanzas, pages, books, stage directions; and, b) those legos that result from a comparison between two versions of a given text. The first we already address somewhat adequately, evident from the fact that I am able to evoke them by name; the second is the subject of this study.
Before turning to Césaire and the practical application of legology in my next chapter, I want to focus on three of the main registers that define how we compare texts: the bibliographic, the semantic, and one that for a lack of a better word we can call the differential for now. The bibliographic, we covered in the previous chapter. We somewhat touch on the semantic in the final chapter. This chapter fleshes out the differential, at first, by placing ourselves in the shoes of an alien reader who knows nothing about our semantic or bibliographic history.

**Chinese Cookies and the Martian Cryptographer**

A Martian cryptographer travels to earth—long after Chomsky and the human species became extinct—to verify her ancestors’ claim that human languages all came from the same stock, only to discover that the only surviving “evidence” of our culture is a Chinese cookie. After carefully removing the brittle strip of paper from the stony cookie crust, she discovers the series of orderly markings we called type. Though she has never seen such strange scribbles, she suspects the artifact is a form of one of our famed languages and sets out to prove it.

How well deserved the reputation of Martian cryptographers across the Milky Way! Left with no other evidence of human culture to compare it to, the task will be difficult, and even though the Martian cryptographer will probably never know what the cookie says, she will discover patterns that will reassure her that the markings are indeed part of an extra-natural script. We are lucky to see
the Martian at work, since her methods can teach us some important lessons about
the way our machines handle difference and repetition in decontextualized
*strings*.

While she chews the impossible cookie with relish, our intrepid
cryptographer begins with a search for sense by unraveling the artificial order
signaled by the distances between repetitions. Before settling on groupings and
regular sequences, our heroine will open a window unto a mysterious world of
oscillations that carry her back and forth between mirror markings, all brewing
within a nebula of possibility. Soon enough, patterns and blocks do begin to
surface, and, inevitably, the oscillations will begin to stabilize around what we
could call proto-meaning: an imperfect isomorphism drawn from repetition,
difference and sequence.

Let us begin with the simplest of examples: a cookie without any repeated
graphemes. What will our Martian get out of our cookie then? Not much, but
enough. If the only fragment that survives consists of the following sequence: 155

an English speaker need not be a cryptographer to know the string is just a bad
joke. The Martian, on the other hand, will probably get the number 21 from the
spaces between the graphemes, an appreciation for the clarity of roman type, and
concrete evidence of proto-meaning based on the similar shapes and vectorial orientation of the graphemes.

Notice that in order to claim proto-meaning, the lego cannot be perfectly isomorphic, either. The fact becomes clear when we realize that a sequence consisting of the same glyph repeated over and over, other than being clunky ways of representing a number, does not help our Martian prove her thesis. Take for example the following sequence, “eeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeee,” which gives us little beyond the number 21 and other derivatives. While meaning is highly dependent on repetition and difference, the closer we get to absolute equality or absolute difference, the closer we get to nonsense… at least from the point of view of the Martian cryptographer.

To bring our sample Text closer to life, let us add a bit of repetition to our Chinese cookie, this time with the original pangram:

```
thequickbrownfoxjumpsoverthelazydog
```

In this example, we have the following repetitions: ‘o’ x 4, ‘e’ x 3, ‘t’ x 2, ‘h’ x 2, ‘r’ x 2, and ‘the’ x 2. The Martian recognizes the repetitions in no time. To keep track of her progress, she separates those letters from the rest of the phrase, highlighting the following subsequence:

```
thequickbrownfoxjumpsoverthelazydog
```
She promptly recognizes deeper repetitions, highlighting other subsequences in turn. If she created a subsequence consisting only of matching substrings, i.e. graphemes that appear in exactly the same contiguous sequence, we get the following:

\[
\text{thequickbrownfoxjumpsover} \parallel \text{thelazydog}
\]

We can call this sort of repetition an exact match, indicated by the following notation: \text{the}– \parallel \text{the}–, where the hyphen – represents an indefinite number of intervening graphemes, and the double vertical bars \parallel indicate the place at which we mark the zeroth position of the repeated sequence. Our example is structurally the same as two scrolls:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{thequickbrownfoxjumpsover} \\
\parallel \\
\text{thelazydog}
\end{array}
\]

If we went further and allowed for non-contiguous sequences, ignoring intervening graphemes, we get the following sequences:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{thequickbrownfoxjumpsover} \\
\parallel \\
\text{thelazydog}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{thequickbrownfoxjumpsover} \\
\parallel \\
\text{thelazydog}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{thequickbrOwnfOxjumps} \\
\parallel \\
\text{OverthelazyDg}
\end{array}
\]
We may call these repetitions *mixed* or *approximate matches*, indicated by the following notation `the-ο- | | the-ο-`, and, `-ο-ο- | | ο-ο-`. Both sequences can also be said to be *overlapping* because they both share the first and third ‘ο’. We always arrive at overlapping sequences by a different set of instructions or *algorithms*. One possible set of instructions for the first sequence (`the-ο- | | the-ο-`) looks something like this:

a) Begin at the leftmost point of the Text.

b) For each character look at every following character to the right to see if a match is found.

c) If you find a match, mark the location of the match with double bars `||`

d) Write down the matched character to the left of the double bars (ex. ‘||t’).

e) Return to the character to the right of the matched character. Begin searching for that character right after the first matching characters after the double bars.

f) If a match is found, go back to d.

g) Else, mark the location of the difference with a hyphen–and, keep looking for the character until the end of the Text.

h) If another match is found, go back to d.

i) Rinse and repeat until you reach the double bars from the left.

The second sequence, (`-ο-ο-||ο-ο-`), on the other hand, can only be derived by a different set of algorithms. A simple one looks like this:
a) Find the character that is repeated the most times

b) If the number of repetitions is even skip to d.

c) Subtract one.

d) Divide by two.

e) Place double bars at the beginning of the second subsequence.

The differential reading of our Martian cryptographer has several implications for textual scholarship, as we will see shortly, especially when we try to understand transpositions. The fact that we can extract several subsequences from a string according to different rules, that these subsequences could overlap or not, and, that these rules move us forwards or backwards within a string, should convince the agnostics that text—if not reading in general—is both linear and non-linear. Many more sequences can be extracted from our small example, let alone from a life-size text. The possibilities increase when we allow anagrammatic and other non-linear sequences in the mix. If algorithms determine subsequences, as I hold to be evident, subsequences need not be collinear with the original Text.

At this point, we leave our alien friend to allay her indigestion by playing countless other games with the strip less pertinent to us. In what follows, we move to our treatment of transpositions between two Texts.
Sequence Unbound

The most basic and easy to understand form of transposition consists of a block or a few blocks that change position relative to a stable sequence of sorts. One of the clearest examples I have come across in my own work are the two blocks of text which trade places *ceteris paribus* between the two 1947 versions of Césaire’s masterpiece, the *Cahier d’un retour au pays natal*: 156

![Figure 3.B - Stable background sequence](image)

The blocks in question were added to the original 1939 version sometime around 1943 for the Brentano’s edition being prepared in New York (the left column above). Sometime during the preparation of the Paris, Bordas edition (the right column), those blocks were switched, leaving the rest of the original text more or less intact. The *Cahier* example illustrates perfectly what we could call a *stable*
background sequence. We should be careful not to take for granted that background sequence(s) remain stable whenever we compare texts. In fact, sequences behave down right wacky when transpositions begin to multiply. The example above also shows how our legos, just as their namesakes, will behave as perfect blends of plugs and sockets, of negative and positive spaces, environments and species.

When I declared in a previous chapter that the transition from the Saint-Dié typescript of Et les chiens se taisaient to the 1946 Armes version involved 70+ transpositions, it would have been premature to point out that the rest of the text in the typescript and the rest of the text in 1946 were mutually exclusive. In other words, they share no clearly recognizable stable background sequence as in the Cahier example. Constructing one wouldn’t be possible either.

A simplified version of a relative background sequence looks eerily like the example above, with different colors representing the different backgrounds:
Despite the absence of a stable background, very few scholars would hesitate to call this a transposition. Yet, if I asked someone who has not thought rigorously about this problem to define transpositions in a way that would account for both models (or a mixture of the two), chances are they would be at a loss.

Complications arise because blocks are both sequential and discrete. A given amount of text repeated in two versions consists of particles (graphemes) and waves (sequences). Text for the most part does not behave like a disordered set. While we can readily see that characters form an order, we fail to see that sequences themselves can form a meta-order. Figure 3.D is an abstract representation of the last thirty pages of both the 1946 *Armes* text of *Et les chiens se taisaient* and one of the typescript versions in the Jahn collection.
I've highlighted three groups of blocks in green, orange and red. The rest of the selections (blue on the left and purple on the right) are either mutually exclusive or move outside the scope of the selections. Each of the colors represents a different common subsequence of *noncrossing partitions*, evident by the absence of line crossings within each color group. The four green blocks follow each other in the same sequence in both cases. The same goes for the three orange blocks, and of course, the single red block. When we add them all together, they cross each other, signaling transpositions. While characters are organized left to right to form lines, sequences are organized by overlapping each other. The lesson to be learned for textual scholars is simple: When we compare texts, we compare characters *and sequences*. 
If we take another look at the *Cahier* example above, where the background seems to remain stable, we will notice that the background itself is nothing more than another common subsequence, in this case, the longest one. Compare a text to an exact replica of itself and you have one global common sequence (even if they are but a mere subsequence compared to the field of textuality itself). Add a single character to either and not the other, and you have common subsequences. A transposition, unlike character differences, marks the point at which two texts adopt another sequential dimension. To wit, a text with one transposition has two subsequences, a text with two (crossing) transpositions three subsequences, and so forth. When we see the layers of sequences that can arise from comparison, we understand how the false Text of tradition, immutable and fantastical, derives its semblance of unity from the erasure of relative sequences.

We need a small clarification here. As long as the “main” text overwhelms the smaller blocks, the latter seem to move from one place to another within the larger sequence, with no apparent crossing—an illusion, not optical, but textual. When one block is said to move from one place to another within a larger sequence, something rather obvious happens to that larger sequence: It splits virtually. Figure 3.E represents this phenomenon:
The different partition of the containing texts in turn justifies connectors to be drawn between them, suggesting crossing graphs after all. A more accurate representation of the move of a block within a larger block also reveals how transpositions depend on a shift in perspective, not so different from the *canard-lapin* of philosophical fame:

or,
In order to avoid shifts in perspective *ad infinitum*, we must define criteria by which we can consistently identify transposed blocks. For the purposes of this study, and for reasons that will become evident soon, we will derive our criteria from certain standard computational procedures used to determine the *longest common subsequence*.

To summarize, a transposition can be internal to another sequence or external to other sequences, and it can cross a containing sequence or an external sequence. Here are six basic, non-recursive, transposition legograms, from smaller to larger amount of common subsequences:}$^{157}$
The revision and transmission history of Céaire's is notoriously rife with examples of transpositions. When we compare the two versions of the *Cahier* published in 1947, for example, we notice that, except for additions and deletions, example D in Figure 3.H represents the text wonderfully. Our text, *Et les chiens se taisaient*, on the other hand, mostly follows the pattern of example E... many times over.\(^\text{158}\)
Non-Crossing Decremental Common Subsequences.

If you mention tokens and strings to a traditional textual scholar, do not be surprised to receive a polite reprimand in response. Most consider the vocabulary inherited from computer science undeserving of the rich realities of the texts they hold dear, and with good reason. We have already endured an uphill battle against older, more insidious forms of abstraction that would have us believe texts are written in the heavens for all of eternity. At the same time, a growing number of well-intentioned scholars are content to use digital tools that manipulate texts precisely at this level, without asking too many impertinent questions about the black-box processes that give them handy results. The classic example of this disavowal is the unquestioning use of Google or Microsoft Word, which I venture have become staples of scholarship everywhere. When we think of all the processes we depend on for simple input and output, we realize we are in a world of “black-boxes all the way down”:

Let’s posit for a moment that technological progress, in general terms, leads to a sort of density of knowledge such that one need not fully grasp underlying processes to make effective use of them. This is sort of a holy grail in software development, the creation of standalone “black box” modules whose inputs and outputs are the only pieces of information of any relevance to the programmer.

(Sweeney)
While the seeming glorification of black-boxes by Sweeney Nightingale may find a chorus in many corners of the programming community, the vision of a society defined by black-box processes should be enough to awake in us a Marxian or Freudian sentiment against totality. Sweeney agrees that we need “reverse engineering” as much as “a sort of conceptual framework for thinking about emerging complexity” (Sweeney). Although we understandably place our blind faith in some areas of our workflow in order to move along, as scholars we ignore some black-boxes and their emergent complexity at our own peril. Not only do we risk transferring agency for some of our key maneuvers to a half-understood process, we may miss key insights on our own scholarly procedures.

After a few years of using the Juxta tool to help me collate the fascinating mutations of Aimé Césaire’s *Et les chiens se taisaient*, I finally took a peek inside the internal processes of the software (NINES). In my defense, I really wasn't ready to look behind the curtain before dusting off my math skills, learning some of the basic vocabulary of computer science and acquiring basic code literacy. Although I still feel I have much more to understand, what I discovered behind the black box prompted me to consider it worthy of a chapter, not because I can necessarily contribute to the engineering of the software—although I am—but because of the lessons to be drawn about sequences and transposition applicable outside of the world of computers, if such a world exists.

The Martian cryptographer above was meant to evoke an organic Turing machine of sorts, solving problems by figuring out the right set of procedures or algorithms. The technique she used to derive the sequence `the-o-` | `the-o-`
belongs to the family of algorithms we use to solve what is called the *longest common subsequence problem*. One of the most famous implementations of these techniques, the *diff* utility, also serves as the basis for some of our current collation tools, including Juxta. Digital collation tools have been a great resource for scholars for three decades now, but experienced collators will attest that they are not the indicated tools to deal with texts that have been rearranged substantially. Juxta is no exception.

As I have pointed out elsewhere ("Juxta"), Juxta cannot handle the Césaire texts adequately unless you break them into smaller chunks. The main problem was and is the large amount of transpositions between one version and the next of *Et les chiens se taisaient*. I did the work of cataloguing and diagramming the many “moves” by hand of the set in Chapter 1, using Juxta to compare each block of text internally. I soon started having doubts about my ability to capture all matching blocks between one version and the next, especially those comparisons that revealed upwards of 70 moves! I noticed that Juxta caught *some* matches, so I tried a small experiment.

I uploaded my digital transcriptions of the typescript (chSD.txt) and the *editio princeps* (ChAM46.txt) and processed them whole through Juxta. I carefully used the results to remove from chSD.txt and ChAM46.txt all the matches caught by the first run. Once I had removed every match from both files, I ran those smaller files. Of course, the next set of matches was different than the first. I carefully removed those matches from the files. This process continued for 10 or 11 runs, until I eventually had two small files with text I was reasonably
certain was mutually exclusive. I made a screencast explaining the process
(Vimeo). Later, I realized that this method does not guarantee 100% accuracy, but
I'm getting ahead of myself.

The experiment proved that I had indeed missed some matches when I was
doing the work without the help of computers, despite months of working with
these texts. I was very satisfied with the ingenious solution, but I still didn't
understand why Juxta matched some things and not others. While I was thus
occupied, a team of colleagues who had accepted my challenge to find an
algorithmic solution to the transposition problem was beginning to see positive
results porting the output of SuperFastMatch to the Juxta Web Service API.
SuperFastMatch is an open-source software library used to find fuzzy or
approximate string matches in a corpus. If two texts have similar blocks,
SuperFastMatch will find them. Approximate string matching is another possible
solution to digital collation, one that would solve the problem of transpositions
and collation in general if we could get it to sort out the babies from the bathwater
better. But, I understood even less about the inner-workings of approximate string
matching and SuperFastMatch than I did about diff. It was time to think inside the
box.

I had the faint notion that Juxta used a modified version of the diff utility,
so I started my research there. The diff family builds on Myer's solution to
the longest common subsequence problem. Juxta was indeed catching a longest
common subsequence as a match in every run of my experiment. Here is where a
hundred questions, questions I would have never thought to ask had I stayed
outside the box, took center stage in my research: What does it mean that a complex comparison set has several levels of overlapping subsequences? What do these levels tell us about textual sequence in general? What is the relationship between these sequences and the process by which a text is actually rearranged from one version to the next by human agency?

The longest common subsequence of any two strings compared to each other is that set of tokens that follow each other in the same linear order in both strings, despite any intervening tokens. In the case of Juxta, which seems to be running the wdiff flavor of the Google diff tools, the tokens in question are words. For example, given the following two strings, where each token is represented by a letter of the alphabet: 1) ABCXDEYFZ, and 2) ABMCDXYZEFN, the sequence ABCDEF can be said to be the longest common subsequence. If we ran this example through Juxta, M, N, X, Y and Z would be highlighted in green, while the longest common subsequence would remain unformatted. This is the principal method by which Juxta can claim to mark difference. As long as you work with simple texts, i.e. texts with one clearly recognizable longest common subsequence with minor interruptions, this technique can be very effective. On the other hand, texts with many transpositions “break” Juxta because mutually exclusive large subsequences intersect each other. Realizing the reason for Juxta's limitations, I couldn't help but think that textual scholars have long been operating a human diff of sorts, assuming a long stable sequence against which differences move about.
At some point, I started thinking about the possibility of automating my experiment by writing a script to do what I was doing “manually.” I call the method *iter-diff*, or iterative *diff*. Once I set out to do the work of recognizing and stashing sequences programmatically, I started seeing the problems with a fully automated solution. Though these problems are not game-stoppers, they taught me an important lesson.

The best philologist is a cyborg. No isolated machine or human can replicate her results. A rudimentary *iter-diff* provides preliminary evidence. Imagine we compare the results of the first *diff* run to the results of a human scholar who matches only what is meaningful to her. The latter would not be exactly the longest common subsequence, but they would definitely lead to better results when we run the *diff* a second time. Chances are that letting the computer net everything automatically would probably lead to the accidental disintegration of smaller blocks of interest the deeper we iterate. The reason for the discrepancy between the results of the computer and the cyborg’s should give us pause. Obviously, we are looking for something other than longest common subsequences; not so obviously, what we are looking for is better discerned by thinking *with and for* an algorithm.

Once I set out to think with my *diff* machine, two main questions guided my path, the question of *noise* and the question of the *quid*. *Noise, the second formal question of legology*, can be defined as the remainder between mechanic procedures and philological desires. The question of the *quid*, what I called above
the first formal question of legology, follows from the problem of noise inasmuch as we don't have a perfect procedure or method to individuate legos.

Both questions are unique to us as philologists. To illustrate, take the case of the diff machine, where noise means the aggregate of false positives and negatives, and where falsity is judged by our desires. That noise ranges from single words to whole blocks, all part of the longest common subsequence highlighted by the machine. Here is where our desires differ, for example, from the mathematician or the geneticist. For the former, a value of zero must be counted as a sequence; for the latter, every unit carries meaning. Although we could draw our attention to some isolated tokens when comparing two texts (rare words or proper names, for example), our search for a quid is more idiomatic.

In the next section, I describe how I would build an algorithmic solution to address these two questions, noise and selection, as we work out a method proper to the cyborg and discover that all legos are not created equal. If the following seems on the surface to be an amateur contribution to computer science, I claim nothing of the sort. I am under no illusion that I could do such a thing at this stage, even if I wanted to. Again, the algorithmic procedures I describe below represent a methodological approach to define and select blocks of texts useful to scholars, whether we use computers or not.
Marking the border

*Noise* comes in many flavors.\(^{161}\) In Juxta, the most easily recognizable form of noise can be seen as white fragments in a sea of green. Leaving aside hard notions of intentionality, these stragglers are most often non-editorial. If the texts compared consisted of one stable sequence around which simple additions and deletions were made, the noise would coincide with those human changes. In two texts with various sequences, some of the noise has nothing to do with the editorial process. The obverse on the other hand, green fragments in a sea of white, we have traditionally called an edit and are for the most part editorial. A philologist on the hunt for legos would discard the one and keep the other. One could argue that the latter is not noise. While a human would consider edits to be part of the sequence, the computer would not. The key here is the differential between the two agents.

![Juxta noise](image.png)
Both phenomena, the non-editorial and the editorial noise, can lead to small errors if we were to run our rudimentary \textit{iter-diff} as-is, i.e., as an iteration of the search and stash of longest common subsequences. The errors come from the probability that a word caught in a sequence belongs to a smaller intersecting common subsequence. Several strategies can help us minimize the impact of the smallest noise. The first step would be to apply a list of stop words to get rid of the most common words in the language: articles, particles, common prepositions and the like. This simple step goes a long way to clearing up the muck. The second step, more involved, would be to explore what comes before and what comes after to determine whether a token is isolated or not. The second step is non-trivial, and takes us into the very heart of the human perception of a block of text.

If we were to start from the cleanest, most strict approach, a bibliographer’s match or positive lego would be any series of words that is delimited by a difference, or negative lego. In other words, an exact match. The most simple case of an exact match involves difference at all four borders: the border where A begins, the border where A ends, the border where B begins, and the border where B ends. We can call this a simple match. A slightly more complex structure would compromise one of the borders. Depending on which column collapses the border, we could call these structures a split or a splice.
From these three possibilities we can extrapolate the less strict approach, but it is not so simply implemented, neither by machine nor human. Here are the first blocks we recognize from the transition between ChAM46 and the last Jahn version in French to be revised (chJJ.C2).}

Figure 3.J - Simple matches, Splits and Splices
We could map the blocks, one on the right, one on the left, in different ways. In both texts marking the beginning at “L’écho: Bien sûr qu’il va mourir le Rebelle” should be uncontroversial. The end proves a bit trickier. The first, “strict” way to map it marks the end of the first block at “déplacera || déplaçera.” A human reader would ignore this bit of noise because it is only a small difference in a diacritical mark, a typo to be precise. We easily could program our machine to do as we do, by normalizing all accentuated forms and allowing for spelling variations (as a modern spell checker would do). Using the same criteria, we can discard the next choice for an ending a couple of lines below, “ou || au.”

In order to justify the inclusion of this line within our lego, as most scholars would, we must leave behind simple string matching for a more nuanced approach that can handle markup. The word “Chorus” can be said to exist at a different level than the dialogue that follows. The same goes for the stage directions immediately after. Our troubles are compounded by the fact that other
ancillary dimensions could be abstracted from _actual documents_. We include in this group the page, the margins, the header, the footer and a host of other mutations that give added meaning to blocks of text, and which, in some cases, are non-sequential.

![Figure 3.L - Margins](image)

Not only do actual texts disassemble in n-dimensions, as Jerome McGann put it ("Marking"), these dimensions may be disjointed at the core or impossible to disentangle, which may amount to the same problem. Nevertheless, we proceed by constructing the enabling fiction of individuated dimensions. A complete legology would be able to navigate n-dimensions to find recognizable patterns in the rifts and overlapping hierarchies. My goal here is much humbler: to explore that dimension opened up by comparing versions to one another vis-a-vis sequences.
For this purpose we can bracket speakers (and stage directions if we needed to) in the same way that we bracket margins and headers. In what has now become the standard form of markup for literary texts, the TEI standard, “Chorus” would be marked as a <speaker> and the stage directions as <stage>. If we parse the text to account for these different levels, discard stop words and normalize diacritical marks, our computer can perfectly generate the following exact match, “larmes conviennent faucons poings pensees silex.” We can call these words substantials.

That leaves the border right after “silex.” At this point something interesting happens. A poetic fragment in ChAM46 is elided and substituted for a stage direction in chJJ.C2. I would probably stop here. The reason is only evident when we use the iter-diff approach. Both the poetic fragment and the stage directions are one line or longer. The chance that these fragments themselves come from somewhere else in the text are high enough to merit pause. Before we move into the issue of clusters, very pertinent to our first isolated block, we should deal with a minor nuisance: getting the computer to mark the border after “silex.”

Whenever we encounter a negative block, we should pay attention to the possibility that a group of substantials marked as different between two texts by one run of the diff may be marked as matches on a further iteration. The obverse is also possible: the small group of substantials may not be a “move” after all. That is the case of both small blocks in our example, where we have a classic case of substitution. If we decided to adjudicate based on whether a negative block (a
block marked as different) is a move or not in another sequence, this would create some edit distance problems. Edit distance, quickly defined, is the number of maneuvers needed to transform any string into another string. Luckily, solving for edit distance in order to find boundaries for individual blocks is not necessary at the practical level to solve for positive noise.

Instead of a statistical approach, I use my prerogative to invoke another principle, in the Euclidean sense of the word: a positive block should end when one or both of the two texts introduces a difference equal to a reasonable magic number, provided the different substantials are mutually exclusive in all iterations. In our case, I suggest we provisionally work with the unit of the line, determined by the presence of bounding line breaks (\n or <br>).

In our example, the matching sequence resumes almost immediately with a second adjacent block, beginning with “Architecte aux yeux bleus.” The negative blocks in ChAM46 and chJJ.C2 are bounded by “silex” and “Architecte.” While the negative block in ChAM46 does not meet our criteria (it has a line break only at the end), the one in chJJ.C2 does. Once we have verified that the partial block of ChAM46 is not replicated anywhere in chJJ.C2, we instruct the computer to mark the boundary at the end of the last line including a match in both cases. We name the blocks A1.a and B1.a, or to use shorthand, |1.a|. The A and B indicate the two different texts. If we needed to be explicit, we could substitute A and B with ChAM46 and chJJ.C2. The 1 in |1.a| indicates that this is a result of the first iteration of the iter-diff, i.e., part of the first longest common subsequence. The a indicates that this is the first block of the first sequence.
We could also write \(1.a\) in longhand:

\[
L'ÉCHO/Bien sûr qu'il va mourir le Rebelle. [...] mes poings et mes pensées de silex c'est ma muette invocation vers les dieux du désastre || L'écho: Bien sûr qu'il va mourir le Rebelle. [...] nos poings et nos pensées de silex.
\]

By focusing on marking the boundaries of positive spaces, instead of approximate string match approaches that rely on edit distances, we have also stumbled upon a solution for the negative, or non-editorial, noise we started this section with. According to our line-plus rule, a positive space is defined as any space with matches bounded by two mutually exclusive lines. This means many one word matches in longest common sequences will be counted as single-line matches, when a human would recognize them as garbage. In order to avoid this problem, we must deal with one-word noise completely outside of valid positive spaces and one-word noise on a line bordering a valid positive space.

To deal with the first case, we can discard all occurrences of one-line matches where the match is only one substantial word within the sentence. To deal with the second case, we can investigate all first and last lines of recognized positive spaces to ferret out the one-word matches. With these two small tweaks, we trash almost all likely interference.

What we have accomplished by deploying a hard and fast limit, and tidying up in the process, is to define what constitutes the monad of transposition. We can call such a method the *monadator*. We can of course increase or decrease
the limit using a sliding scale to compare results, but for now we leave the
monadator set at the line-plus. Figure 3.M is the result of the process applied to
ChAM46 || chJJ.C2. Different colors indicate different sequences. The size of the
rectangles is proportionate to the number of lines they abstract.

The line-plus approach works very well for our purposes, but it is not the
only use we can make of the iter-diff. In order to expand from monads to other
meaningful legos, we must find ways to combine the former as we iterate through
the sequences.
Figure 3.M - Transposition monads
Clusters and fractal snakes.

The machine-identifiable blocks I have just outlined can conglomerate in different ways to form clusters. Take for example the simplest split. According to our line-plus rule, the first block on ChAM46 does not have an intervening full line. We marked that border because the chJJ.C2 text has more than one line interrupt the sequence. That makes the block a split. While the originating block can be thought of as a unit (ab), the two blocks on the left would be more appropriately called a cluster (a+b). The + indicates a split where the intervening block is small enough for us to consider a and b to be a set of sorts. We indicate the whole with the shorthand notation 1.ab||1.a+b or 1.a+b. If the split were substantial enough, we would indicate the distance between a and b with a double plus, ++. A splice, on the other hand, can be indicated with the - and -- symbols. If we only consider sequence 1, lock 1.d and 1.e are as good an example as any of a splice.
Ignoring for now the fact that the negative block that separates A1.d from A1.e contains 2.a and 2.b, we would indicate the splice thus, 1.d-e || 1.de or 1.d-e.

Clusters, though, are usually much more complex than |1.a+b| or the simplified form of |1.d-e|. We could have many splits, or a combination of splits and splices, or many splices. We have already seen some of the possibilities. Let us add to our taxonomy of legos by looking at the first recognizable cluster formed with sequences 1 and 2: |1.c~1.g|, where 1.c and 1.g indicate its boundaries, and ~ indicates the indefinite content of the cluster. Our example consists of a reduction. A reduction can be defined as a set in which the size of the difference, or negative blocks, in A is larger than in B. The reverse we could call an expansion.
The \(1.c\sim1.g\) cluster also contains what I call a *snake*, or combination of interlinked splits and splices. Let's examine it step by step with legograms. In the first iteration, sequence 1, the first three blocks, 1.c, 1.d and 1.e form a simple snake: one splice and one split interconnected. The next two blocks, 1.f and 1.g, form a simple splice. The whole forms a reduction (Figure 3.O).

![Figure 3.O](image)

The second iteration, sequence 2, shows an even simpler combination of a splice and a simple connection, also forming a reduction (Figure 3.P).
The result is the following semi-complex reduction, with no intervening negative space on the right, $|cd(a-b)e-f-(c-)g||c(ab)de(c)fg|$ (Figure 3.Q):
While the two clusters, on the left and the right, can be easily recognized by human eyes, it is not self-evident how the computer would be able to recognize them when we place the blocks in the context of what follows and precedes them. Furthermore, the two clusters would have to be recognized both in their own context separately and in the context of each other. In our case, the $|1.c\sim1.g|$ cluster is preceded by the simple cluster $|1.a+b|$, and followed by a simple block that displaces far beyond the border of $B1.g$. Nevertheless, we can map a larger, fuzzy snake on the whole formation. Figure 3.R below, up to a second iteration, highlights the problem:

![Fractal snake](image)

**Figure 3.R - Fractal snake**

**Third Principle of Legology. The Principle of Isomorphism:** Splices are to Splits what Reductions are to Expansions, determined by arbitrary difference
metrics at the top and bottom borders on both sides or on either side of the 
comparison set.

Even if we begin with the one-line plus rule to determine the smallest 
useful legos for bibliographers, we can always reduce or increase the size of our 
lens by dint of the metrics we impose on our sets. As wide as we can open our 
lenses, given the right metrics, we would still be faced with snake formations, 
much in the way that some fractal formations reproduce themselves at certain 
intervals.

While most human observers would be able to extract $|1.c\sim l.g|$ with very 
little hesitation from the legogram above, without a magic number or an edit 
distance calculation, the computer would have no way to differentiate smaller and 
larger snakes in any meaningful way. In other words, the easiest way to determine 
clusters, by far, is casting a human eye on a simple, monadator legogram and 
marking up the results. Furthermore, the more complex the formations become as 
we keep stacking iterations, the more so this is the case. Sadly, we learn very little 
about lego clusters, and our own assumptions, by choosing the easiest route.

I admit a thorough study of cluster-recognition for literary texts probably 
deserves a shelf of legology monographs. For our purposes, though, I am content 
to offer a simple method which in practice has helped me understand the 
transformations of *Et les chiens se taisaient*. Hopefully, others will find it useful 
for similar comparison sets.
The GOP and the snake corral

Meaningful clusters can come in many shapes and forms. Any method(s) we device will define those clusters as the total sum of the rules that recognize them in the first place. The simple method I describe below proceeds by adjusting the results of single iterations of the monadator and then organizing the new results. In practice, this means we are deploying a different modality of the iter-diff that effectively condenses the particulars of the monadator. Call it the federalist, if you will.

*During iteration: Parallel clustering.*

Given a cluster on the right matched to a cluster on the left, migrations can be of two kinds: An *internal* migration does not transcend the outer-boundaries of either cluster, as in the example above; *external* migrations, in contrast, can cross the outer boundaries in one of three directions: a) *Immigrations* begin outside matching clusters and end within the borders of the right cluster; b) *Emigrations* are exactly the inverse of immigrations; finally, c) *Fly-by’s* cross particular clusters without becoming part of them. In Figure R we see clusters and migrations in action. Clusters are indicated by curly brackets. Different colors, as always, represent different relative sequences.
Clusters that have no migrations leaving or entering their borders, or *parallel clusters*, can usually be abbreviated as simple matches, splits or splices without loss for cluster-determination. The *GOP* (Graph Orientation Parser), sorts out the *immigration status* of individual blocks in relationship to clusters in order to allow us to isolate parallel clusters.
To do its work, the GOP brackets contiguous blocks or simple snakes during each iteration to see if they encapsulate other blocks in the next iteration. Once it finds migrant blocks, the GOP runs a series of tests to see if these blocks are either internal or external (immigrations or emigrations). Testing for fly-bys is unnecessary since by definition they rest outside of pairwise matches. The GOP uses the results of these tests to dynamically generate an indexed table of all migrations. The table can be used on the fly and after the fact to determine what to bracket and what to ignore for the moment. At the simplest level, purely internal migrations, whether they form a solid block on either side or not, are indications of clusters. Blocks can be accredited by the GOP as internal if their starting position falls within the boundaries of temporary brackets on both columns.

The GOP safely ignores fly-bys, even those that attempt to land on a border external to a bracket. All external migrations that border on a bracket-cluster will have a chance to change their immigration status once the GOP is no longer operative. In the meantime, the GOP is left to solve only for immigrations and emigrations.

The operation is very simple. If a block falls outside the boundaries of a bracket on the right it is an emigration, and vice versa. Once the block has been appropriately labeled, we divide the bracket(s) in two, before and after the migrant block. The goal, as always is to isolate parallel clusters. By definition, a parallel cluster cannot have any immigrants or emigrants.
After the GOP has properly ID’d every block and refined or added its brackets, we should have in our hands a *GOP legogram, a bracket table* and a *migration table*. The next step, slightly more sophisticated than the GOP, takes the two latter returns and produces our target legogram.

**Post-Processing: A clustering toolkit**

Let us call the second set of tools in our cluster recognition efforts, the *snake-corral*. The goal of the *snake-corral*, as the name implies, is to bundle snakes.

The first method begins by comparing the original sequence of a monad or monad-bracket with the GOP brackets. The original sequence of each monad, and by implication, of brackets so far, should be found in the *bracket table* generated by the GOP. All intra-sequential brackets which retained their contiguity after the GOP immediately become candidates for union.

Direct contiguity guarantees a union, and the *snake-corral* joins the two blocks or brackets, regardless of migration status, in some cases forming a snake where there was none, in others increasing the size of an already existing snake or snakes. As you guessed, direct contiguity is determined using the same line-plus method we used to determine monads. Furthermore, because this approach disregards migration, the new brackets are not parallel. The unsustainable symmetry of the GOP gives way to a more diverse, but meaningful set of brackets.
Negative spaces larger than one line return us to the same quandary that we faced with the *monadator*. Unlike the latter, though, we want to give ourselves more room to integrate intra-sequential contiguities now that they have survived the GOP. Because recursions can be confined by the outer limits of contiguous blocks, we can substitute the absolute magic number approach with a proportional approach, no less magical, without fearing that the new bracket will grow to the size of the Text.

Given two contiguous solid blocks of the same sequence, the distance from the top of the first block to the bottom of the second block is called *the height*. The distance between the bottom of the first block and the top of the second one we call *the gap*. We measure both of these in line breaks. The *separation index* results from the division of the height by the gap. The separation index can be calculated regardless of the connections across comparison sets. In other words the separation index of two blocks on the left column of a split is no different than the calculation for two simple pairs of matching blocks.

Of course, the separation index we chose is just as a magical as the one line rule. Our clusters will be defined by our choice of acceptable distances. In the same way as the one-line rule—which we could have set to two, or three—we can also set the separation index as a variable parameter and play around to find the one that makes the most sense based on the scholars’ goals and “fuzzy” notion of what constitutes a cluster. Prior to a machine run *snake-corral*, though, I propose a visual 80-20. To be on the safe side, we could choose the larger of 80-20 or 5 lines.\textsuperscript{164}
The next method in the *snake-corrail* helps us figure out whether any snakes have swallowed other snakes. The first iteration of the |1.c~1.g| cluster illustrates the scene (Figure 3.Q). Notice that the blocks within the second iteration fill up all the one-line plus gaps on the right, forming a solid block, and effectively uniting the two contiguous snakes of the first iteration. Because all moves in the second iteration fall within the boundaries marked by the two snakes in the first iteration, we can claim that these migrations are irrelevant to external calculations. In other words, clusters which are equal to the sum total of all blocks on both sides, regardless of internal moves, can be abbreviated as simple matches, splits or splices without loss for cluster-determination.

As a result, the combination of both iterations can be reduced to a simple splice in principle. Since we will be flattening two sequences, the resulting blocks should have the color and sequence value of the dominant sequence. Though common in most post-publication transmission histories, these strange creatures, neither parallel nor cohesive, are rarely found in the Césairean wild. We do well not to worry ourselves with them, other than to declare the union official and move on.
Figure 3.T - Cluster legogram
Now that several snakes have been corralled without upsetting the ecosystem and without considering external migration patterns, the time has come to revisit the latter to refine our results further. The third method in the *snake-corral* consists of joining brackets separated by a single immigrant. This extra step is risky, but applied to the Jahn comparison set, it provides very useful results. The rule of thumb is to follow the 80-20 model we chose for the second step. After the third step is complete, we can re-run the second for good measure.

I am quite aware that the abstract description of an algorithm can be quite unnerving and tedious until we see it in action. Since I am describing a simple set of methods which can be easily implemented “by hand”—as all algorithms can in principle, if ever so slowly—we can preview the results of the *snake-corral* on Figure 3.T. We should note that Figure 3.T also incorporates fragments that post-date the source text. While stacking sources can complicate issues computationally, the operation was quite easy using a human.

Until we actually have an automated version that lightens the load of the cyborg’s human side, though, doing the work described in this chapter for all comparison sets amounts to madness. While it would take me another year of research to implement all the algorithms described above, planning them gives us a vocabulary and a conceptual framework to better understand what Ernspeter Ruhe had to postpone as a “puzzle très complexe” (18). We now turn, vocabulary and method in hand, to the particulars of the transition from chSD to ChAM46 and the Jahn transformations.
Chapter IV: Oscillations

Textual Topologies: The path is the reading.

Unique in the long history of syncretic approaches to the Caribbean—transculturación (Ortíz), cannibalization (Andrade), creolité (Bernabé), etc.—Antonio Benítez-Rojo's critical work astutely opts for a brand of chaos theory that emphasizes open-ended approximate repetitions and ever-receding subterranean lines of approach—unforeseen journeys, in short:

Certainly, in order to reread the Caribbean we have to visit the sources from which the widely various elements that contributed to the formation of its culture flowed. This unforeseen journey tempts us because as soon as we succeed in establishing and identifying as separate any of the signifiers that make up the super-syncretic manifestation that we're studying there comes a moment of erratic displacement of its signifiers toward other spatio-temporal points, be they Europe, Africa, Asia, or America, or in all these continents at once. When these points of departure are nonetheless reached, a new chaotic flight of signifiers will occur, and so on ad infinitum (12).
While Benítez-Rojo remains strictly culturalist in his approach, we can already see hints of bibliography in his understanding of “syncretic artifacts” (21). The overlap is methodological; instead of moving to the artifact/text from a received provincial reading—be it European, Cuban, African—Benítez-Rojo unveils an ever-expanding textual field from the artifact outwards, where the path dug by the scholar is the reading.

Benítez-Rojo offers an excellent example in his approach to the cult of *la Virgen de la Caridad del Cobre*. He begins with the date 1605 and the three sources of meaning first articulated around the cult, “one of aboriginal origin (the Taino deity Atabeyor Atabex), another native to Europe (the Virgin of Illescas), and finally, another from Africa (the Yoruba *orisha* Oshun).” He quickly moves away from the sources to trace the vectors for each of them, suggesting an infinite network of connections. “Atabey, the Taino deity,” for example, “is a syncretic object itself, one whose signifiers deliver to us another signifier that is somewhat unforeseen: Orehu, mother of waters to the Arawaks of the Guianas.” He goes on to trace many “unforeseen” pathways, “a contradictory vertigo which there is no reason to interrupt” (13-16). A garden of forking paths indeed!

The Chaos theory that Benítez-Rojo borrows from Edward Norton Lorenz traces its roots to the catastrophe theory of René Thom, which in turn is built on the topology of Henri Poincaré. Topology, as a study of n-dimensional surfaces that can transform without changing the contiguity, convergence and connectedness of any point therein, can be very useful for wrapping our heads around textuality for several reasons.
To understand topological space in terms of textual fields let us build a sample “phase space,” a space where each possibility of any given system is represented by a single point. We will form ours out of only two parameters: edit distances and strings. As I said in the previous chapter, an edit distance can be defined as the number of operations needed to change one string of text into another. If we start from any transcribed version of ChAM46, we could map a topological field where every possible variation with an edit-distance of one character is contiguous to each other. A transcription, any transcription of chSD lies somewhere in this field. A moment’s thought is all we need to realize that Hamlet and this paragraph also lie in the same field. Borges’ “Biblioteca de Babel” is a peculiar representation of the same exercise, both disorganized (the books are out of order in terms of edit distance) and constrained (each book has 410 pages and each page 40 lines).

Textuality is, of course, never exhausted by the already infinite string/edit-distance field inasmuch as it is materially embodied and read. If we were to imagine a total topology of text, if such a thing is possible, we would have to add geo-temporal information, bibliography, genre, reception histories and many other dimensions, eventually reaching a total topology of the Real, better left to theologians and philosophers.

The first textual scholar to propose that textuality itself could be understood as a topological field, Jerome McGann, limited the madness to six “dementians” (“Marking”). Though I owe much of my thinking to his theories, especially to his text “Marking Texts in Many Dimensions,” we disagree on the
number of possible fields or “phases” within the topology of text, even at a practical level.

I ask then and once again the question we asked in the introduction, how do we find our way through the labyrinths opened up by textuality? What text? The answer must remain pragmatic, i.e. grounded in our own historical and institutional moment. At the doorsteps of an unprecedented transformation in the mechanisms of human memory, the work of the humanist in the 21st century should be what McGann dubs “Philology in a New Key”: “to preserve, monitor, investigate, and augment our cultural inheritance, including all the material means by which it has been realized and transmitted” (“Philology”).

Caribbean scholars in particular cannot afford to ignore their crumbling archives, exposed as ever to saltpeter, expropriation and siloes, nor the methods that now allow us to map connections and contiguities, to trace paths along the “repeating island” that were until now limited to the reach of library rats. To do so judiciously, we must be able to oscillate between the material particularities of real records and the virtualities and levels of address made available to us with our new technologies.

I refer the reader to Gilles Deleuze's distinction between the “virtual” and the “actual” to mark existing documents as topological attractors swimming in a sea of virtuality. If we allow for the possibility of the string/edit-distance field to intersect with the field of typographical objects, we can see how actual documents form points of contact between different realms of potentiality.
Each of our chapters so far has traced a path across both actual and virtual terrains. In Chapter 1, I introduced the notion of virtual versions, which we might as well have called hypothetical. In Chapter 2, we gave placeholders and phantom texts the same valence as actual texts in our temporal legograms. If I also insisted in that chapter on adaptation-by-default, it was because each manifestation of a text, attractors in a topological space, can only correspond to a single point, regardless of its radiations. In Chapter 3 we arrived at a methodological definition of legos because we were willing to tap into the virtualities formed by the comparison of two actual texts. Legograms, *hypothetical* versions, geo-temporal bibliographies, legos, are all slices of the textual field, touching on the attractors of pre-existing documents and actualizing many more blocks from the virtual areas of the field.

All of these investigations imply, but do not explicitly avow the disturbing role of the reader/scholar in the textual field. Something really bizarre happens when you do so; what was once a series of allo-poetic fields becomes auto-poetic (“Marking”). The actualization of many virtualities, by virtue of the feedback loop we call a reading, may imply that the textual field is ever expanding, like the universe. We should be wary of such assumptions, lest we forget that actual texts are disappearing, and with them galaxies of virtualities.

The event of reading marks a limit point between the world of the actual and the world of the virtual, and the more we play the more we preserve. As Bethany Nowviskie recently put it, *a propos* of the difference between digital and manuscript preservation:
In contrast to physical documents and artifacts, where the best-preserved specimens are the ones that time and good housekeeping forgot, the more a digital object is handled and manipulated and shared and even kicked around, the longer it will endure (Nowviskie).

While I would qualify the role of amnesia in preserving material artifacts, the point is well taken that the more we address and deform digital actualities, the more we preserve them—and I would add, the higher the chance we will celebrate and protect the material “attractors” that made them possible in the first place. All the more reason to make our paths oscillate between the extremely particular and large swaths of unexplored virtualities.

In this chapter I set the path of the reader—a reading in the fullest sense—along one of the central questions opened up by recent debates in what is now called the “digital humanities”; how do we reconcile distant and close reading, big data and tiny data? If the reader is willing to concede that legograms are at a medium distance, I'm sure we don't need to disagree about what counts as a close reading. We need as much of the latter, as we need of the former. The answer, then, to the question of the hour: what reading is appropriate to our age? Simple: an oscillatory or transversal reading.

An easier way to think about transversality is to break the textual field into a series of intersecting and dimensionally consistent planes. I tend to read McGann's “Control Dementians” in this light (“Marking”). To say that we move
transversally is to say that we move across planes.\textsuperscript{169} If we consider the possible orders of composition examined in Chapter 1 as a consistent plane of the textual field, where the parameters are but a handful, any time we deviated to comment on genre or the historicity of the text, we performed a transversal move.

The three sections below exemplify the practice of oscillatory reading, this time moving from the macroscopic patterns suggested by differential legograms, to the very minutae of the revisionary process. Let us not be mistaken, transversal oscillation is more than just the flavor du jour. Were we to remain locked within any given single plane of the textual field, we could not justify our activities. The relevancy of our work, our master narratives and inter-disciplinarity itself are only surface effects, “functions,” of transversality. In this sense above all I insist that the path is the reading.

The reader will notice that the only logic that connects the macro-with the micro-scopic in this chapter and the rest, is the scholarly desire to understand how and why one text becomes another. In the same way that justice escapes deconstruction according to Derrida, our desire remains—for now—the only singularity to escape the black hole of textuality.

**The Transfiguration: From typescript to print.**

As we saw in Chapter 1, the Saint-Dié typescript (chSD) serves as witness to an early shift in orientation for Césaire. The movement away from history and the constant rearrangement of parts will continue after he sends the typescript to
Breton. By the time it is published in *Les Armes miraculeuses*, the text will have become alien to the earlier strophes of the typescript in what remains to my mind one of the most outstanding transformations of a literary work in recent history, on a par with Eliot’s transformation of *The Waste Land* or Whitman’s reworking of *Leaves of Grass*.

The differences between chSD and ChAM46 are so marked we can declare them to be different dramas without reservation. Although both texts share a total of 70+ blocks of text, which constitute the bulk of their content, these are rearranged to the point where we lose all notion of a shared sequence. Most historical references to locale, personage and events either completely disappear or are substituted for general placeholders, nebulous references to a history of oppression and rebellion. The series of revolutionary scenarios of *Acte I* and *II* give way to the prison in the Jura mountains of *Acte III*, now reimagined as an asylum of sorts. As a result, the poetic reflections of Toussaint Louverture and the Chorus, at first directed at a specific historical narrative, become transfigured into a series of oneiric visions where past, present and future blur their boundaries. We could hastily add that the resulting text opens itself to a wider audience, that it achieves something akin to universal import, but by doing so we foreclose the possibility of understanding how the universal signifies only within very specific literary geographies.

We already noted some patterns in the three pre-publications: different speakers, selective fragmentation, loss of reference to the dramatic action, destabilized chronology, and finally, the use of anaphora to mark the
reconfiguration of blocks. All of these appear in one form or another when we compare the two larger texts. Prior to delving into an examination of selected transpositions, to both deepen and expand this list, we should first explore some larger patterns that make themselves evident when we examine the abstract representation of the moves.

Figure 4.A - Acte I
Figure 4.B - Acte II
Figures 4.A, 4.B and 4.C represent the transpositions belonging to each of the acts, separately. One way to look at these graphs productively is to look for clusters and to pay attention to the size of the blocks moved. In the same way that the acts developed differently, they each reveal different patterns of transposition. The first half of Acte I (Figure 4.A), for example, moves for the most part to the end of the 1946 text; the second half does not provide as much material, and the
material it does provide, it provides in blocks that move for the most part to the
beginning of the 1946 text. Acte II seems to contribute to both the beginning and
the end of 1946, but not so much to the middle (Figure 4.B). Acte III, on the other
hand, contributes mostly to the middle and the end of 1946, with hardly any
contribution to the beginning (Figure 4.C). When we look at it from such a
distance, the transformation does not seem so chaotic. One preliminary conclusion
we can draw from these patterns is that the work of transposition was mostly
episodic. Another way of saying this is that episodes in the 1946 text were
cobbled up from blocks in the typescript. A closer look at the individual instances
corroborates this preliminary assessment.

Another important pattern emerges when we look at these figures: the
second half of ChAM46 borrows larger fragments than the first half. As I pointed
out in Chapter 1, the setting for ChAM46 (a prison/asylum of sorts) grows out of
the third act of the original historical drama. The same applies to the plot, the
agony and death of The Rebel. If we combine this fact with the series of large
blocks that accumulates towards the end of the 1946 text, we notice that Césaire
worked this section differently, moving large episodes to condense the story told
in the typescript around the death of the Rebel in the 1946 version. Starting on
page 156 of ChAM46, what we have is verily a distillation of the action of the
typescript, a summary of sorts constituted by large blocks from all three acts, and
following an episodic order similar to the original (Figure 4.D). Something else
we notice when we look at the accumulation of large blocks towards the end of
the 1946 text is the fact that starting on page 156, hardly any new material (gaps
within the blocks) was added. Most of the major work of revision went into the first two thirds of the new drama.

Years later, when Césaire begins collaborating with Janheinz Jahn, their correspondence serves as a testament to the continued practice of thinking in terms of episodes in relationship to *Et les chiens se taisaient*. That Césaire was working around the organizational directive of episodes in these early texts is
reinforced by a comparison of the episodic structure of the two texts, which reveals two main maneuvers: a) whole episodes were moved largely intact, or b) new episodes receive scattered fragments from the typescript.

Perhaps the most striking move, if not the bulkiest, consists of the eleven opening pages of the typescript moving towards the end of the published drama. In a sense, it provides a great case for the study of the dynamic that accompanies large blocks. Here are some considerations which can be generalized to a certain degree:

a) Erasures: If we consider the first eleven pages as one large block, three smaller segments internal to it, about a half page each, are not copied over. These segments are all historical in nature. The first makes reference to the siege of Saint-Marc (3), the second to Toussaint’s slave past (5-6), and the third to Toussaint’s take-over of the Spanish part of the island (10-11);

b) Function: Once the historical backdrop is left behind, the re-contextualization gives the passages a completely different function. In their new context these pages follow the confrontation with the Messenger, the Rebel’s last chance to “save” himself, and precede the Rebel’s christic recognition of his solitude, “j’ai peur je suis seul.” Their new function is to set up the impending death of the Rebel at the hands of the jailers;

c) Iteration: In chSD, the prophecy of Toussaint’s death precedes all the historical action and thus serves as a frame for the whole drama. In ChAM46, new material was written for the beginning of the play with the
same function, “Bien sûr qu'il va mourir le Rebelle...” By the time we arrive at the prophecy again in this block, the re-iteration is more poignant since it is close to the torture scene. Just as in this case, new material in the 1946 text will continuously iterate material from the typescript, in a sense, doubling the original material.

**Erasure**

The removal of direct references to the Haitian revolution is a very straightforward and systematic affair from an editorial point of view. Erasures happen at two levels, either Césaire removes whole segments or he substitutes for an appropriately abstract equivalent in the published version. Most erased segments fall under three large categories: a) the abundance of antagonistic white characters and references to whiteness; b) interactions between Toussaint and the crowds, “La Foule;” and, c) direct references to the skirmishes and battles that punctuate the plot.

Of the most frequently excised lemmas, “blanc” stands out, especially the plural form “blancs.” The typescript registers 69 occurrences, while the print version registers a meager 16. Targets include the call “Mort aux blancs” (sixteen occurrences reduced to three occurrences), the cry “Les blancs débarquent” (sixteen occurrences reduced to five occurrences), and the many negotiations with white emissaries where Toussaint and the crowds debate what to do. Here is a typical expunged scene:
(La scène est envahie par la foule des insurgés : masse d’hommes et de femmes armés de coutelas.)

**Toussaint**

Mes amis, les blancs nous envoient des ambassadeurs[sic]. Voulez-vous les entendre ?

**Des voix**

Oui, oui, qu’ils parlent.

**1er député**

Mes chers amis... Je sais que vous en avez assez de cette guerre, vos enfants ont faim.

**Des voix**

Oui, oui, c’est vrai.

**1er député**

Vos femmes sont lasses d’une vie incertaine et vagabonde.

**Des voix féminines.**

Oui, oui ; après ?

**1er député**

Revenez sur les habitations. Reprenez le travail. Nous sommes prêts à reconnaître la liberté aux meilleurs d’entre vous et nous vous garantissons à tous notre bienveillance paternelle.

(Des cris contradictoires dans la foule.)

Ecoutez les blancs. Ne les écoutez pas. Paix. Paix. mort...

...à mort.

**Toussaint**

Camarades, vous les avez entendus ; de vos propres oreilles,
entendus. Comme ils sont bien gentils et bien conciliants, alors ils sont venus proposer à vos chefs de vous lâcher ; ils sont venus proposer à vos chefs de se vendre... Ils sont venus nous demander de vous trahir.

La foule

Mort aux blancs. Mort aux blancs.172 (27)

The reduced emphasis on whiteness should not be read as a cowering from race. If this were the case, the same fate would have awaited the variations of “noir,” which actually increase slightly in number in the print version. We should heed here Ronnie Scharfman’s admonition that Césaire never uses the words white or black carelessly (41). What we have instead is a reduction of direct references to blancs as an all-encompassing metonymy for the enemy and a concomitant reduction in the number of interactions between the Rebel/Toussaint and minor white characters. As blancs recedes into the background, the figure of whiteness becomes centralized in a few key characters, becoming in a sense a universal Whiteness. This editorial maneuver makes perfect sense in the adaptation to a readership that included multi-racial allies, without necessarily compromising the positioning of the play along racial lines.

The above passage also exemplifies the sort of interactions between Toussaint and the people that are just as important to the development of the original action as Toussaint’s growing solitude. Of these interactions, only those prone to a hallucinatory reading make it to the print version, where the Rebel now takes center stage without having to engage in naturalistic exchanges.
Finally, many of the excisions were directed at ostensive declarations from the characters or the stage directions signaling the skirmishes and battles:

*Le récitant*

*Un coup de sifflet... Les nègres sortent des broussailles avec une grande clameur. Les coutelas s’abattent et se relèvent et s’abattent dans le moulinet de l’exaspération.*\(^{(29)}\)

or,

* (3 coups de canon espacés retentissent. Des hommes avec des torches courent des explosions... de la fumée... une panique...)*^{(29)}

This sort of erasure, perhaps even more so than the others, will radically shift the semantic thrust of the fragments that are copied over.

**Function**

Direct references to the battles in the Haitian Revolution belong mostly to *Acte I* and *II* of the typescript. Many of the fragments that are copied over from these two acts lose their original sense, and gain another, more refracted sense in their new context. Whether these expositions in the typescript served as substitutes for actual stage representation, or whether they were commenting on the action on stage, the accompanying poetry bore directly on that action. In their absence, much of the unmoored poetry becomes multi-valent, oneric. The following example is representative:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saint-Dié Typescript, p. 39</th>
<th>Les Armes miraculeuses, p. 132</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **La récitante.** (dolente)**
300,000 hommes, tribart brisé, se précipitent dans la ville et poussent des hurlements clabauds... Le port est couvert de blancs qui cherchent à gagner les bâtiments en râde... Ah, les chaloupes chavirent...

**Le récitant (féroce)**
... Les têtes roulent comme des cabosses de cacao.

**La récitante.**
Le tam-tam halète; le tam-tam éructe... le tam-tam crache des sauterelles de feu et de sang.

**Le récitant.**
Le feu défonce la nuit de ses épis canaques...

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LA MÈRE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mon enfant... donne-moi <strong>la main</strong>... laisse pousser dans <strong>ma main ta main</strong> redevenue simple.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LE REBELLE**
le tam-tam halette. le tam-tam éructe. le tam-tam crache des sauterelles de feu et de sang. **ma main** aussi est pleine de sang.

**LA MÈRE (effrayée)**
tes yeux sont pleins de sang.
The first set of *tam-tams* are grounded by the action around it. The fire and the blood relate directly to the scene of 300,000 men descending on the city. Notice also the speaker is *la Récitante*, who switches between descriptive and poetic codes to illustrate the battle scene. On the second set, to the right, the *tam-tams* are a distant memory of rebellion, a response to the mother by the Rebel that his hands cannot be cleaned so easily. Framed by the repetition of ‘*ma main,*’ the *tam-tams* are no longer played by a multitude of anonymous hands. They are the Rebel’s own now, almost indistinguishable from his corporality, as we have seen in other examples in the play. Furthermore, in its new context, the fragment loses its mimetic function, becoming a metaphor for rebellion in general.

We see here the main process by which text adapts to text. Each text read by itself falls short of the comparison between the two. That is the privilege of the bibliographical reading: to read Caribbean literature, or any literature for that matter, in the oscillation between actual texts enriches the meaning. If one of the favored tropes in *Et les chiens se taisaient* and many of the poems of *Les Armes miraculeuses* is the pseudo-romantic transfiguration of history and nature in the poetic-body of the I, the effect is only the more poignant when we see the passage adapt from a pseudo-stage-direction to the *corpus* of the Rebel.

**Iteration**

Both the historical drama and the oratorio are rife with various forms of repetition operating at different registers: internal rhymes; repetition of phrases,
words and syntactic formulas, anaphoras, etc.; episodic structural kinships; juxtaposed isomorphic images;\textsuperscript{175} and intertextual borrowings, to name the most important ones.

Repetition in the form of fragmentary reprints, as we saw in Chapter 2, was very much a part of the editorial landscape of the time. Iterations at the textual level are also to be understood in this context. Perhaps the easiest form of iteration to grasp is intertextuality. One example from the text is the use of the formula “\textit{belle comme}” or “\textit{beau comme},” each used once in the drama, and each traceable to Lautremont, Breton, and to \textit{Tropiques} contributor Lucie Thésée, who in issue N°5 published her poem “\textit{Beau comme...}” (Pierre 281). However, the relationship between iteration and the practice of fragmentary reprint goes beyond simple intertextuality.

The ambiguous paratext of the poems we examined above corresponds to the reframing of internally coherent fragments through the use of repeated formulas. As we saw in Chapter 2 in our analysis of the second “Poème,” Césaire used the repetition of the words “\textit{ô morts}” to bind together fragments culled from the original. In the following example, the repetition of the formula “\textit{monte très imminent seigneur}” plays a similar role, splicing dialogue that belongs to two different speakers:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saint-Dié typescript, p. 47</th>
<th>Les Armes miraculeuses, p. 118</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toussaint.</strong></td>
<td><strong>LE CHŒUR (psalmodiant)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masse sans communauté ni</td>
<td>Avec tes sandales de pluie et de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communion</td>
<td>courage, <strong>monte surgir imminent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>une église brûle dans l'écrin de la</td>
<td>seigneur tout près des larmes <strong>monte</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fôret tordue</td>
<td>dans le désert comme l'eau et la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>des débris de fusée disent</td>
<td>montée des eaux houleuses de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hourra</td>
<td>cadavres et de moissons;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la chair vole en copeaux d'Afrique</td>
<td><strong>monte très imminent seigneur</strong>, la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sombre.</td>
<td>chair vole en copeaux d'Afrique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Récitante.</strong></td>
<td>sombre, <strong>monte très imminent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>il y aura encore des yeux</td>
<td><strong>seigneur</strong>, il y aura encore des</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comme des tournesols ou de</td>
<td>yeux comme des tournesols ou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grands sojas amoureux</td>
<td>de grands sojas amoureux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bandés d'oiseaux aussi</td>
<td>bandés d'oiseaux aussi beaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beaux qu'une sonnerie de pomme</td>
<td>qu'une sonnerie de pomme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d'adam dans l'éclair des colères</td>
<td>d'adam dans l'éclair des colères</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brèves.</td>
<td>brèves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Récitant.</strong></td>
<td><strong>LA RÉCITANTE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Coupeurs de choux-palmistes,</em></td>
<td>Vous avez entendu, vous avez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>entendu, le roi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another good example of this framing device can be found on the “baptism by earth” episode. This episode closes Acte II in the typescript, when the, “ravaudeurs du désert” baptize Toussaint by pouring earth over his nape. When the episode is transplanted to the 1946 text, it is framed before and after by the phrase, “Coursiers de la nuit entraînez-moi.”

Markers, guideposts, beats, traces, points de capiton, these rhetorical turns are also the scenes of larger iterations. The case of, “Coursiers de la nuit entraînez-moi” is very instructive in this regard. The “baptism by earth” episode already contains the seeds of the refrain in Toussaint’s demand “Ravaudeurs du désert, baptisez moi.” Rippling out from this one line to the rest of the new text, we find a pattern of iteration that was absent from the typescript. The first ripple comes as we have seen at the boundaries of the fragment. The second ripple comes right before the passage, with the actual first instance of, “Coursiers de la nuit entraînez-moi.” This line appears for the first time in the text just a few lines before the baptism episode, right after the Rebel’s eyes have been gouged.

The blinding of the Rebel is one of the most important differences between the two texts. Although the typescript is full of poetic play between light and darkness, night and day, heaven and the underworld, Toussaint never loses his sight. In the 1946 version the blinding of the Rebel effectively divides the drama in two, with enormous consequences for all of the poetry therein. In this new context the baptism by earth is directly linked to a journey to the underworld, iterated by blindness, but also an initiation into the mysteries of death. The
presence of the line, “Coursiers de la nuit entraînez-moi” at this juncture gives it added structural weight.

When we compare the presence of the imperative in the two texts, limiting ourselves for now to the constructions with “-moi” we find that occurrences in the 1946 text (41 total) by far outnumber the typescript (thirteen total). Many of the instances in the typescript are just speech mannerisms, “permettez-moi de remarquer que vous…”177 (79) or “De quel droit, dites-moi, Monsieur…”178 (31) In the 1946 text, on the other hand, they attach themselves to an operative demand. Furthermore, they are also examples of various figures of repetition (often combined): a) conduplicatio, i.e., repetition for emphasis: “Oh, laissez-moi. laissez-moi,”179 (155) “Laboure-moi, laboure-moi,”180 (128) etc.; homoioiteleuton, i.e., where only the -moi is retained: “polders de Hollande engloutissez-moi/laisses de basse-mer soyez-moi sœur,”181 (105) “Laboure-moi phacochère et piétine piétine-moi,”182 (128) “Ligotez-moi./piétinez-moi. Assassinez-moi,”183 (164) etc.; c) anaphora: “Embrasse-moi; embrasse-moi,”184 (103, et al) used several times by the Lover to open her lines.

Each of these constructions fans out from an original few in the typescript, including “baptisez-moi” in our sample. They also play an important structural role. Towards the end of the play, as he approaches his death, the Rebel is confronted with a choice between voices from below, “voix souterraines,” and voices from above, “voix céslestes.” This scene represents the limit ripple of the series of adhortati, as whispering voices ask the earth gods to take him, “Entraînez-le, entraînez-le.”185 The end connects to the middle through the echo
of, “Coursiers de la nuit entraînez-moi.” The desire or dare of the Rebel to be
dragged down to the earth becomes vindicated at the threshold of death, when he
makes his final choice and offers himself to the earth:

\[
\begin{align*}
Dieux d'en bas, dieux bons \\
j'emporte dans ma gueule délabrée \\
le bourdonnement d'une chair vivante \\
me voici....^{186} (106)
\end{align*}
\]

That is not to say that iteration was not an important part of the typescript. On the
contrary, a cursory look reveals several examples of mirror structures and
repeated phrases throughout. We already pointed out above that the first and
second act are mirrors of each other. Notwithstanding, I would like to make two
points about the relationship between the two: a) new iterations usually expand
from language already present in the typescript; and b) old iterations are usually
transformed in the new text.

As some internal repetitions move from chSD to ChAM46, they often
resonate further in the new material. Perhaps the best example is the reiteration of
the anaphora, “nous sommes au moment…” In the typescript, this phrase is
repeated three times (57, 60). In ChAM46 it is repeated thirteen times in two
separate episodes: one towards the beginning, during the funeral procession for
the Lover (109-110)—also where the original three instances find their home;
and one towards the end, during the series of visions that precede the Rebel’s
torture and death (170).
Those iterations that are carried over into the new text are often transformed. The following example shows how a straightforward anaphora in the typescript becomes a more complex system of iteration in the new text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saint-Dié Typescript, p. 104</th>
<th>Les Armes miraculeuses, p. 129</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Récitant.</strong></td>
<td><strong>PREMIÈRE VOIX TENTATRICE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>à l'heure rouge des requins</td>
<td>je suis l'heure rouge, l'heure dénouée rouge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>à l'heure rouge des étrivières</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>à l'heure rouge des noyades</td>
<td><strong>DEUXIÈME VOIX TENTATRICE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>à l'heure rouges des nostalgies</td>
<td>je suis l'heure des nostalgies, l'heure des miracles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>à l'heure dénouée rouge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>à l'heure rouge des cohues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>épaules de l'eau bouillante nos fesses scarifiées se mirent à crier vengeance;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>à l'heure rouge des miracles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberté belle de nuit éclose au caillebotis et fumier de jambes coupées</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>les chenilles rugissaient sur le pont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next two sections we move away from the centrality of Césaire-the-author to place the work at the center, as it undergoes another fantastic transfiguration at the hands of the editor, translator and man-o-letters extraordinaire, Janheinz Jahn. Despite our shift in focus, we do not stray away from the "author function" by tracing the textual field of the Jahn collaboration.
for two reasons: a) Césaire was actively involved in the new text and ultimately approved it for distribution in Germany; and b) Césaire, as a result of Jahn's efforts, has a role to play in the literary and cultural scene in the 1950s and 1960s in West Germany. Furthermore, if our ultimate goal is to find our way through transcultural and intertextual fields grounded in bibliography, to follow the transformation of one text into another, our mission pushes us outside of traditional author-centric histories.

**A Brief History of the Jahn versions: A necessary aside.**

The first and only extended word on the Jahn-Césaire materials was offered by Ernspeter Ruhe in his work *Aimé Césaire Et Janheinz Jahn: Les Débuts Du Théâtre Césairien* published in 1990. Ruhe’s analysis of the editorial exchange is justifiably influenced by the thesis that Jahn inducted Césaire into the theater. While it remains plausible that Jahn pushed Césaire to write for the stage again, in light of the evidence presented by the Saint-Dié typescript, we must place the origins of Césaire’s interest in the theater a decade earlier. Naturally, our new knowledge changes our approach to the texts.

Ruhe’s edition of the work was a reconstruction of what he thought was Jahn’s intended mission, adding an added layer to the transmission history of *Et les chiens se taisaient*. I am, obviously, fascinated by all textual transformations. Even if I prefer to remain as diplomatic as possible in my own approach, I defend Ruhe’s prerogative to “correct” Jahn’s work. We learn much also from his
introduction to the text, in which I would only like to correct Ruhe’s recurrent reference to “le manuscrit,” as if only one state of the text survived. Jahn’s personal archive holds instead five complete states of the “manuscrit” Ruhe must be referring to (six if we count Jahn’s annotated copy of Les Armes miraculeuses), one incomplete state, a set of loose scenes, both typescript and manuscript, two states of the radio-play and several copies of the German print version. The following is a brief account of those documents in the form of a late history of the work.

Jahn first approaches Césaire in August of 1953, via letter, to ask for Césaire’s blessing and collaboration for an anthology of “nouvelle poésie nègre” to be published by Carl Hanser Verlag. Césaire responds enthusiastically and their long years of collaboration begin. The first mention of “ET LES CHIENS SE TAISENT” [sic] comes on the second letter from Jahn, dated “7 décembre 1953.” In the long letter, Jahn introduces Césaire to one Mme. de Bary as a collaborator in the translation of Césaire’s poetry for the anthology. Jahn also claims to have read the play recently and wants to translate it for the radio at a profit of 600 to 1000 DM for 60 minutes. Jahn is not sure he can guarantee a 60 minute production, and is worried that the text will have to be condensed:

_Pour une rappresentation [sic] complète la comédie est trop longue. Le maximum sont des transmissions de 90 minutes - normalement on fait des transmissions de 45 minutes. C'est différent [sic] second les stations. Si on ne me donne que 45 minutes à Frankfurt on me peut donner par exemple 60 minutes à_
Baden-Baden. On ne sait jamais. En tout cas je ferai mon possible [...] Est-ce que vous avez la bonté de me faire savoir quelle parts de la comédie on peut omettre?\textsuperscript{191} (7 Dec. 1953)

Jahn has very little luck initially convincing Frankfurt to air the play, but that does not stop him from beginning the translation/adaptation. In the next letter, dated “26 février 1954,” he informs Césaire that Mme. de Bary has already translated parts of the play, and more to the point, that they intend to collaborate and seek to publish the drama in Germany.\textsuperscript{192}

A year goes by before the next letter (Letter 14 Feb. 1955). Jahn’s anthology, “Schwarzer Orpheus” has been published in the interim, and Jahn is ready to focus on Et les chiens se taisaient. Mme. de Bary will leave the translation project solely in Jahn’s hands, because, “elle n'a pas de chance de faire accepter sa traduction.”\textsuperscript{193} At this point we have no textual evidence of Jahn’s, or Mme. de Bary’s work. We only know that Jahn is already working on versions for the theater and for the radio.

Jahn visits Césaire in Paris during the second week of June, 1955, to work on the translation. On his return we learn, via letter (13 July1955), that Jahn has shown Césaire a “nouvelle version” and that Césaire has promised “des scènes nouvelles.” Césaire responds in August with a scene and the promise of another:

\begin{quote}
Je n'ai guère d'inspiration ce jours-ci. Je vous envoi quand même une scène. Je l'ai fait en suivant vos conseils. Il s'agit d'une scène où l'Amante essaie de détourner le Rebelle de son destin. J'ai l'idée
\end{quote}
Jahn responds immediately with good news (Letter 20 Aug. 1955). He has finished the radio adaptation and Frankfurt agreed to transmit it. Jahn goes on to summarize “l'architecture de la pièce.” As Ruhe points out in his study, we already see in Jahn’s summary the general structure that will define all the Jahn versions:

a) The Administrator on his state. Voices prophecy his downfall.

b) The Rebel in prison. A flunky of the Administrator attempts to rally the masses against him, but the Rebel is able to turn them around.

c) The Rebel is confronted with four temptations: A Messenger, his Mother, his Lover and the Administrator himself.

d) The Rebel dies at the hands of the jailer, steadfast to the end.

e) Return to the prophetic warning against the Administrator. (12)

The typescript of the radio-play (chRF.ts) is the only dated state found at the Jahn archive: November 1955.195 A detail in the letter suggests that the typescript was prepared after the letter. In his summary, Jahn suggests that the scene open with the Administrator listening to a show on the Radio on the subject of the colonies. That scene is nowhere to be found in the states I have seen.

At this stage, without further dedicated research, I find it difficult to date with any certainty the other states, and in one important case their relative order
of composition. At the center of the difficulty is a “master” text (chJJ.A1), which Jahn used to create some, if not all of his other versions: the radio-play prepared for HR, a German version for print, the staged version (of which we only have reports), and the French version that Ruhe focused on in his study. While it is clear that the German and French theatrical scripts post-date chJJ.A1, it is not so clear that it post-dates chRF.ts, which seems to follow a different branch from it or to it. What legology and traditional forms of analysis reveal, at least provisionally, is that the radio version departs the most from all other versions.

When we superficially compare the block movements from ChAM46 to chRF.ts to the block movements from ChAM46 to chJJ.C2, the last complete set of the French versions, we find that the general movements are similar, and they both could trace their origins to the general guidelines provided by chJJ.A1. A more detailed comparison would require rigorous legograms of all the versions, which I personally postpone until I can convince the computer to implement the algorithms I described in Chapter 3. The comparison of legograms is perhaps one of the most promising areas of investigation in the research agenda of legology, and I will have more to say on the subject in later studies.

The radio-play was transmitted for the first time in January, 1956. A recording of the play (chRF.rec), as it was transmitted by Hessischer Rundfunk in Frankfurt, follows the chRF.ts almost verbatim. The two chRF states are the farthest away from the “master” text, as I said above, but we do not have hard evidence, yet, that they predate it. For the staged versions of the play, one in Bâle
in 1960, and one in Hanover in 1963, I refer you to Ruhe’’s research (20-23).

Without any doubt, these post-date the “master” text.

The “master” text, chJJ.A1, reveals Jahn's method of composition and reorganization. The bulk of the text consists of Jahn’s own additions, with source and page reference numbers to his copies of three of Césaire’s texts: The 1946 version of Les Armes miraculeuses, the 1947 Bordas edition of Cahier d’un retour au pays natal, and the 1948 edition of Soleil cou coupé. The latter two provided Jahn with small fragments that he felt appropriate to the adaptation.

Jahn's notation system is exemplified by the following passage:

```
L'Administrateur: Le mieux serait que je laisse le tyle s'
Schapper. La foule le battrait à mort et l'affaire
serait fini. Je dirai au geôlier d'ouvrir la prison.
(L'Administrateur rentre dans sa palais).
11:174.
12:142-143.
Le Vendeu: 13:175
14: Sonnenkloche 8,14,1.drei Zeilen und letzte 5 Zeilen.
Malheur malheur!
La Foule: Puyone, Puyone!
14:175
La Foule: Scoutes-le, Scoutes-le! Vive la vengeance! Vive la
vengeance!
```

Figure 4.E

Indexed 11, 12, 13 and 14, Jahn’s lego references have a double function: to point to the sources and indicate their relative position in the new version. The fact that some of the indexes are duplicated, as in 14 above, reveals Jahn’s notation for refrains, which is the case here and throughout. The annotated copy
of *Les Armes miraculeuses*, which gives meaning to the page references above, survives in the Berlin archive. Ruhe describes Jahn’s system in a footnote as follows:

\[Jahn travaillait sur cet exemplaire sans le découper; on était encore très loin, dans les années 50, des techniques modernes de copie et des facilités qu'elles entraînèrent. Il numérotait dans l'ordre de leur nouvelle disposition les parties du texte de Césaire qu'il voulait intégrer dans sa version et les différencia en même temps à l'aide de crayons-feutres de couleur selon les actes dans lesquels devaient être reprises les citations (acte I, numéros 1-82: rouge; acte II, numéros 83-174: vert; acte III, numéros 175-238: bleu). De plus, il indiquait à gauche dans la marge la longueur de ces passages numérotés en les entourant d'un trait jaune.\]^{197} (25)

The clunky French and the intrusion of German notes in our sample from chJJ.A1 are representative of the rest of the document. In other places, Jahn uses English, which also suggests that these rough sketches were meant to aid collaboration with Césaire, who did not read German. A typical example comes from the first page, “*Tu es un brave nègre, et tu m'aides* for good pay.” The possibility that the English was meant for Césaire is reinforced by the fact that the German is mostly confined to the lego references, while English is reserved for Jahn’s additions.

As I suggested above, chJJ.A1 is closer to the German print version and the French versions than it is to the radio-play. Although we cannot date chJJ.A1
precisely without further research, a copy with corrections and annotations, chJJ.A2 can be safely dated after the chHR.ts. A correction on page 9 of chJJ.A2 points to a fragment Césaire sent with an undated letter sometime before June 1, 1956, the date Jahn sends a letter to acknowledge the receipt, and presumably after April 28, when Jahn travels to Paris for a collaboration session. The correction on page 9 refers to a source marked with the letter C (Figure 4.F).

The source in question is a scene sent by Césaire with the undated letter to be inserted on what was at that point page 19 (p19JJ). The document bearing that scene indeed has the letter C written on the top right corner. The page in question eventually will fall on page 18 in the next states we have available to us, chJJ.B1, chJJ.B2, chJJ.C1, and chJJ.C2.

The transaction provides us with some important clues. The references 59B and 59C, written on the left margin of p19JJ, confirms that Jahn marked sources at the block level using the same numbers that he used on the destination, as Ruhe described. We also learn that Césaire had in his hands, not a copy of the “master” document, but an unabbreviated version. The “master” document is understandably much shorter than the rest of the complete states, totaling only 22
loose leaves in both copies. The fact that the destination of p19JJ.ts falls on page 18 of the unabbreviated sets, B and C, suggests that Césaire had in his hands a version that approximates those sets. In the same undated letter where Césaire sends the scene, he indeed declares that he has finished reading, “notre’ version.”

Césaire probably received the version he made the insertion for from Jahn himself, on the latter’s April-May visit to Paris. We know that Césaire had already given Jahn carte blanche for the, “agencement des scènes” described above, asking only that the changes would apply only to the German versions for print and the radio (Letter 26 Aug. 1955). At this point, Césaire had already set to work on his own rearrangement and adaptation for the theater, which would lead to the 1956 Présence Africaine “version théâtrale,” CHPA56. He describes his new arrangement to Jahn in detail in the Aug. 26 letter, but the latter will ignore it completely, even going against Césaire’s express wishes by staging his version in Germany. To make matters worse, Jahn presents the 1956 German print version, CHJJ56, as a translation of the work to appear under the Présence Africaine imprint. After suggesting the collaboration with the author for the radio-play led to major corrections (Korrekturen), Jahn goes on to add:

Und diese wirkten sich natürlich auch auf die Bühnenfassung aus.

Der Autor Césaire hat diese Ergebnisse auch für die französische Fassung akzeptiert, und die Neuausgabe, die in Kürze in dem Verlag Présence Africaine, Paris, erscheinen wird, wird der deutschen Ausgabe völlig gleichen. (Hunde 8)
Identity, of course, was not the case.

The unabbreviated B set (chJJ.B1 and chJJ.B2), seems to follow the “master” text even more closely than the German adaptation for print and stage, adopting the corrections and substitutions made on chJJ.A2. The set is characterized by the continued presence of Jahn’s pidgin French and English stand-ins, which signals that at this stage of composition, the French text was still only a departure point for translations into German. The C set finally eliminates all traces of English and German. The set comes from corrections introduced in chJJ.B2.

The last time we hear the drama mentioned in the correspondence comes on the last surviving letter from Jahn to Césaire, dated Sept. 9, 1968. For financial reasons, or otherwise, Césaire asks Jahn to send him the French version he had prepared, in order to court publication in France. Jahn attaches a revised version in the letter to Césaire, asking him to, “corriger et reformuler” his authorial contributions to the original texts. We never hear again of this last version, but we have reason to believe that it consists of a version of the C set, likely a copy of the complete C2. The fact that all traces of English and German are removed suggests that chJJ.C adds an element of finality that was not necessary while the documents remained a departure point for other work. Furthermore, though the French of the C set is a bit more refined, it still in very much need of copy-editing, explaining Jahn’s petition to Césaire.
The following section relies for the most part on legograms derived from the comparison set ChAM46 || chJJ.C2. I chose the two limit points in the Jahn line of transmission because they offer us the most complex set for analysis. Needless to say, a more complete series of legograms wait on the horizon.

**Applied Legology: The Jahn Oscillations**

If we look at the *monad* legogram for the transition from chAM46 to chJJ.C2 (Figure 3.M), we can immediately recognize at the macro level that Jahn's dominant mode of revision is condensation. Culling fragments from different areas of the original structure, Jahn constructed islands of text from Césaire’s content, leaving himself room for transitions and episodes of his own device. When we look at the abbreviated results of the cluster legogram (Figure 3.T), the persistent complexity of the center area, roughly corresponding to Jahn’s second act, or “*Le rêve,*” as he called it, also becomes apparent. The resistance to abbreviation makes sense in light of the nature of *Acte II*, in which Jahn wanted to concentrate most of Césaire’s lyrical flights, interspersed in the source.

Such generalizations, made easy by legograms, are readily useful for literary history and/or genetic criticism. Nevertheless, not all condensations were created equal; nor is the madness of *Acte II* without method. In order to truly engage with the complications of the particular, machine-aided work should allow passage from macroscopic observations to close reading and back. Legograms do
not make arguments by themselves. They are powerful because they orient our
gaze or guide our path through a comparison.

Episodes are the natural use-case for abbreviated legograms. In legologic
terms, episodes are clusters that derive their meaning, not from the comparison of
strings, but from a hermeneutic act or a bibliographical cue. In the Old Greek
Tragedy tradition, the ἐπεισόδιον (epeisodion) signaled a parenthetical
interruption from the chorus of voices. We are not that far afield from its original
significance. Precisely, what the word describes for us is still a modular unit that
interrupts and sets boundaries. For legology they become important whether they
intersect or not with our purely mechanic approaches.

When we compare the destination column produced by the *snake-corral*
(Figure 3.R), for example, with the episodes named in the correspondence
(brackets on the left), we find they overlap in many cases. In the cases in which
they do not, we can see how the legogram would help us easily reconstruct their
formation. Furthermore, we can also begin to understand how episodes in the
source could be broken down to form new episodes in the destination. Sometimes
what we thought was a coherent episode can split in two, or vice versa. In many
cases, the blocks are too small to form coherent episodes. We can make a
distinction here between non-episodic legos and episodic legos. In the following
example, we see how non-episodic legos can help to form episodes. Other
configurations remain implied.
One of the most suggestive regions of the cluster legogram for me personally is the second half of Acte II, beginning with the highest concentration of migrations in the destination (chJJ.C2 36-37). The knot was patched up together from seven different sequences and five general areas. (Figure 4.G). The dramatic episode contained in these fragments unfolds in the thick of the dream, immediately after the Rebel has risen from a nap within the dream. Though all the fragments that compose the knot are not episodic in themselves, the result is a coherent episode, bracketed by the awakening and Columbus’ entrance.
We already saw how Jahn’s rearrangements are mostly condensations, in the legologic sense of the word. Closer attention to this cluster reveals that Jahn was equally adept at condensing micro-repetitions. The fragments cohere around five central tropes—noise (bruit, tams-tams, sonne, sonner, Ecoute, rumeur, claquement), vision (yeux, regarde, lueurs), the feminine (femmes, femme, filles,
fille), water (marées, amphore, bouilloire, verseau, brunes, la mer) and rising (monter, lever)—glued together with a healthy smattering of epizeuxis. To Jahn’s credit, the passage captures Césaire’s own editorial reliance on over-determination and figures of repetition. This coincidence should not lead us to hypothesize a false fractal relationship between the different transfigurations. The source text, ChAM46 has enough internal repetition already, that the coincidence can be attributed to poetic imitation.

The stage direction inaugurates the episode by punctuating the dramatic action with a silent dance, “Les femmes dansent sans aucun bruit, sans tam-tams.” The Rebel, now awake, departs on a series of lyrical exchanges with the ancestors, a call and response between the poles of a well-trodden image/sound dyad.

The Rebel’s lines are some of the most obscure in Césaire’s whole output, magnificent specimens to be found in what Césaire called, “la forêt lyrique que constitue la version primitive” (Letter Aug. 26, 1955). In contrast to Césaire’s, Jahn’s adaptations were driven by the perceived need to contain Césaire’s lyrical profuseness, managing the forêt from the source. In doing so, he had to adapt the dreamscapes and lyrical profuseness of the source to a West German audience attuned, in his mind, to more realist fare. As Ruhe points out, Césaire often returns to the guiding words, “clarté et simplicité” in his correspondence with Jahn, suggesting that Jahn nudged him in that direction (11).
The role of the feminine in Césaire’s poetry or its offshoots has been well explored by Césaire scholars, more recently in the form of a feminist re-evaluation (Couti, Halphen-Bessard), but nothing so far with a bibliographic sensibility. In Jahn, again, the feminine becomes a quilting point for his legologic condensation. Five blocks from four different areas of the source come together in our passage with references to an anonymous female figure, framed as we said, by the silent dance of the women.

One of the blocks, the smallest, escapes the figural logic that binds the rest, “L'Aieule: Malheur, malheur.” Surely the level of granularity of Jahn’s work must give us pause. Such punctilious copy and paste can be attributed in this case to another form of condensation, as the opening lyrical flight of the Rebel gives way to a rapid-fire dialogue with the ancestors on a 2/2 beat:

L'Aieule: T'es-tu levé?

Le Rebelle: Je me suis levé.

L'Aieul: T'es-tu levé comme il convient?

Le Rebelle: Comme il convient.

Patience je regarde, j'ai regardé.

L'Echo: Ecoute! Ecoute donc!

L'Aieul: Oh, j'écarte les feuilles de bruit.

L'Aieule: Malheur, malheur.206
The rhetorical echoes complement nicely the theme of memory, if not in discrete vocabulary, in the general tenor of his visions. The passage begins with a reference to the ancestral land, “Bornou, Sokoto Bénin et Dahomey Sikasso/Sikasso” and ends with a phantasmatic reference to the drowned bodies of the Atlantic slave trade. “Une rumeur de chaînes de carcans monte de la mer...” Memory blends with vision through the chain of associations outlined above, all leading to the meeting with Columbus.

In conclusion, Jahn’s rearrangement of Césaire’s source follows a pattern of condensation at different levels, in several dimensions. In many places his additions to the text replicate the tropes and rhetorical figures of the source in order to blend with them more smoothly. Undoubtedly, Jahn’s versions amount to a different drama, in the way that the ChAM46 may be said to be a different drama than the typescript. In a more profound sense, though, Jahn continues the work of transformation that defines the drama from the start. By his transformation, Jahn also actualizes a new adaptation of the drama for post-war Germany, at a time when support for colonialism was still mainstream.

Both in the first transformation, from typescript to first published edition, and the second transformation, from first published edition to the Jahn collaboration, we have traveled from a pattern recognizable in a legogram to the minutiae of close readings. In these paths from the macro- to the micro- we perforce must push our vectors beside the purview of repetition into the realms of meaning. While legograms were not strictly necessary to these maneuvers, the
paths that follow their provocations are unique to them and useful to us. Thus it goes with all clearly delineated methods in the age of many-distanced readings.

At the moment when we grasp for other organizational and sense-making paradigms to confront the schizophrenic fields of textuality—our Authors and Texts being too limiting—we begin to listen to the private conversations between texts and texts. In that eavesdropping I hope you find, as I do, the possibilities of all meaning. At the moment when we are asked to remediate our past and make it available to the anonymous earth, that secret conversation between texts can also justify our belief that no text—a remix of time immemorial—belongs to us. Both free and situated, we live in text and vice versa.

The future remains bright for legology as computer technology make textual fields more easily surveyed from a distance. In this chapter, I have focused only on the comparison of two texts at a time, with occasional intrusions from other blocks. We have yet to explore the possibility of legologic stemmas, the addressability of legos across comparison sets and multi-lingual legograms, to name but a few of the possible avenues of future research.

At the most abstract, legology is the study of repetition and sequences. Nothing stops us from extending that principle beyond strings, to encompass for
example the geo-temporal relations described in Chapter 2, or the hypothetical versions described in Chapter 1. If textuality is indeed radiant, legologic networks of many textures await our macrosopes. As we keep on pushing ahead to develop technologies that help us sort out sequences and align legos, even beyond author or work-centric corpora, we should expect many more, “unforeseen journeys” through the wonderful paths of intertextuality that mesh our textual heritage, not as hierarchical trees, but an n-series of overlapping galaxies.
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Notes

1 [This text is of the utmost importance to me because it is a work that is both free and well situated in its environment—the Caribbean. It is a bit like the nebula where all the other future worlds that constitute my other works come from.] (My translations unless otherwise indicated)

2 “Genetic” here and throughout refers to the study of the production process of a given work. The term is borrowed from the French school of “la critique génétique.”

3 I use quotation marks to indicate the particular versions, and italics to mark the work that encompasses them all. By necessity, I also use quotation marks for the 1956 theatrical version published as a stand-alone book. Part of the problem that I am studying is precisely the ambiguity in bibliographical designation that distinguishes Césaire’s writings. The need to bypass the MLA guidelines is a reflection of this ambiguity.

4 For a narrative of how this text was discovered and a plot summary see my article “La découverte d’un tapuscrit d’Et les chiens se taisaient.”

5 Césaire describes the work this way in 1965 on an interview with Claude Stevens, “Pour un théâtre d’inspiration africaine” (41). This generic definition has since then been accepted by critics.

6 It is important to distinguish our new philology from the New Philology movement started by James Lockhart, Matthew Restall and others in the 1970’s to approach the history of colonized people. I learned of the existence of this tradition after this text was approaching its current finitude. At the surface, the efforts of New Philology seem to overlap in some important areas, and I hope to study the school more seriously in the near future.

7 The ‘new’ here does not mean to erase its immediate context within debates in the discipline of textual criticism and its long, rich history. The work of McGann and McKenzie has been understood in productive ways by reading it against the work of scholars aligned with the work of W. W. Greg, Fredson Bowers, and more recently G. Thomas Tanselle, often referred to together as Greg-Bowers-Tanselle. For an excellent
account of "The Current Debate" please refer to the eponym section in D.C. Greetham's 
*Textual Scholarship: An Introduction* (335-346).

8 [Living beings are networks of molecular production in which the molecules produced 
generate with their interactions the very network that produces them]

9 McGann uses *dementian* as the co-relate of dimension in a Cartesian space. The 
behaviour refers to us, as we approach texts from different angles (“Marking”).

10 See for example, “The Concept of a Work in WorldCat: An Application of FRBR.”

11 The ellipsis is dropped in subsequent versions.

12 [The thick spit of the centuries/aged/after 306 years]. I owe the following observation 
and many others to the critic and editor Pierre Laforgue, in my opinion one of the keenest 
reader of Césaire’s early work and my principal collaborator in the genetic edition of *Les 
Armes miraculeuses*, to be included in the genetic/critical edition of Césaire’s complete 
works slated for publication by Planète Libre in 2013.

13 The classic retelling of the story by Breton in “Un grand poète noir” can be found in 
his *Martinique, charmeuse de serpents*. For some anecdotes about the time spent together 
in Martinique see Julia P. Herzberg’s “Wifredo Lam: The Development of a Style and a 
World View” (50-51).

14 “Alors c'était un isolement assez complet, et la conséquence en a été aussi qu'il a fallu 
absolument que la population trouve elle-même des solutions à toutes les privations ... 
C'est pour cela que je dis que pendant cette période les Martiniquais ont vraiment 
inventé—je pense que de ce point de vue c'est une période qui a développé l'esprit 
d'invention.” (Interview 98)

15 This explains in part Césaire’s article on Péguy and selections from his poetry in the 
first issue of *Tropiques*. In the article, Césaire defended Péguy for his nationalist love of 
the peasantry. Because Peguy had been appropriated by the Petainistes, Césaire could 
maneuver a message of Martinican particularity using him as a stand-in for a nationalism 
rooted on the peasantry. Let us not forget that it was Péguy who said, “Je ne veux pas que 
l'autre soit le même, je veux que l'autre soit autre. C'est à Babel qu'était la confusion, dit 
Dieu, cette fois que l'homme voulut faire le malin” (1569). These words echo Césaire's 
own anti-assimilationism in the first issue of *l'Etudiant noir*, “Jeunesse Noire, il est un 
poil qui vous empêche d'agir : c'est l'Identique, et c'est vous qui le portez.” This reading
is, of course, complicated by the fact that Césaire had already praised Péguy for his "heroïsme" in another article published in Paris in 1939 ("Péguy" 2). That other article ends with the words, "à Suivre," which imply that the Tropiques article is the announced continuation. The point remains, that the different reasons for praising him fall on different audiences, and that in both cases an ironic reading is possible. See also, Malela, Buata B. “Aimé Césaire, Le « Fil Et La Trame ».” Critique Et Figuration De La Colonialité Du Pouvoir. Paris: Anibwé, 2009. 26-28. Print.

16 [Death to the whites]

17 Traffic seems to stop altogether in 1942 when the US ships cut off all access to the island for several months as the Germans intensified their campaign. This explains in part a gap in the correspondence between Césaire and Breton from April 20, 1942 to January 10, 1943.

18 My gratitude to René Henane for allowing me to consult his transcriptions of the correspondence and for his generous friendship.

19 [A possible collection of poems and a drama: Et les chiens se taisaient.]

20 I owe a great debt of gratitude to his widow, Nadine Ronsin, who has taken over the role of curator of the Goll collection in her husband’s stead. She has welcomed me on two occasions to that peaceful small town in Lorraine—where the name America was uttered for the first time in history— with the hospitality that inspires the best in others. I also thank her colleagues at the Bibliothèque Municipale de Saint-Dié des Vosges for providing a comfortable work space and a pleasant atmosphere for the long days of repetitive scanning.

21 We learn from the letters that “Un grand poète noir” was written at the behest of Goll as a possible introduction to the Cahier d’un retour au pays natal, by a somewhat unwilling Breton, who didn’t consider Hemisphères to be the appropriate vehicle for such a text. This short tribute to Césaire will go on to have a life of its own in several other publications since, most notably as the introduction of the Brentano’s edition of Cahier d’un retour au pays natal and as a chapter in Breton’s Martinique, Charmeuse de serpents.
This dual-language edition was finally published three years later in 1947 by Brentano’s in New York. For the most accurate and up-to-date history of Césaire’s masterpiece, please see my essay “Bridging the Middle Passage.”

This statement remains true in so far as we have never recovered his thesis on Black Southern writers in the United States.

As we will see shortly, MAIN inherits most of Late A until page 55. What I am calling MAIN is a combination of page numbers from Late A, a few pages of Late B and Late C, and page numbers written at the last stage of pagination. In Appendix I, in the column named MAIN, the page numbers which are inherited are written in gray in order to distinguish them from those written at the time when the text received its final organization.

Other numbering systems will be indicated by name + page number. Sometimes the MAIN page number will follow in parenthesis. Ex. Late A 55 (56) is the same as "the page with the number 55 in the number set labeled Late A, and the number 56 in MAIN."

Appendix II is an early version of the legograms explored in the next chapters. We could call the tabular legogram in Appendix II a codicological legogram.

As I indicated at the beginning of the chapter, the numbers in parentheses represent the MAIN pagination. In this case, these pages were originally numbered 1, 2…20. That would be the Early A numbers. In the final ordering they became 23, 24…40. This would be the MAIN numbers.

We assume the existence of Early A 1 and 2, but these have disappeared without a trace.

I have marked that ambiguity with an inverted curly bracket in the table.

I will offer digital versions of these “virtual versions” once I have finalized the architecture of the digital edition. In the meantime, it should not be difficult to reconstruct them simply by looking at the pages in the typescript.

[Go back inside, girls, playtime is over, the orbits of death push their fiery eyes through the pale mica]

[Is it a riddle?]
33 This is the French equivalent of “Boo” in English. In other words, the girls are imitating the sounds of ghosts in mock-scary.

34 We cannot say with certainty how Early B originally began because we are missing the first two pages.

35 [(At that moment darkness engulfs the stage; gunshots; discordant cries; gradually, the disturbance settles down; when the light returns, the décor has changed; the black camp in the middle of a forest. Meeting of black chiefs and white deputies.)]

36 [(In the chasm of fright, a vast collective prison peopled with nègres, all contenders for madness and death; thirtieth day of the famine, the torture and the delirium.)]

37 On page 15 we find, for example, a stage direction describing the smell of blood, and another, immediately after, describing the silence that falls on the stage as rigid and funereal. On the last page we find one of the most fascinating stage directions in the whole typescript and I discuss it directly later in the chapter. Page 15 and the last page, 20 (40), also share another peculiarity in addition to their extra-theatrical stage directions. They are the only two pages in Early A without any dark pencil corrections. We should note also that half of the parentheses around stage directions in Early A were added in pencil, especially on the first six pages, pages 12 (32), 17 (33) and 18 (34). An argument can be made that these pages represent yet an earlier stage than the rest. Page 15 and 20 are, of course, probably the latest of Early A.

38 This refrain will play a pivotal role in the trajectory of the drama. As we will see in Chapter 2, Césaire tones down the rhetoric when he publishes the text in an international context. Although I do not address it directly in Chapter 3, Césaire assigns a couple of stanzas in 1956 to the Rebel that question the wisdom of this rallying cry.

39 Philippe François Rouxel, vicomte de Blanchelande, was governor of Haiti when the revolution began. Unlike the Blanchelande of the play, Philippe was sent back home to France in September of 1792. In 1793 he faced trial for treason and was eventually guillotined.

40 [A sinister and buffoonish gathering, full of bombast and cruelty.]

41 [Toussaint and Boukmann have built an army.] In a later revision, Boukman gets crossed out in dark pencil, leaving Toussaint to build an army by himself.
The historical Dutty Boukman was killed in November of 1791, and as far as I know, he did not fight alongside Toussaint.

Jean Jacques Dessalines was the most important leader of the revolution besides Toussaint Louverture.

Ironically, the more “avant-garde” version of 1946 will reclaim all three Aristotelian units of time, space and action.

The song is mockingly reprised on page 15 (35) by the vengeful crowds of slaves. See also footnote 28.

[In Matinique, Matinique, Matinique/That is chic...]

[As she speaks, all of it is drawn on the screen.]

American audiences may recognize Méliès from Martin Scorsese’s 2011 film Hugo, an adaptation of the 2007 illustrated novel The Invention of Hugo Cabret by Brian Selznick.

See for example, Owusu-Sarpong, Le Temps historique dans l’œuvre théâtrale d’Aimé Césaire, or the doctoral thesis by Ali Alhamdou.

Columbus also makes an important apparition in Jahn’s adaptation. The echoes between Jahn’s contributions in the 1950s and the early text, which Jahn never saw, continue to amaze me.

[In the back of the stage.]

[All of this appears mixed together on the screen.]

[The silence already poisons every fiber/Half-swallowed hieroglyphic gestures signal/The plowing and seeding of corpses.]

[The Reciter: A whistle… The blacks exit from the brushes with a great uproar. The cutlasses clash and they are raised again and they clash in the reel of exasperation.]

[By bringing me down, you have only cut the trunk of the tree of black freedom in Saint-Dominque; it will grow again, because the roots are plentiful and run deep.]

Note that this is not marked up on Table B, which in a sense conflates pagination schemes with order of composition. The reality is not so. While the pages were composed early, the Early B pagination probably came much later. Considering the historical setting in this segment, they were also probably meant to follow Early A.
57 [The Chorus: My eye is gilded with sovereign visions… Toussaint makes his solemn entry in Santo Domingo. The cabildo hands him the keys to the city.] Césaire misspells the Spanish word cabildo (twice). A cabildo was a Spanish form of local government best understood as a colonial administrative council. It was indeed a Spanish cabildo in Hispaniola which surrendered to Toussaint Louverture in 1801.

58 [The scene is at Saint Domingue…at the time of the French Revolution.]

59 [The Chorus: Hurrah! The English have lost… Our batteries of approach sweep their ramparts… our breaching artillery is in place… Saint-Marc cracks… like a rotten ship.]

60 [Toussaint: I had brought I will bring this country to the knowledge/ of itself,/ I familiarized will familiarize this land with its secret demons/lit I will light the craters of helodermes and cymbals/the symphonies of an unknown hell, splendid/infested with haughty nostalgias.]

61 [On the margins of jolting waves, I march on the water of turning Springs; I perceive high up my sentinel eyes. Foolproof, insomnia grows like the disobedience along the free temples of the woman with amphora, aquarius, aquarius germ tempest, kettle.]

62 The king in question could be a reference to Napoleon who by 1801 was already in power. The choice of king is not at all surprising since that word will become a grab-all for all forms of supreme rule in the drama. In the following scene in particular, it is precisely that title which is offered to Toussaint.

63 [Voices of temptation.]

64 [The grand University Professor: Glory and renown for Toussaint Louverture, educator of the masses! Leave it to Villaret-Joyeuse to close the schools in neighboring Martinique and cynically declare: “Ignorance is a necessary bond for men chained by violence or withered by prejudice.”]

His work was also known in other francophone countries under the reach of surrealist circuits. Perhaps the most far-flung example of a mention in this period comes from Étiemble’s criticism of Breton’s influence on Césaire in the journal *Valeurs* published in Egypt in 1945 (110).

Jerome McGann has insisted on this multi-dimensionality for much of his career. See for example the Introduction to McGann, Jerome J. *Social Values and Poetic Acts: A Historical Judgment of Literary Work*. Harvard University Press, 1988. It is important to note that McGann and McKenzie differ in scope. While the latter can be said to be interested mostly in textual questions, the former explodes the n-dimensionality of texts to reinscribe them in differentiated histories. Notice also that the adaptation-by-default model I advocate here does not necessarily contradict recent forms of anti-contextualism (cf. the recent special issue of New Literary History, “Context ?” 42:4, Autumn 2011), since the “default” in question refers to a positioning within particular matrices, not to the foreclosure of interpretational moves.

I took the liberty of modifying Foucault’s language in “What is an author?” to emphasize the fact that prior to a “pure romanticism” where “fiction” flows freely, we already have real texts flowing in materially constrained circuits of manipulation, composition, decomposition and recomposition. I oppose here also text to fiction, to call attention to the fact that memes or “statements” do not exhaust the possibilities of actual texts, above all poetic texts.

In this sense, we benefit from Jonathan Culler’s recent revitalization and reevaluation, in his article “Lyric, History, and Genre,” of Ralph Cohen’s relational and historicist theory of genre. For Culler, the stakes are to be found at the intersection of purely theoretical (which Cohen rejects) and purely historicist approaches. Culler’s solution to the impasse is to acknowledge the indispensible role of both in a trans-temporal praxis:

If one avoids the temptation to separate generic categories into the theoretical and the empirical but insists that genres are always historical yet based on some sort of theoretical rationale, they are more defensible as critical categories, essential to the understanding both of literature as a social institution and of the individual works that take on meaning through their relations to generic categories. (881)
While Cohen already located meaning as the precipitate of actual texts in relation to classes of text and texts in relation to human actors, Culler recuperates “logical” (read ideal) notions of genre as part of the environment in which those relations are played out. Inasmuch as those “logical” notions of genre also inform bibliographic reality (titles, indexes, page layout, etc.) and vice versa, texts can be said to adapt under generic pressures. We should also note in passing that the reinsertion of the critic as an inseparable component of the “observed” textual field shares the spirit of McKenzie’s intervention.

70 We should note that adaptation to new geographies implies adaptation to the literary histories that inform them. When we approach textual fields through the dimension of transcultural phenomena, literary movements, etc. we should bear in mind that transculturality itself belongs to particular environments. For example, to say that Césaire is engaging with this or that tradition, means anything only if we add ...in New York, ...in Martinique, ...in 1941 or ...1946, ...in a *petite revue*, etc. In other words, *adaptation* encompasses literary histories and transculturality, not the other way around. The latter two are particular, the former universal.

71 Though not directly relevant to the discussion above, we cannot discuss other disciplinary uses of the word adaptation without at least a footnote in honor of Adaptation Studies, itself at the interstices of several disciplines. Although they use the word adaptation solely to refer to the remediation of literature into film, their concerns overlap with ours in interesting ways. For many years beholden to the question of fidelity to literary sources, Adaptation Studies has made a move in recent years to a more diverse set of questions that approach it to recent textual scholarship. One only need to look at the list of disciplinary questions that Thomas Leicht outlines for us in the inaugural issue of the new Oxford journal, *Adaptation*, to glean the fertile ground for future collaborations: “Does the film depart from its literary source because of new cultural or historical contexts it addresses?” “What implications do characteristic features frequently found in adaptations carry for more general theories of intertextuality?” “How do concepts commonly treated by adaptation theorists as universal change when they cross national and cultural borders?” (63-77).

72 As we will see in Chapter 4, this totality is only but a phase of the many possible phases of textuality.
[By the small door, or if we accept the metaphor, it has been grafted.]

This distant reading was produced using "Word Trends" from voyant-tools.org (Sinclair). The text underlying the analysis uses a digital diplomatic transcription of Jacqueline Leiner's facsimile edition of Tropiques. The diplomatic approach focuses on the linguistic content, ignoring type, layout and other bibliographical features, but does not attempt to emend the text. The two volumes of Tropiques were scanned to 300dpi TIF files, OCR'd using OmniPage Pro 16.0, and revised for misrecognitions against the original. Line breaks were hardcoded in some cases and all occurrences of æ were converted to oe. All page titles and page numbers were removed. The texts were saved as .txt files encoded in UTF-8. These files were finally uploaded to Voyant Tools for analysis.

[Dumb and fallow land. I’m talking about ours. And my ear reckons the chilling silence of Man in the Caribbean. Europe. Africa. Asia. I hear the cry of steel, the battle drums in the bush, the temple prayers among the Banyan trees. And I know it is Man who speaks. Hitherto and forever, and I listen. But here the monstrous atrophy of the voice, the secular decrepitude, the prodigious mutism. No city. No art. No poetry. No civilization, the true one, I mean that projection of Man onto the world; the modeling of the world by Man; the stamp of Man’s figure on the universe.]

[Only we can express that which makes us unique. If we strive to be more than mere spectators of the human adventure, if we believe that we must make a personal offering simply to participate in a true humanity, if we are convinced that it is not to comprehend, but to make what really matters, we know what is our task, and what way leads to its realization.]

[But in doing so, my heart, preserve me from all hate/do not turn me into the hateful man for whom/I have nothing but hate.]

See also “Nos camarades Césaire et Bissol ainsi qu’Archimède et Girard déposent un projet de loi tendant à régler la question de l’Imprimerie Officielle à la satisfaction générale.” Justice. Martinique (20 juillet 1950).

We still don't have access to comparative studies of the petite revues, cahiers and journals of the inter-war period as we do for little magazines in the Anglophone world. I have used the wonderful bibliographic blog "Les Petites Revues," run by @SPiRitus, to
get a better sense of the medium from the late 19C to the middle of the 20C. Sadly, the blog only records front covers. These, already, reveal a movement towards cleaner, less cluttered layout, which *Tropiques* exemplifies.

80 Kora Veron Leblé reports in conversation that she has seen evidence that Breton et al, returned to Martinique after a brief tour of the islands before eventually going off to their final destinations. I have not been able to corroborate her story independently.

81 The safest assumption is that this is Césaire’s own translation. Not only was he the one to introduce the poets, we know he had already translated at least one other “New Negro” poet earlier in 1939: Sterling Brown’s “Les Hommes forts.” For an excellent article on Césaire’s relationship to early 20th Century African-American literature see Fabre, Michel.

82 Césaire is notoriously absent from this publication, oftentimes called *surrealist*. An explanation can be sought in Breton’s homophobic antipathy, despite several contributions over the years, to the journal’s homosexual editors Charles Henri Ford and Parker Tyler. His animosity seems to have intensified after Breton tried to hire Ford as editor for VVV and Ford refused. (Polizzotti 502-503, 508)

83 Computer generated geo-temporal visualizations should help us visualize these relations in the near future.

84 [This revue only publishes original work.]

85 [Poems from Jeanne Mégnem and a text from Pierre Mabille, but only the poems could be published in *Tropiques*.]

86 The text, which we assume to be “Le royaume du merveilleux,” was eventually published in *Tropiques* N°4, January 1942.

87 [The philosophical errors of the French master.]

88 [On our next issue, we intend to give the surrealist aesthetic all the attention it deserves.]

89 [A small book by Monsieur Durand.]

90 I have not been able to recover the book. The only reference to the book I have found comes from a list of his other works in Durand’s book, *Algunos poetas venezolanos contemporáneos*. 
91 [Are we going to, yes or no, establish sustained cultural relations with our American and Spanish neighbors?]

92 A word culled from Spengler to signify what others now call hegemony. “J’appelle pseudomorphose historique les cas dans lesquels une vieille culture étrangère couvre le sol avec une telle présence qu’elle empêche une jeune culture de respirer et que celle-ci n’arrive pas, dans son propre domaine, non seulement à développer ses formes d’expression pures, mais encore à l’épanouissement complet de la conscience d’elle-même” (Déclin de l’Occident, t. II, p. 173). For an analysis of Césaire’s use of the word see James Arnold’s introduction to our joint edition of the Volontés version of “Cahier d’un retour au pays natal,” forthcoming in the critical/genetic edition of the works of Aimé Césaire to be published by Planète Libre in 2013.

93 [An urgency even the more real because our problems are often the same as theirs. The same difficulties found. The same solutions offered. Colonial or semi-colonial countries, countries trying to find themselves. Cultures that through the hegemony tend to affirm their own originality. And in this fever, upright, there “the New Indian,” here the New Negro.]

94 Their view of Viernes came from an article by José Ratto-Ciarlo, often considered the father of modern literary journalism in Venezuela. Tropiques does not provide a citation for Ratto-Ciarlo’s article.

95 Cosmopolitanism reigned supreme, of a different kind than the one we find in Latin-American modernists, the desire to go beyond borders and national problematics to confront the reality of human universality.

96 In retrospect, this poem, dedicated to André Breton, will become a fragment of the Brentano’s edition of “Cahier d’un retour au pays natal.” In the pre-original there is no indication that this will be the case.

97 While the notion of adaptation indeed implies that all texts find some coherence in whatever context they find themselves, we are not limited, in consequence, to traditional organicist readings. Only if we erase the memory of the textual field whence texts arrived at any given context can those readings have any semblance of authority. Having said that, I would not completely ban readings that try to assign a self-identical whole to a
decontextualized text, if only because they provide a much better passtime than crossword puzzles.

98 That very same ambiguity also provides an image of textuality where the distinction between fragments and wholes depends solely on our focal point. We must be careful here to distinguish though, between fragments and blocks of text or legos (treated in more detail in the next chapter). I refrained from referring to blocks of texts as fragments precisely to avoid all the critical baggage that the latter carry with them. The fact that Césaire's proliferation of “Fragments” during this period overlaps with the textual topology I'm trying to describe, does not mean we should confuse the fragment's generic (Levinson), metaphysical (Blanchot), performative (Elias) operations with the block of text. A block of text can be both a whole and a part; it has a minimum, but not a maximum size; it is independent of genre and does not have a pre-bibliographic function, even if we still insist on addressing it.

99 Lilian Pestre de Almeida suggests that these two poems and the Cahier d’un retour au pays natal form an epic trystic. She offers no real evidence for this declaration, so we will avoid it in the future. For her comments, see Cahier d’un retour au pays natal, p. 33, and Aimé Césaire. Une saison en Haïti, p. 74.

100 [You can imagine Aimé’s joy at the idea of being published by you. He trusts you entirely with the details of the publication. He sends you a few unpublished poems with this letter.] My emphasis unless noted otherwise.

101 The poem will later be reprinted in Breton’s Martinique charmeuse de serpents along with his other contributions to Tropiques.

102 [That you have seen, loved, sang this country, that Mabille conducts his research in Haiti, that Lam is in Cuba, all of these are events that I find decisive, in any case, for the future of the Caribbean.]

103 Italicized from this point forward to differentiate the ideal, longer eponym from the smaller sub-section, published in Tropiques N°2 (which would eventually become the poem we know today under that title).

104 This bio-bibliography is now being revised and augmented by Kora Veron Leblé. Her work and her friendship have been an invaluable source for me and this study.
According to the Internet Archive, the site atelierbreton.com ran until 2008.

http://wayback.archive.org/web/*/atelierandrebreton.com

Some images that were present in the former site seem to be missing from the new one, including images for “L’Irrémédiable.” (Bibliothèque littéraire Jacques Doucet, BRT C 456.) All poems in *Les Armes miraculeuses* have a pre-publication state accounted for. This makes the genetic dossier for *Les Armes miraculeuses* the most complete of all of Césaire’s works.

This document is now in the possession of the private collector Dominique Annicchiarico, a lawyer with offices in Paris and a Césaire enthusiast.

This document is now at the bibliothèque Schœlcher in Martinique.

The documents and the envelope were sold together to Mr. Annicchiarico as Lot 2265, perpetuating the mistaken date.

[So happy to hear from you again. Only the regime weighing on us for three years now can explain the infrequency and insignificance of our letters […] (after VVV N°1, nothing, nothing, not the catalog we heard about, not VVV N°2, nor number 3, no books, no journals.)]

[Thank you for the offer to publish my poems—I will try to gather them as soon as possible.] Notice that the word *éditer* in French is a false cognate.

In the letter following this one, Césaire asks Breton if he had received the text of “Batouque.” This gives us reason to believe this is the unnamed poem in question.

The word legogram derives from the child's toy to emphasize the modular and mechanical features of textual transmission histories. I am at work now on a series of two-dimensional and three-dimensional legograms representing different dimensions of the transmission process of Césaire's oeuvre. I should mention that current digital tools allow us to add a geographical dimension to the temporal. Of course, this is very difficult to represent on paper.

[I will soon send you a parcel with manuscripts for a possible collection of poems and a drama as well: *Et les chiens se taisaient.*]

[A poem (to join to those already sent) and some supplementary pages for “Et les chiens se taisaient.”]
A letter from Goll to Breton, dated January 18, 1944, confirms that the two had also begun collaborating on the edition of *Cahier d’un retour au pays natal*, for which the text “Un grand poète noir” by Breton would serve as “Préface.”

The original title refers, of course, to the third line of the poem, “*les cent purs-sang hennissant du soleil*.”

One exception to this trend seems to happen with the variation in accidentals in the word “*Fenêtre,*” spelt “*Fenètre*” only in “*Tombeau.*” This obvious error can be safely attributed to Césaire’s hurried handwriting of the circumflex accent, evident in many other instances where we find his pen.

I say early months because the precarious friendship between Goll and Breton would not reach June.

The missing poems, “*Tam-tam I,*” “*Tam-tam II*” and “*Annonciation,*” were missing for a good reason: They had appeared in *VVV* N°2-3. These are also technically absent from the typescript of *Colombes et Menfenils*. A page indicating their relative position in the whole lists the titles and sends the putative editor to see “*VVV no2.*”

An analysis of the paper of ts.Ts will have to wait until I have access to the originals.

[Our poems are lucid. We are the blind ones. I’m thinking of “*Batouque,*” especially “*Grand midi,*” part of which appeared thanks to you in *Hémisphères.*]

[I would also ask you, if the text is ever to be published in the United States, to delete the artificial additions which I believe weigh it down: 1) The subtitles (excepting “*Pursang,*” “*Grand midi*” and “*Conquête de l’aube*) which will be advantageously replaced with white space. 2) The fragment added at the last minute—which I believe to be a pathetic addition, where you find the name Suzanne Césaire.] That the transcription does not bear these corrections, supports the hypotheses that it pre-dates this letter.

[Windows of the swamp, bloom, ah! bloom/on the night calm for Suzanne Césaire.]

The collage and transcription of *Tombeau du soleil* could be a great source for literary historians interested in the genesis of Césaire’s writings. Regrettably, before we get access to the originals, the images on the andrebreton.fr site and a set of facsimiles provided by the owner are our only source. Many details can be observed from the higher resolution images, including the fact that the collage has several layers, or that some
leaves (if not all) were glued on pages written in Spanish. On leave #14, for example, we
read the words “del olivo” under an uncovered patch. An examination of the original
document would, of course, be invaluable.

126 The copy of the inventory comes via René Hénane, who transcribed it from the old
site.

127 I have used my own careful digital transcriptions of Césaire’s writings spanning the
years 1935 to 1946 and the complete run of Tropiques, to perform this search.

128 [Written a few poems, including a new ending for “Conquête de l’aube.”]

129 The possibility that they were sent separately remains, but considering the
correspondence does not speak of another large set, coupled with all the arguments we
laid out above, leads us to desist from this hypothesis.

130 See my essay “Bridging the Middle Passage: The textual (r)evolution of
Césaire’s Cahier d’un retour au pays natal.” Canadian Review of Comparative
Literature. 38.1 (March 2011): 40-56 and Arnold, A. James. “Césaire’s ‘Notebook’ as
Palimpsest: The Text Before, During, and After World War II.” Research in African
Literatures 35.3 (2004): 133–40.

131 In the prolegomena, Breton tries to rejuvenate surrealism once more. This time he
calls for a sort of Jeffersonian permanent revolution against all settled opinion, surrealism
included. This maneuver allows Breton to approach the more thematic Césaire. “I would
contradict the unanimous vote of any assembly which does not itself intend to contradict
the vote of a more numerous assembly; but by the same instinct I will give my vote to
those who rise, to all programs not yet subjected to the test of fact and tending towards
the greater emancipation of man. Considering the process of history, in which truth
shows itself only to chuckle up its sleeve, and is never grasped, I declare myself for the
minority which is ever reborn to act as a lever: my greatest ambition is to insure the
continuation after me of the theoretical significance of this minority.” (23)

132 The prolegomena was published in dual-column French and English translation. I use
here the original translation.

133 [In Martinique, the charmer.]
My projects? To publish a collection. To do it, though, perhaps it would be wise to wait until publication goes back to normal in France. What do you think?

Its transfiguration is almost complete and I will send you the manuscript as soon as possible.

Editions Gallimard, as the house is known today, will not carry that name until 1961.

For a full an open report of the research trip that led to the Queneau connection, see my blog post “Breaking News: It Was Queneau!” 23 Sept. 2012. Web.

After the liberation, when I was able to reconnect with what was published outside of France, I saw that you brought to fruition the promise of your first work. I also read with the same interest your poems published in Confluences and Fontaine.

I would love to propose a complete edition of your poetical works to Mr. Gaston Gallimard.

Please find enclosed a contract for “Cahier d’un retour au pays natal” […] Either way, it won’t be possible to publish the “Cahier d’un retour au pays natal” in the same volume as “Les Heures Miraculeuses.”

According to transcripts of the Doucet ms. the two 1944 texts bear several differences in spelling and one substantial difference: “le coup est vache en même temps qu’irregulier.” in the ms., becomes “Le coup est vache,” in the Tropiques version. When we compare the corresponding fragments between the Tropiques text and the 1946 text, we find that the 1946 version remains closer to the readings found in Tropiques than those in the transcript of the manuscript. Lacking access to the original ms., this form of datation remains inadequate for us.

The damage is done. The containment has just been cleared.

Surrealism, poetry, freedom are only but one.

Even if the slavers have physically disappeared from the world's stage, we can however rest assured they toss about violently in the spirit, where its "ebony wood" is our dreams; it is more than the despoiled half of our nature, it is this hasty cargo that remains too good to send down to rot in the hold.
[To let yourself speak. To let your dreams invade you. To let its images dominate you. It wasn't a question of “thesis” or “theme” anymore. It was simply a matter of braving life, all of life.]

[Born under Vichy, written against Vichy, at the height of white racism and clericalism, at the height of black resignation, this work carries with it, rather disgustingly, the mark of its circumstances.

In any case:

1) I ask that you consider the manuscript you received as a canvas, advanced certainly, but a canvas nonetheless. And if you ask me what did I send it so hastily, it was because I thought it urgent to get it out of the colony and place it in safe hands.

2) This canvas must be completed and modified. Corrected in the sense of a greater freedom. In particular, the history part, or its “historicity,” already reduced substantially, should be eliminated completely. You will judge yourself by the “corrections” that I send to you with this letter.] N.B. I have not been able to establish what these “corrections” consist of. The fact that Césaire uses scare quotes for the word corrections suggests to me that Césaire sent a reworked passage, and not a list of actual corrections.

[Alas, you will die.]

[Alright, I will die. But naked, intact.]

[News on the scene: Upcoming works by Aimé Césaire.]

[An anonymous reporter in Port-au-Prince notes that the poet's next work “will be a drama that by its structure and composition is inspired by ancient tragedies.”] I have not had a chance to visit the archives in Haiti to search for traces of Césaire's seven month stay. I am convinced several important documents lie in wait for researchers there.

[From [Goll], I hope he has the decency not to publish anything, given he has not asked me for permission, and especially considering I disavow the version that you know. ] Almost as a prescient afterthought, he references Caillois immediately after, “Du pion de Buenos Aires, j'ai reçu assez innattendûment, Les impostures de la poésie présenté comme un livre « austral »”—did he know Caillois was about to reprint his text in Buenos Aires? Perhaps. In any case, the favor was not returned and no fragment from Les impostures de la poésie will appear in the pages of Tropiques.
To join in solidarity with the Martinique proletariat, at a moment I believe to be crucial in its history.

Erudite trickery of conferences without rhyme or reason on quick sand.

“La vache des naufrageurs,” stands out as a metaphor and bears annotation. The reference points to the Breton (the people, not the author) legend of the naufrageurs, coast dwellers who used to hang lanterns on the horns of pasturing cows to cause ships to crash against the crags.

Someone recently pointed out to me that our artificial satellites will probably survive longer than our Chinese cookies. The chapter was already written when this crucial piece of information landed on my lap.

For added effect, I have taken out the spaces and punctuation from the message on the thin paper strip.

For a detailed history and complete description of this transposition, please refer to my article: “Bridging the Middle Passage: The textual (r)evolution of Césaire’s Cahier d’un retour au pays natal.” Canadian Review of Comparative Literature. 38.1 (March 2011): 40-56. Print.

These diagrams are a bit different than the others. In the final version I will standardize all diagrams. The reason for the discrepancy is that I have been trying out different programs.

Interestingly enough, when we compare all the different versions, the closest in sequencing are the 1946 Armes text and the 1956 “arrangement théâtrale.” That comparison yields the C model, like the Cahier. Regardless of the closeness between the 1946 Armes and the 1956 arrangement théâtrale, their paratextual apparatus sets them unduly apart in the imagination.

The transcriptions of the text used the same approach I used for my digital transcription of Tropiques (see note 74).


One form of noise I do not consider in this section arises from the presence of repetition internal to a text: e.g. refrains, anaphoras, etc. When we run an iter-diff that has not been modified to account for internal repetition on the chSD and chJaC, the third loop catches a false match because a series of three lines is doubled by Jahn and the algorithm catches the first occurrence. The second occurrence belongs to a larger coherent block. In order to account for this kind of noise, our algorithm should recognize and mark internal repetition before iterating through the sequences. In the next section we consider some forms of internal repetition found in our texts, but without specifying a method for recognizing them algorithmically. In another occasion I will deal with the non-trivial problem of recognizing internal repetition programatically.

This version coincides with the one Ernspeter Ruhe used for his edition of “Et les chiens se taisaient” (Ruhe). Ruhe “corrected” much of the text in an attempt to “clarify” Jahn’s interventions. I, of course, use the Jahn originals in this study, and unless noted otherwise, mostly the text of chJJ.C2.

(See Table 1 for a complete listing of the blocks between ChAM46 and chJJ.C2)

We could also join all contiguous positive spaces from the same sequences. This approach may attract those who find magical numbers too messy. The final legogram, though, will have minimized the amount of negative spaces beyond usefulness. We must get used to the messiness of pseudo-arbitrary delimiters. It would help if we took to heart the idea that they help us define our legos in predictable and reproducible ways.

Again, as elsewhere, the magic number can be turned into a variable parameter, to tweak at will.

As far as I can see, the third method could also be integrated with the first for slightly similar results.

Needless to say, computational approaches offer us many ways to skin a cat. Although we have successfully avoided them, the two simple calculations below could also yield positive results if linked to a proper statistical model:

a) the migration index: the number of internal blocks divided by the number of migrant texts. The lower the index, the higher the chance we have a coherent block. The
transition to the Jahn typescript is brimming with examples. The most reworked section of Jahn's remix, act 2, for example, contains so many crossings that we end up with many smaller clusters compared to act 1 and act 3, where Jahn borrowed Césaire sequences without as much interference.

b) the migration angle: given any two pairs of legos on each side, we calculate the acute angles formed by the intersection of their connectors. For all intersecting connectors, as you approach 0 degrees, the chances increase that we are dealing with a cluster. An angler could serve to cluster extra-sequential adjacent clusters by bracketing blocks according to a variable parameter, as some of the approaches above.

168 Virtuality is not used here in the vulgar sense of “virtual worlds,” i.e., in the way some readers of Deleuze have differentiated between computer screens and the hard-drive. Texts on the screen are no less real than texts on paper. The difference is only their lifespan. If indeed the slightly longer lifespan of the 1’s and 0’s on the hard-drive guarantees we will be able to recall a text many times over, this does not equate them, it just means they are contiguous on a topological field.

169 We should not confuse plane with a two dimensional cartesian plane. Topological spaces are not Cartesian.

170 As opposed to the legograms in Chapter 3, Figures A-D color the acts themselves, not sequences: Acte I, purple; Acte II, green; and, Acte III, red. The blue blocks represent the pre-publications we dealt with at the end of Chapter 3.

171 [Of course the Rebel will die.]

172 [(The stage is overrun by crowds of insurgents: a mass of men and women armed with cutlasses.)

Toussaint: My friends, the whites send us their ambassadors. Would like to hear what they have to say?

Voices: Yes, yes, let them speak.

First Deputy: My dear friends… I know that you have had enough of this war. Your children are hungry.

Voices: True, true, it’s true.

First Deputy: Your women are tired of an uncertain and vagrant life.
Feminine Voices: Yes, yes; and now?

First Deputy: Go back to your homes. Go back to work. We are ready to recognize the freedom of the best amongst you and we guarantee all of you our paternal good will.

(Contradictory cries from the crowds)

Listen to the whites. Don’t listen to them. Peace. Peace. Death…

…to death.

Toussaint: Comrades, you have heard them. With your own ears, you have heard them. How nice and conciliatory they are, they have come to offer your leaders to abandon you. They have come to offer your leaders to sell themselves… They have come to ask us to betray you.

The Crowds: Death to the whites. Death to the whites.]

173 [The Female Narrator: A whistle… The blacks exit from the brushes with a great uproar. The cutlasses clash and they are raised again and they clash in the reel of exasperation.]

174 [(3 separate canon shots echo. Men with torches run from the explosions… from the smoke… a panic…)]

175 For a discussion of isomorphism in Césaire see my essay “Bridging the Middle Passage: The textual (r)evolution of Césaire’s Cahier d’un retour au pays natal” (Bridging) and J. Khalfa and J. Game. “Pustules, Spirals, Volcanoes: Images and Moods in Césaire’s ‘Cahier d’un retour au pays natal’” (Khalfa).

176 [Drag me, coursers of the night]

177 [Allow me to remark that you…]

178 [What gives you the right, Sir…]

179 [Oh, leave me, leave me]

180 [Plow me, plow me]

181 [polders of Holland, engulf me/ low-waters, be my sister]

182 [Plow me, warthog, and trample trample me]

183 [Tie me down./tie me down. Kill me.]
[Embrace me; embrace me]

[Drag him, drag-him]

[Gods from below, good gods
I carry in my dilapidated mouth
the buzz of living flesh
here I am…]}

See also Mbondobari Ebamangoye.

The Jahn archive is now housed at the Asien-Afrika-Institut, Humboldt University, Berlin. The documents are divided into several binders organized by genre. In my estimation, the archive is currently in need of re-organization and more appropriate cataloguing by a specialist. For this reason I will use my own naming system throughout this study. For those interested in researching the collection the best method still remains to ask for the binders to be brought out from the warehouse.

The Mme. de Bary who will initially collaborate with Jahn on translations of Césaire’s work is the writer Erica de Bary (also known as Erika de Bary or Erica Ruthenbeck). She was involved with Jahn through out the 1950s in the project of introducing German audiences to black francophone writers, Césaire and Senghor being the most prominent.

The relative value in 2010 dollars ranges roughly between $1,200 to $2,000. Needless to say, other metrics can increase those figures.

[The play is too long to be reproduced in its entirety. 90 minute translations are the limit - most transmissions are 45 minutes long. It depends on the station. If Frankfurt can only offer us 45 minutes, maybe Baden-Baden can offer us 60 minutes. You never know. In any case, I will do my best [...] Will you be so kind as to tell me which parts of the play I can omit?]

In a fascinating twist in a literary history already rife with misdirection and irony, by the same letter, we learn that Jahn intended to use Césaire's poetry as interludes in Karl Otten's adaptation of his drama “Die expedition nach Santo Domingo” (1931), one of the few, if not one of two treatments of the Haitian Revolution in German literature at the time. The other I know of is also by Karl Otten, “Der schwarze Napoleon Toussaint und der Negeraufstand auf Santo Domingo.”
[She cannot hope to get her translation accepted.]

[I have had hardly any inspiration these days. I send you a scene anyway. I made it according to your advice. It is a scene where the Lover tries to turn the Rebel away from his destiny. I had an idea for another scene: a scene that pits the Rebel and the Administrator against each other, and which end with the blinding of the Rebel. I'm hoping to dedicate myself to it non-stop.]

If we take the footer seriously, “50 x November 1950,” the document seems to be one of 50 serigraphies.

We already saw the role of “placeholders” in the construction of textual topologies when we discussed “Conquête de l'aube” in Chapter 2. Jahn provides many rich examples through his revision method.

[Jahn worked on this copy without cutting it; we were very far in the 50s from modern copying techniques and their affordances. He numbered those parts of Césaire’s text he wanted to integrate in his version in their new order, and differentiated them at the same time with the help of colored pencils according to the acts in which the citations belonged (act 1, 1-82: red; act 2, 83-174: green; act 3, 175-238: blue). In addition, he indicaded on the left margin the length of the numbered passages by circling them in yellow.]

The excerpt also comes with a mystery. The lines marked for substitution are printed in red. Other lines are imprinted in blue. The chJJ.A1 version has all its lines printed in black. In every other possible regard, the reproduction is the same. Typographical errors and anomalies are reproduced exactly. I understand if my membership to the Society for Textual Scholarship is revoked, but I have not been able to pin point the method that would create this result. If I had to guess, I would say that chJJ.A2 is a carbon copy of chJJ.A1 where a strip of red carbon paper was introduced at key places during typing. The question still remains, for whom?

[Scene layout.]

As opposed to Jahn's reworking of the text, Césaire tries to preserve most of the structure of the 1946 text in his adaptation for the theater. I decided not to dedicate too much time to that reworking because it does not present us with as many challenges as the Jahn versions. I am, nevertheless, planning a research trip to the PA archives to
investigate its production history. Chances are the results of that trip will not be incorporated into this study.

201 "And this of course has impacted the stage version. The author, Césaire, has also incorporated the results [of the collaboration] in the French version, and the new edition, to be published shortly in Paris by Présence Africaine, is completely identical to the German edition."

202 Always the practical man, Jahn argues in the letter that they could publish the text as a new text in order to avoid paying copyright fees to other stakeholders.

203 [The women dance without any noise, without tams-tams.]

204 [The lyrical forest that constitutes the primitive version.]

205 [Clarity and simplicity.]

206 [The Ancestor: Did you wake up?/The Rebel: I woke up./The Ancestor: Did you wake up as you should?/The Rebel: As you should./Patience, I see, I have seen./The Echo: Listen! Listen then!/The Ancestor: Oh, I break the leaves of noise/The Ancestress: Misfortune, misfortune.]

207 [A rumor of shackle chains rises from the sea...]
APPENDIX I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Early A</th>
<th>Early B</th>
<th>Early C</th>
<th>Early D</th>
<th>Late A</th>
<th>Late B</th>
<th>Late C</th>
<th>San-Jo</th>
<th>Power and carbon (paper type)</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Ink</th>
<th>Residue</th>
<th>Tone</th>
<th>Blank</th>
<th>Blank</th>
<th>Blank</th>
<th>Blank</th>
<th>Blank</th>
<th>Blank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A/white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B/black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C/dirty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D/dirty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A/white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B/black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C/dirty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D/dirty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A/white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B/black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C/dirty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D/dirty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The different instruments used to revise the typewritten text)
### APPENDIX II

**PAGINATION SCHEMES: A GENETIC LEGOGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early A</th>
<th>Early B</th>
<th>Early C</th>
<th>Early D</th>
<th>Late A</th>
<th>Late B</th>
<th>Late C</th>
<th>MAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix III