

O'REILLY

SAMUEL BECKETT: COMMENT C'EST  
HOW IT IS AND / ET L'IMAGE

SAMUEL BECKETT  
COMMENT C'EST  
HOW IT IS  
AND / ET L'IMAGE  
A CRITICAL-GENETIC EDITION  
UNE ÉDITION CRITICO-GÉNÉTIQUE



EDOUARD MACESSA O'REILLY

ROUTLEDGE  
NEW YORK AND LONDON

Published in 2001 by  
Routledge  
29 West 35th Street  
New York, NY 10001

Published in Great Britain by  
Routledge  
11 New Fetter Lane  
London EC4P 4EE

Copyright © 2001 by Edouard Magessa O'Reilly  
Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group.

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Beckett, Samuel, 1906-

[Comment c'est. English & French]

Comment c'est = How it is ; and, L'image / Samuel Beckett ;  
edited and translated by Edouard Magessa O'Reilly.

p. cm.

ISBN 0-8153-3767-1

I. Title: How it is. II. O'Reilly, Edouard Magessa. III. Beckett,  
Samuel, 1906- Image. English & French. IV. Title: Image. V. Title.

PQ2603.E378 C613 2001  
843'.914--dc21

2001019748

SAMUEL BECKETT

## Remerciements

Je tiens à remercier tout d'abord Monsieur Jérôme Lindon, exécuter littéraire de Samuel Beckett, de m'avoir très aimablement autorisé à citer de longs extraits tirés de documents inédits de l'auteur; et Monsieur Edward Beckett et la succession de Samuel Beckett de m'avoir autorisé à citer la correspondance. Je remercie aussi de leurs aimables autorisations les détenteurs desdits documents: le Centre de recherche Harry Ransom de l'Université du Texas à Austin; la Beckett International Foundation (Université de Reading, Angleterre); la Division de livres précieux et de manuscrits des Bibliothèques de l'Université d'État de l'Ohio; la bibliothèque Lilly de l'Université de l'Indiana, Bloomington (Indiana).

Pour l'aide précieuse qu'ils m'ont donnée pendant mes recherches, je dois signaler ma gratitude envers Elva Griffith de l'Université d'État de l'Ohio, Michael Bott de l'Université de Reading et tout particulièrement envers Linda Ashton, Responsable de la collection française, Pat Fox et tout le personnel de la Salle de lecture du Centre Harry Ransom. Mes remerciements les plus vifs sont pour Gloria Zyskowski qui, par son amitié, sa patience et sa générosité, a contribué à rendre mes séjours à Austin des plus agréables et des plus fructueux.

Ma recherche a bénéficié de bourses provenant du Conseil de recherche en sciences humaines du Canada, du Vice-Recteur (Académique) de la Memorial University de Terre-Neuve et du Centre Harry Ransom. La publication du présent volume est possible grâce à une subvention provenant de l'Université Memorial.

Grâce à l'appui de l'Université Memorial, j'ai pu bénéficier de l'aide d'un certain nombre d'assistants que je tiens à remercier : Natasha Beaupertuis, Kimberly Russell, Patricia Carpenter, Artee Luchman, Kalinda Dadali, Jennifer Drover, David Eavis, Barry Peters, Tracy Primmer, Tracy Sheppard, Keith Williams, Justyna Wacławek, Alan Murphy, Kimberly Thompson, Beverly Randall, Kevin Lemoine et Christine Taylor.

Les conseils de Charles Krance, directeur général des *Œuvres bilingues complètes de Samuel Beckett*, ont été d'un grand secours tout au long de la préparation de ce volume.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank first and foremost Monsieur Jérôme Lindon, Samuel Beckett's literary executor, for permission to quote extensively from manuscript and typescript sources of *Comment c'est* and *How it is* and Mr. Edward Beckett and the Estate of Samuel Beckett for permission to quote from Samuel Beckett's correspondence. I also thank the owners of the manuscript and typescript sources for their kind permission to quote: the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, the University of Texas at Austin; the Beckett International Foundation (University of Reading, UK); Division of Rare Books and Manuscripts of the Ohio State University Libraries; the Lilly Library, Indiana University, Bloomington (Indiana).

For their kind assistance during my research I wish to express my gratitude to Elva Griffith at Ohio State University, Michael Bott at the University of Reading, and especially to Linda Ashton, Keeper of the French Collection, Pat Fox and all the personnel of the Harry Ransom Center's Reading Room. My most heartfelt thanks go to Gloria Zyskowski whose friendship and generosity made my sojourns in Austin as pleasant as they were productive.

My research was financed in part by fellowships from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Vice-President (Academic) of Memorial University of Newfoundland and the Harry Ransom Center. The publication of this volume has been made possible by a subvention from Memorial University.

Thanks to the support of Memorial University I was able to count on the help of a number of research assistants whom I wish to thank: Natasha Beaupertuis, Kimberly Russell, Patricia Carpenter, Artee Luchman, Kalinda Dadali, Jennifer Drover, David Eavis, Barry Peters, Tracy Primmer, Tracy Sheppard, Keith Williams, Justyna Waclawek, Alan Murphy, Kimberly Thompson, Beverly Randall, Kevin Lemoine, and Christine Taylor.

The advice of Charles Krance, general editor of *Samuel Beckett's Complete Bilingual Works*, was invaluable throughout the preparation of this volume.

## English Introduction

### How to use this edition

Coming after Charles Krance's editions of *Company* (Beckett 1993) and of *Ill Seen Ill Said* (Beckett 1996), this is the third volume of *Samuel Beckett's Complete Bilingual Works*. Like those volumes, this one presents twin English and French texts and a complete record of the genesis of each one. Along with *Comment c'est* and *How it is*, I have included *L'image*, an excerpt from *Comment c'est*, which was later published in a separate volume.

In this introduction I will keep to a presentation of the pre-original documents of the cited works and of the protocol which I use to transcribe them. On the one hand, Charles Krance has already explained the aims of the series in his two introductions and elsewhere (Krance 1996). On the other, given the already considerable size of this volume, I will save a critical study of the geneses presented here for another venue.

This volume, as with the two previous ones, is meant to serve as a research tool primarily in two areas: the comparative study of Beckett's English and French texts, and the study of the genesis of either or both texts. Beckett's bilingualism and his practice of self-translation, have been objects of study in recent years and could already be studied without this type of edition. Reading the two versions of a Beckett work, the volumes dovetailed into each other, has been going on for some time and has merely depended on obtaining copies of the twin texts. An edition of this type simply makes the task easier by placing the two texts on facing pages and by marking the most obvious cases of mismatching. Studying the genesis of either *Comment c'est* or *How it is*, on the other hand, has not been a simple task which could be improvised by obtaining two corresponding volumes. This volume makes such a study possible by publishing for the first time the relevant portions of far-flung manuscript and typescript sources.

### *Comment c'est*

*Comment c'est*, more so than *How it is*, is a singular and highly innovative work. It could probably only have been written by someone for whom French was a second language. Whereas *How it is* fits into a context which includes James Joyce and Gertrude Stein—nothing in the French novel prepares us for *Comment c'est*. Contrary to French stylistic tradition, let alone the much touted *génie de la langue*, *Comment c'est* is a work whose stylistic thrust is to reduce subordination and syntactic linkages of all sorts.

Stylistically, it is diametrically opposed to the type of work for which a writer like Proust is so highly praised. In composing *Comment c'est*, Beckett invents a new way of writing narrative. The result, as I have written elsewhere (O'Reilly 1996), is a novel not in prose but in rhythmically organised fragments which mimic some of the patterns of oral speech. Though sentences can be discerned here and there (for the most part very short sentences), it can be argued that in *Comment c'est* Beckett sustained a narrative of some 200 pages without using the sentence as the basic unit of text building. This type of unpunctuated, fragmented writing is for many emblematic of Beckett's style, but it is a form which he honed for this novel and used nowhere else. Even the short pieces which followed *Comment c'est* throughout the 1960s, though fundamentally similar, are not presented in discreet fragments and have at the very least an initial upper case letter and a period at the end.

The term *fragment* requires some comment. It has already been used by Charles Krance in his editions of *Company* and of *Ill Seen Ill Said* and in Krance 1997. I prefer to reserve the term *fragment* for the specific type of typographical unit represented in *Comment c'est* and *How it is*. For reasons I have developed elsewhere (O'Reilly 1992), it is my conviction that *Company* and *Ill Seen Ill Said* are made up of what are paragraphs in the truest sense of the word—they are defined as paragraphs not only by typography but by their semantic and rhythmic structure. The term *fragment* does apply to *Comment c'est* and *How it is*. Just as word groups do occasionally form discernible sentences, paragraphs can be recognised among the fragments. However, the thrust of fragmentation goes contrary to notions of paragraph. These fragments frequently do not coincide with semantic units and do not rely on the lexical tools of syntactic cohesion. At times a continuous development is fragmented (I:65-66: II:91-93'), while at other times fragments contain semantic elements which are not obviously related to each other (II:153). Juxtaposition is the rule.

In this edition, I use the word "paragraph" to refer to the textual units of the pre-original documents up to and including Tx1 (Typescript 1, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, the University of Texas at Austin<sup>2</sup>). In that document, and in those which precede it, the text is written in continuous, unfragmented prose organised into paragraphs (indentation) and sentences (capitalisation and punctuation).

Given the peculiar nature of the discourse, can we still speak of *narrative* and of *novel*? There is no doubt that *Comment c'est* and *How it is* are novels, regardless of their discursive form. The narrative neatly and explicitly features a beginning, a middle, and an end. It frames a central event, a meeting, which for Wolfgang Kayser (pp. 482-83) is the archetypal event of the novel form. Passing time and the transformations it brings are therefore fundamental principles of the fictional world. That world is represented in a



way which conforms to notions of cause and effect. A man crawls around in the dark and the mud, not knowing where he came from nor where he's going, during which time he meets another whom he calls Pim and with whom he communicates by means of torment. Later, Pim abandons him and, alone in the dark and the mud once again, the narrator reflects upon the nature of his universe. Passing time, as it turns out, is cyclical. The encounter is in every way a parody of the romantic meeting which is the basis of the love story. The fictional world is radically alien to the world we know. Yet the conformity of this pattern to that of the novel, as parody or reversal, is unquestionable.

## Copy Texts

*from left to right and top to bottom as in our civilisation*  
(II:118)

The first text in order of composition (*Comment c'est*) has been placed on the left, and the second text (*How it is*) facing it, on the right. The fragments of each of the parts have been numbered and variant readings in the Appendices are keyed to these fragment numbers. Fragment numbers naturally match up from one text to the other, except for a short section of part three. Both parts three, that of *Comment c'est* and that of *How it is*, are made up of 315 fragments. However, fragment 198 of *How it is* has no equivalent in *Comment c'est*, while fragment 222 of *Comment c'est* has none in *How it is*. Hence, the twenty-five fragments from 198 to 222 do not match up. A reminder to this effect has been placed in the Appendices at those fragment numbers.

The Copy Text of *Comment c'est* is that of Les Éditions de Minuit (Paris, 1961). The first printing ("achevé d'imprimer le 6 janvier 1961") contains a few errors. I have used as Copy Text that of a subsequent printing ("achevé d'imprimer le 31 janvier 1969"), which has the same pagination but contains fewer errors. This text differs slightly from subsequent printings and it has unfortunately been impossible to ascertain if these new changes (most notably at I:33 and III:301) were made on Beckett's instructions or not, as no proofs of any kind could be consulted and Jérôme Lindon assures me that there is no trace of correspondence concerning *Comment c'est* in the files of Les Éditions de Minuit (letter of 13 January 1994).

I have corrected the 1969 printing of *Comment c'est* in two places. At I:163, "quatre-vingts" ("eighty") appears to be an error and I have re-instated "quatre-vingt-dix" ("ninety") which, according to the manuscript of *Comment c'est* and the Copy Text of *How it is*, was apparently intended. (A similar slip up seems to have occurred at I:275 of Tx1, but is later obviated by substituting "angle droit" ["right angle"] for the erroneous "quatre-vingts".) The second correction is at III:119: here "que" has been corrected

to read “qui.” This is the form which appears in Tx3 (where the relative clause appears for the first time) and echoes the final relative clause of III:118 as well as the Copy Text of *How it is* at both III:118 and 119.

*How it is* exists in two slightly differing texts, an English edition (John Calder: London) and an American edition (Grove Press: New York), both published in 1964. The Copy Text of *How it is* gives alternate readings where the two differ. In four places, however, one or the other has been taken to be the only correct reading.

- 1) The John Calder reading appears to be the result of a typographical error in I:173: “[...] friend’s is [...]” (JC p. 35);
- 2) and in I:275: “[...] habit then right angle [...]” (JC p. 52), where the word “right” should be repeated, indicating first the direction of the turn, then the angle of that turn.
- 3 and 4) Evidence to be found in the pre-original sources of *How it is* as well as in the Copy Text of *Comment c’est* lead me to conclude that the Grove Press edition contains two errors in III:4: “[...] comes in from the right I watch it fly [...] zzizz then next all that” (GP p. 103, my italics). The word “right” appears—in place of “left”—in Oh2 apparently through inattention and, though corrected in the John Calder proofs, goes unnoticed during the preparation of the Grove Press edition. In the same fragment, the word “then”—in place of “the”—finds its way into the Grove Press edition despite correction on the proofs.

Mindful of Murphy’s scarves (Beckett 1938, p. 2), I have, in a fifth case (III:214), resisted the temptation to correct the Copy Text though both English-language editions contain what appears to be a mistake. They read “[...] of the four three quarters of our total life only *three* lend themselves to communication” (JC p. 143, GP p. 131, my italics). The word “three” appears in the second typescript (Oh2) as well as in the published excerpt from the novel (Beckett 1963). As we know, only two three quarters are listed in the following fragment, and in *Comment c’est* we read “deux.”

In cases where the variation between the two English-language texts has been preserved, alternate readings are presented as follows: each reading is presented within square brackets and preceded by the abbreviation JC or GP. Thus, in I:234, the text is marked as follows: “[...] passage more laborious from one side [JC: semi-side to the other] [GP: to the other one semi-side] prolongation of intermediate procumbency [...].” One can read either the John Calder text, “[...] passage more laborious from one side semi-side to the other prolongation of intermediate procumbency [...],” (JC p. 46), or that of Grove Press, “[...] passage more laborious from one side to the other one semi-side prolongation of intermediate procumbency [...],” (GP p. 41). The John Calder text, which is always given first, has been used as the English-

language Copy Text for the purposes of collating the pre-original documents in the Appendix of *How it is* and for marking mismatches between the Copy Texts. Hence, in the facing text of *Comment c'est*, only the JC position of the missing underlined item is marked (by a vertical bar, see “Editorial symbols and formatted text” below), and in the Appendix to *How it is*, readings which conform to the GP order are italicised as variants. Twelve fragments of *How it is* contain alternate readings: I:152, 209, 234, 274, II:42, 103, 142, 259, III:56, 234, 238, 244. A reminder to this effect has been placed in the Appendix at those fragment numbers.

A second set of editorial marks used in the Copy Texts highlights the most obvious discrepancies between the French and English versions of the novel. Mismatches which are highlighted are cases of a word or word string in one text which has no equivalent in the twin text. A mark in one text is echoed by a corresponding mark in the facing text. Solid underlining is used to indicate the word or word string which has no match in the facing text. A vertical bar, |, in the facing text indicates the position that would most likely have been occupied by the matching segment, were it present. Occasionally, an underlined segment in one text may correspond to an underlined segment in the facing text, rather than to a vertical bar, when two portions of text, though semantically disparate, occupy the same position. Stated simply, underlined words in *Comment c'est* were not translated, underlined words in *How it is* were added during the composition of the English text. The vertical bar indicates an “absence” in one of the twin texts.

Other discrepancies might have been highlighted: cases of evident modifications of sense resulting from shifts of verb tense, of singular and plural, of person or register, or any number of other modifications which occurred in the translation of the French text. Likewise, changes of order could have been marked as they are in the Appendices. It is easy to see, however, that it would be impossible to point out such an endless array of mismatches. Even the apparently simple question of whether or not a word has an equivalent in the twin text is not always easy to distinguish from an extreme change of position (see I:244).

In marking the Copy Texts, I have tried to be attentive to the differences of rhythm which result from unmatched connectors such as conjunctions and prepositions. Even unmatched determiners sometimes have sufficient impact on the rhythm of a segment to have been marked. And, keeping in mind how a recurring word or word-group is rendered elsewhere in the text, particular attention has been paid to patterns of repetitions and echoes which are unmatched.

Having been published in a slim volume by Les Éditions de Minuit in 1988, *L'image* is presented here as a distinct work and despite the fact that it is not, strictly speaking, a bilingual work. An English-language version appeared in 1990 in the collection *As the Story Was Told*. This translation is

uncredited and does not appear to be Beckett's. A new translation by Edith Fournier appeared in 1995 in *The Complete Short Prose, 1929-89*. Though *L'image* is not part of Beckett's bilingual work, its inclusion here went without saying given its place in the genesis of *Comment c'est*.

The text of the 1988 volume, continuous and unpunctuated save for an initial upper case letter and a final stop, is the Copy Text here. The evolution of *L'image* branches off from *Comment c'est* before the fragmentation of that text took place. However, for the sake of standardising the Appendices, the corresponding fragment numbers of *Comment c'est* are used to reference the variants and are therefore introduced within square brackets into the Copy Text. The Copy Text of *L'image* is free of all other editorial marks since it is matched up to no English-language equivalent.

Fragment numbers, underlinings, vertical strokes, all these markings make for a text not for reading, but for research. The pleasure of reading *Comment c'est* or *How it is* can still best be had in one of the generally available editions published by Minuit, John Calder or Grove Press. The marked-up Copy Texts included here are but a research tool and lend themselves to a different use. The most important research tool this volume aims to provide, however, is contained in its Appendices.

## Genesis

*cet automatisme verbal est détestable*  
(Appendix, Cc I:258)

Many early critics of *Comment c'est* and *How it is*, recognising that they are not written in prose, immediately concluded that they were some kind of poem (Albarès, p. 2; Simon, p. 245). This conclusion reveals two flaws. It assumes that discourse can exist in only two forms, prose or poetry (here loosely synonymous with "verse"), and that the novel can only be written in prose. I have dealt with these matters elsewhere (O'Reilly 1996) but wish to revisit the second in relation to the genesis of *Comment c'est*. Though novels were once written in verse, they have been written in prose for a very long time now and the assumption that what is not in prose cannot be a novel testifies to the close association between the two. The pre-original documents pertaining to *Comment c'est* are also testimony of this strong association. Perfecting, nay, finding in the narrator's words, "a language meet for me meet for here" (I:85) required a surprising amount of work on Beckett's part. Surprising because of a false yet understandable assumption that it is easy to write like this, without sentences, since it is beautiful, perfectly balanced sentences which are difficult to hone. In fact, Beckett's work shows that it was at least as difficult for him to break out of the habit of making sentences as it would have been to hone measured periods. The rhythmic sentences of *Molloy* in fact came much more easily, almost automatically, informed

as they are by tradition and familiarity with the masters of French prose.

Beckett wrote *Comment c'est* first and, save for the excerpt "From an Unabandoned Work," did not begin *How it is* until *Comment c'est* was finished. The opening pages of *Comment c'est* exist in some 14 pre-original versions. The first versions, some of which are very short and incomplete, are in punctuated prose organised into paragraphs of varying length. As Beckett wrote more of the novel, he gradually lapsed back into the long meandering strings of word groups punctuated by commas which are characteristic of the last pages of his previous novel, *L'innommable*, and of the shorter *Textes pour rien*. Though this form of writing is already present in the first full-length draft of *Comment c'est*, that draft in fact represents Beckett's ninth attempt at the novel. Beckett did not give the text its fragmented form until his twelfth go, the fourth full-length version of the text. In a letter to his friend Ethna Leventhal, written when most of *Comment c'est* had yet to be drafted, Beckett writes of his work on rhythm. "Struggling along with the new work, 6th version of opening pages, rhythm and syntax perhaps coming now, enough anyway to justify my going on [...]."

This long struggle can be observed in the Appendices. In order to work with the Appendices, one must be familiar with the source documents and the editorial symbols used to transcribe them.

### Sources Pertaining to *Comment c'est* <sup>4</sup>

*Pour continuer donc ce qui me préoccupe aujourd'hui, c'est le sac.*  
(Cc ms, notebook 1, l. 1)

The entire 6-notebook manuscript of *Comment c'est* is housed at the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center of the University of Texas at Austin. The manuscript proper is naturally abbreviated as ms. It is preceded in the first notebook by four incomplete versions which have been identified in the Appendix as ms/a through ms/d. These first four autograph texts alternate with their respective typed versions housed in the Library of the University of Reading where they are identified as Acc 1655/1 through Acc 1655/4. The last four characters of the University of Reading designations are used to identify these typescripts in the Appendix. Likewise, the last four characters of the designation Acc 1661 are used to identify that typescript, also at the University of Reading. The Harry Ransom Center also owns three successive typescripts which they designate Typescript 1, Typescript 2, and Typescript 3. These designations have been abbreviated as Tx1, Tx2, and Tx3 respectively.

Two pre-publication excerpts of *Comment c'est* appeared in periodicals:

"L'Image." X, *A Quarterly Review* 1.1 (1959): 35-37.

“Découverte de Pim.” *L’VII* 1 (1959): 9-13.

An incomplete typescript of the first can be found at the Lilly Library of the University of Indiana at Bloomington and its complete carbon copy at the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, where it is bound with Tx2.

ms/a (manuscript, 1st notebook, l. 1-12). The earliest date on the manuscript is “17.12.58.” The version begun that day in what was to become the first of a six-notebook manuscript is a little over 3,000 words in length. It is written in punctuated prose sentences, grouped into paragraphs, and bears no formal resemblance to *Comment c’est*. Only a few scattered words survive into the published novel. The subject matter is, on the other hand, recognisably that of the novel, though distributed differently. The narrative is in the first person and begins with the sack and tins (I:10). It includes a discussion of “visiteurs” (“callers”), though it occurs earlier here—between what are now fr. 26 and 27—than in the published novel. An insertion introduces the vision of a woman interrupting her needle work and then running out of the house (I:33-34). The narrator also discusses musings which bear on “les efforts que j’ai faits pour sortir d’ici” (I:22a-b; “the efforts I made to get out of here,” my translation), a passage which was later deleted, and on his past (I:22c), a passage which was later consolidated with what would become fr. 26. The narrator then returns to the subject of the callers, referred to this time as “gens” (“people”), who come to him from every direction (I:51). This repetition may have motivated Beckett to interrupt his work here and rearrange the subject matter before continuing (see ms/b below). The portion of the manuscript which I am calling ms/a ends with new versions of what were to become fragments 42 and 52. In these new paragraphs, the narration is in third person.

55/1 (typescript Acc 1655/1). The text of ms/a is typed in the third person and includes many other variants. It covers slightly more than 7 pages. A note, in Beckett’s hand, in the top right corner of page 1 reads “196? On way to Comment c’est” (Beckett’s question mark and underlining). This inscription apparently applies to all four typescripts Acc 1655/1 through Acc 1655/4 and is the nearest thing to a date to appear on any of the typescript versions of *Comment c’est*. The first page of 55/1 bears a number of autograph interlinear emendations, including the substitution of the first person for the third. Beyond the first paragraph of page 2, the third person is left unchanged even though Beckett had evidently decided to reinstate the first person throughout. Generally speaking, there are relatively few emendations of any kind beyond page 1. The manuscript ms/a and typescript 55/1 represent roughly the same text.

ms/b (manuscript, 1st notebook, l. 12-17). Beckett put pen to paper once again, not to produce yet a third version of the text, but to continue it.

The narrative is once again in first person and will remain so. This brief continuation of the ms/a-55/1 version begins with the consolidation of the two discussions concerning the "visiteurs," which henceforth occupies roughly its present position in the sequence of subject matter (I:45-52). The greater part of the continuation is devoted to the "long débat" ("long wrangle," I:53) about whether or not the narrator is alone. This very lengthy wrangle is in fact reproduced through nine versions before being summarised in the few words of the published text. This version ends with a meditation on physical contact (I:54-56) which here includes a deleted passage about remote sexual relations.

55/2 (typescript Acc 1655/2). The entire text as it then stood, the ms/a-55/1 version and its continuation in ms/b, was then retyped and fills 9 pages. It bears autograph interlinear emendations throughout.

ms/c (manuscript, 1st notebook, l. 18-19). Beckett then returned to the notebook and started over at the beginning. He adds an opening paragraph which announces the novel's three parts (I:1) before proceeding immediately to the sack and tins (I:10). This is the only important change. The text is in a hurried hand and is interrupted almost immediately (it covers only two pages in the notebook).

55/3 (typescript Acc 1655/3). Abandoning the autograph version he had just begun, Beckett returned to the typewriter and retyped the text he had already composed. It closely resembles 55/2 and bears relatively few interlinear emendations, the major difference being the presence of the opening paragraph announcing three parts which was introduced in ms/c.

ms/d (manuscript, 1st notebook, l. 20-39). The text is then begun again in the manuscript notebook and further lengthened, roughly as far as fr. 95. This is the first lengthening of the text since the brief addition made by ms/b. The discussion of the "visiteurs" (I:45-52) is inexplicably skipped over, though it reappears in the subsequent typed version. This version most notably introduces passages concerning the narrator's aversion to physical contact, even with his own body (I:62), and an allusion to his own fame (I:90a). The material of fragments I:2-8 has not yet appeared and the foreshadowing of comments on the alternation of night and day (I:84) will be added much later. Otherwise, the succession of subject matter is just about that of the published text, up to I:95.

55/4 (typescript Acc 1655/4). This is the typed version of ms/d, including the discussion of the "visiteurs." This typescript bears autograph emendations throughout its 13 and a half pages. It is the last of the short preliminary versions of the novel.

ms (manuscript, 1st notebook, l. 40-48v, 2nd to 4th notebooks and 5th notebook, l. 1-7). This is the manuscript proper. The six notebooks are entitled, in Beckett's hand, "Pim I (Comment c'est)" through "Pim VI (Comment c'est)." With a few exceptions, Beckett composed on the

recto of the notebook leaf and used the facing verso for notes and revisions. There are also many interlinear insertions. Schematic drawings and calculations abound to support the figures used by the narrator. The second notebook starts with the date "Ussy 11.3.59" (l. 1). Upon extending the text beyond the end of the 55/4 version, Beckett writes the date in the form of this inscription on three lines "NEW WRITING/ EDWARD'S BIRTHDAY/59" (2nd notebook, l. 2—I:95d; Beckett's nephew Edward's birthday is 13 March). This last break corresponds to the break in pagination in part one of 1661 (see below). Further dates found in ms are "27.5.59" (3rd notebook, l. 1—beginning of part two), "28.8.59" (4th notebook, l. 1—II:254), "Ussy 20.9.59" (same leaf—II:255), "21.10.59" (4th notebook, l. 5—beginning of part three), "31.12.59" (5th notebook, l. 1—III:267), and "6.1.60" (5th notebook, bottom of l. 7—end of ms proper).

The tripartition of the subject matter introduced in ms/c, and Beckett's comment to his friend Ethna Leventhal, indicate that he already knew he was writing a long work. But it is only now, upon his ninth try that he sustains the composition to the end. It is also entirely possible, however, that ms was not written at one go. The short, incomplete versions which precede ms, manuscript dating, page numbering in the typescripts and varying typing styles suggest that Beckett may have composed the novel in segments, alternately creating — now writing, now typing — what for the sake of clarity are presented here as two successive documents.

The manuscript contains numerous rewrites and passages which exist in alternate or successive states. Though it contains a number of paragraphs which are later deleted and the published text material which is not yet included here, the novel is roughly as it stands with regard to the fiction and the order of the subject matter. Stylistically, however, ms is still very different from the published novel, although less so as it progresses. The paragraphs gradually lengthen, as do the sentences within them, until the prose resembles that of the final pages of *L'innommable*. Many of the word sequences of part three survive into the published novel, as attested by the presence of the @ symbol in the transcription of this part. But, the merest glance is enough to show that the text of *Comment c'est* went through a complete metamorphosis in the course of the novel's genesis. The great formal distance which separates the early French versions from the published novel means that the manuscript of *Comment c'est*, in its entirety, constitutes a variant. For all intents and purposes, is reproduced *in extenso* in the Appendix, albeit in fragmented form.

1661 (typescript Acc 1661). Parts one and two of the manuscript are then typed (or typed one at a time, alternating with the production of ms).



This typescript is double-spaced and bears numerous interlinear emendations and occasional marginal insertions. Each part is paginated separately. The first 8 pages of part one (roughly equivalent to the version represented in 55/4) are numbered in sequence. Page numbering then begins again (I:95d, see also ms, 2nd notebook, l. 2) and ends with p. 36. This may be evidence that Beckett produced all of these versions of the opening pages, from ms/a to 1661, before continuing the composition of ms beyond I:95 on 13 March 1959 (see ms above). Page 5 of the second sequence is numbered autograph and bears the title “N.W.2, 11.8” (underlining is typed), which may stand for “New Writing 2, 11 August” and corresponds to a similar though undated break in ms (2nd notebook, p. 8—I:126). Page 10 of part one (I:145-49a) is missing. In part two, most of the paragraph which straddles p. 15-16 (II:119-21, 124) is crossed out and replaced by an intercalated unnumbered autograph page. Likewise, the beginning of a paragraph at the bottom of p. 22 is crossed out. The paragraph is incomplete, the page bearing its continuation having probably been removed. Instead, the next two and a half pages (II:174-203) are typed single spaced and the typed page numbers are corrected by hand. This may indicate that as many as three pages following the crossed out paragraph of p. 22 were removed and retyped. The single spacing might be accounted for by the desire to make a longer portion of text fit into the page sequence already typed and numbered. Part three is not included in 1661. It may have been typed and lost, or it may simply never have been typed. If Beckett worked by segments of text, it is possible that, based on his revision of parts one and two, he decided that it was unnecessary to continue until those two parts had been retyped (Tx1). Or, more likely, he may have felt that part three was less in need of revision and dispensed with typing it up at this time. Part three of ms is in fact closer to the published version than the preceding two parts, and may not have even been composed until after parts one and two of Acc 1661 had already been typed and revised.

ms’ (see “Sources pertaining to *L’image*.”)

Tx1 (Typescript 1). This is in fact the sixth typescript, after 55/1 through 55/4 and 1661, but the first complete typescript of the novel. The three parts are paginated separately (29 p., 28 p., 31 p.). Parts one and two are single-spaced and bear interlinear and marginal autograph emendations. Part three is double spaced, suggesting once again that all three parts may not have been typed at once, and bears mostly interlinear emendations. The typed title “*Découverte de Pim*” appears on page 1 of part two along with the autograph inscription “4 premières pages de cette partie données à la Revue ‘L.7’, Décembre 59” (“4 first pages of this part given to the Journal ‘L.7’, December 59,” my translation; Beckett’s sin-