

General editors

RICHARD MACKSEY, *The Johns Hopkins University*
and MICHAEL SPRINKER, *State University of New York at Stony Brook*

The Cambridge *Literature, Culture, Theory* Series is dedicated to theoretical studies in the human sciences that have literature and culture as their object of enquiry. Acknowledging the contemporary expansion of cultural studies and the redefinitions of literature that this has entailed, the series includes not only original works of literary theory but also monographs and essay collections on topics and seminal figures from the long history of theoretical speculation on the arts and human communication generally. The concept of theory embraced in the series is broad, including not only the classical disciplines of poetics and rhetoric, but also those of aesthetics, linguistics, psychoanalysis, semiotics, and other cognate sciences that have inflected the systematic study of literature during the past half century.

Selected series titles

The subject of modernity
ANTHONY J. CASCARDI

Critical conditions: postmodernity and the question of foundations
HORACE L. FAIRLAMB

Introduction to literary hermeneutics
PETER SZONDI

(translated from the German by Martha Woodmansee)

Anti-mimesis from Plato to Hitchcock
TOM COHEN

Mikhail Bakhtin: between phenomenology and Marxism
MICHAEL F. BERNARD-DONALS

Poetry, space, landscape: toward a new theory
CHRIS FITTER

The object of literature
PIERRE MACHERY

(translated from the French by David Macey)

Rhetoric, sophistry, pragmatism
edited by STEVEN MAILLOUX

Derrida and autobiography
ROBERT SMITH

Novels behind glass: commodity culture and Victorian narrative
ANDREW H. MILLER

Kenneth Burke: rhetoric, subjectivity, postmodernism
ROBERT WESS

Rhetoric and culture in Lacan
GILBERT D. CHAITIN

Gérard Genette

Paratexts

Thresholds of interpretation

Translated by

JANE E. LEWIN

Foreword by

RICHARD MACKSEY



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Introduction

A literary work consists, entirely or essentially, of a text, defined (very minimally) as a more or less long sequence of verbal statements that are more or less endowed with significance. But this text is rarely presented in an unadorned state, unreinforced and unaccompanied by a certain number of verbal or other productions, such as an author's name, a title, a preface, illustrations. And although we do not always know whether these productions are to be regarded as belonging to the text, in any case they surround it and extend it, precisely in order to *present* it, in the usual sense of this verb but also in the strongest sense: to *make present*, to ensure the text's presence in the world, its "reception" and consumption in the form (nowadays, at least) of a book. These accompanying productions, which vary in extent and appearance, constitute what I have called elsewhere the work's *paratext*,¹ in keeping with the sometimes ambiguous meaning of this prefix in French² (I mentioned adjectives like "parafiscal" [a "taxe parafiscale" is a special levy] or "paramilitary"). For us, accordingly, the paratext is what enables a text to become a book and to be offered as such to its readers and, more generally, to the public. More than a boundary or a sealed border,

¹ *Palimpsestes* (Seuil, 1981), 9.

² And undoubtedly in some other languages, if this remark by J. Hillis Miller, which applies to English, is to be believed: "'Para' is a double antithetical prefix signifying at once proximity and distance, similarity and difference, interiority and exteriority, ... something simultaneously this side of a boundary line, threshold, or margin, and also beyond it, equivalent in status and also secondary or subsidiary, submissive, as of guest to host, slave to master. A thing in 'para,' moreover, is not only simultaneously on both sides of the boundary line between inside and out. It is also the boundary itself, the screen which is a permeable membrane connecting inside and outside. It confuses them with one another, allowing the outside in, making the inside out, dividing them and joining them" ("The Critic as Host," in *Deconstruction and Criticism*, ed. Harold Bloom et al. [New York: Seabury Press, 1979], 219). This is a rather nice description of the activity of the paratext.

the paratext is, rather, a *threshold*,³ or – a word Borges used apropos of a preface – a “vestibule” that offers the world at large the possibility of either stepping inside or turning back. It is an “undefined zone”⁴ between the inside and the outside, a zone without any hard and fast boundary on either the inward side (turned toward the text) or the outward side (turned toward the world’s discourse about the text), an edge, or, as Philippe Lejeune put it, “a fringe of the printed text which in reality controls one’s whole reading of the text.”⁵ Indeed, this fringe, always the conveyor of a commentary that is authorial or more or less legitimated by the author, constitutes a zone between text and off-text, a zone not only of transition but also of *transaction*: a privileged place of a pragmatics and a strategy, of an influence on the public, an influence that – whether well or poorly understood and achieved – is at the service of a better reception for the text and a more pertinent reading of it (more pertinent, of course, in the eyes of the author and his allies). To say that we will speak again of this influence is an understatement: all the rest of this book is about nothing else except its means, methods, and effects. To indicate what is at stake, we can ask one simple question as an example: limited to the text alone and without a guiding set of directions, how would we read Joyce’s *Ulysses* if it were not entitled *Ulysses*?

The paratext, then, is empirically made up of a heterogeneous group of practices and discourses of all kinds and dating from all periods which I federate under the term “paratext” in the name of a common interest, or a convergence of effects, that seems to me more important than their diversity of aspect. The table of contents of this book undoubtedly makes it unnecessary for me to list these practices and discourses here, except that one or two

³ [The French title of this book is *Seuils*, which means “thresholds.”]

⁴ This image seems inevitable for anyone who deals with the paratext: “an undefined zone . . . where two sets of codes are blended: the social code as it pertains to advertising, and the codes producing or regulating the text” (C. Duchet, “Pour une socio-critique, ou Variations sur un incipit,” *Littérature* 1 [February 1971], 6); “an intermediary zone between the off-text and the text” (A. Compagnon, *La Seconde Main* [Seuil, 1979], 328).

⁵ Philippe Lejeune, *Le Pacte autobiographique* (Seuil, 1975), 45. What follows this phrase indicates clearly that the author was partly aiming at what I am calling paratext: “. . . name of author, title, subtitle, name of series, name of publisher, even the ambiguous game of prefaces.”

terms are provisionally obscure, and these I will soon define. As far as possible, my approach follows the order in which one usually meets the messages this study explores: the external presentation of a book – name of author, title, and the rest – just as it is offered to a docile reader, which certainly does not mean every reader. In this respect, my saving everything I call “epitext” for the end is no doubt especially arbitrary because many future readers become acquainted with a book thanks to, for example, an interview with the author (if not a magazine review or a recommendation by word of mouth, neither of which, according to our conventions, generally belongs to the paratext, which is characterized by an authorial intention and assumption of responsibility); but the advantages of putting the epitext at the end will, I hope, turn out to be greater than the drawbacks. In addition, this overall arrangement is not so strict as to be especially coercive, and those who ordinarily read books by beginning at the end or in the middle will be able to apply the same method, if it is one, to this book, too.

Furthermore, the paratextual messages inventoried here (in a preliminary, condensed, and doubtless incomplete way) do not constitute a uniformly unvarying and systematic presence around a text: some books lack a preface, some authors resist being interviewed, and in some periods it was not obligatory to record an author’s name or even a work’s title. The ways and means of the paratext change continually, depending on period, culture, genre, author, work, and edition, with varying degrees of pressure, sometimes widely varying: it is an acknowledged fact that our “media” age has seen the proliferation of a type of discourse around texts that was unknown in the classical world and *a fortiori* in antiquity and the Middle Ages, when texts often circulated in an almost raw condition, in the form of manuscripts devoid of any formula of presentation. I say an *almost* raw condition because the sole fact of transcription – but equally, of oral transmission – brings to the ideality of the text some degree of materialization, graphic or phonic, which, as we will see, may induce paratextual effects. In this sense, one may doubtless assert that a text⁶ without a paratext does not exist and never has existed. Paradoxically, paratexts without texts do exist, if only by

⁶ I now say *texts* and not only *works* in the “noble” sense of that word (literary or artistic productions, in contrast to nonliterary ones), as the need for a paratext

accident: there are certainly works – lost or aborted – about which we know nothing except their titles. (Some examples: numerous post-Homeric epics or classical Greek tragedies, or *La Morsure de l'épaule* [published in English as *The Shoulder Bite*], which Chrétien de Troyes takes credit for at the beginning of *Cligès*, or *La Bataille des Thermopyles*, which was one of Flaubert's abandoned projects and which we know nothing else about except that the word *cnémide* [greave] was not to have appeared in it.) These titles, standing alone, certainly provide food for thought, by which I mean they provide a little more than many a work that is everywhere available and can be read from start to finish. Finally, just as the presence of paratextual elements is not uniformly obligatory, so, too, the public and the reader are not unvaryingly and uniformly obligated: no one is required to read a preface (even if such freedom is not always opportune for the author), and as we will see, many notes are addressed only to *certain* readers.

The approach we will take in studying each of these elements, or rather each of these types of elements, is to consider a certain number of features that, in concert, allow us to define the status of a paratextual message, whatever it may be. These features basically describe a paratextual message's spatial, temporal, substantial, pragmatic, and functional characteristics. More concretely: defining a paratextual element consists of determining its location (the question *where?*); the date of its appearance and, if need be, its disappearance (*when?*); its mode of existence, verbal or other (*how?*); the characteristics of its situation of communication – its sender and addressee (*from whom? to whom?*); and the functions that its message aims to fulfill (*to do what?*). This questionnaire is a little simplistic, but because it almost entirely defines the method employed in the rest of this book, no doubt a few words of justification are in order at the outset.

A paratextual element, at least if it consists of a message that has taken on material form, necessarily has a *location* that can be situated in relation to the location of the text itself: around the text and either within the same volume or at a more respectful (or more prudent) distance. Within the same volume are such

is thrust on every kind of book, with or without aesthetic ambition, even if this study is limited to the paratext of literary works.

elements as the title or the preface and sometimes elements inserted into the interstices of the text, such as chapter titles or certain notes. I will give the name *peritext* to this first spatial category⁷ – certainly the more typical one, and the focus of Chapters 2–12. The distanced elements are all those messages that, at least originally, are located outside the book, generally with the help of the media (interviews, conversations) or under cover of private communications (letters, diaries, and others). This second category is what, for lack of a better word, I call *epitext*; it will be dealt with in Chapters 13 and 14. As must henceforth go without saying, *peritext* and *epitext* completely and entirely share the spatial field of the paratext. In other words, for those who are keen on formulae, *paratext* = *peritext* + *epitext*.⁸

The *temporal* situation of the paratext, too, can be defined in relation to that of the text. If we adopt as our point of reference the date of the text's appearance – that is, the date of its first, or original,⁹ edition – then certain paratextual elements are of prior (public) production: for example, prospectuses, announcements of forthcoming publications, or elements that are connected to prepublication in a newspaper or magazine and will sometimes disappear with publication in book form, like the famous Homeric chapter-titles of *Ulysses*, whose official existence proved to be (if I may put it this way) entirely prenatal. These are therefore *prior* paratexts. Other paratextual elements – the most common ones – appear at the same time as the text: this is the *original* paratext. An example is the preface to Balzac's *Peau de chagrin*, a preface produced in 1831 along with the novel it introduces. Finally, other paratextual elements appear later than the text, perhaps thanks to a second edition (example: the preface to Zola's *Thérèse Raquin* – four months later) or to a more remote

⁷ The notion of "peritext" overlaps with that of "périgraphie," proposed by A. Compagnon, *La Seconde Main*, 328–56.

⁸ Even so, I must add that the peritext of scholarly editions (generally post-humous) sometimes contains elements that do not belong to the paratext in the sense in which I define it. Examples of such elements would be extracts from allographic reviews (see the Pléiade edition of Sartre, the Flammarion edition of Michelet, and so forth). [The word "allography" in its various forms refers to a text (preface, review, etc.) that one person writes for another person's work.]

⁹ Here I will disregard the sometimes pronounced technical (bibliographic and bibliophilic) differences among *first trade edition*, *original [limited] edition*, *editio princeps*, and so on, to summarily call the earliest one *original*.

new edition (example: the preface to Chateaubriand's *Essai sur les révolutions* – twenty-nine years later). For reasons of function that I will elaborate on below, here we have grounds for differentiating between the merely *later* paratext (the Zola case just mentioned) and the *delayed* paratext (the Chateaubriand case). To designate elements that appear after the author's death, I – like everyone else – will use the term *posthumous*; to designate elements produced during the author's lifetime, I will adopt the neologism proposed by my good master Alphonse Allais: *anthumous* paratext.¹⁰ But this last antithesis is applicable not solely to delayed elements; for a paratext can be at one and the same time original and posthumous, if it accompanies a text that is itself posthumous – as do the title and the (fallacious) genre indication of *La Vie de Henry Brulard, écrite par lui-même. Roman imité du Vicaire de Wakefield* [*The Life of Henry Brulard, written by himself. A novel in imitation of "The Vicar of Wakefield"*].

If, then, a paratextual element may appear at any time, it may also disappear, definitively or not, by authorial decision or outside intervention or by virtue of the eroding effect of time. Many titles of the classical period have thus been shortened by posterity, even on the title pages of the most reliable modern editions; and all of Balzac's original prefaces were deliberately deleted in 1842 at the time his works were regrouped to form the whole known as *La Comédie humaine*. Such deletions, which are very common, determine the life span of paratextual elements. Some life spans are very short; to my knowledge, the record is held by the preface to *La Peau de chagrin* (one month). But I said above, "may disappear *definitively or not*": an element that is deleted – for example, when a new edition comes out – can always reemerge upon publication of a still newer edition. Certain notes in Rousseau's *Nouvelle Héloïse*, absent from the second edition, lost no time returning, and the prefaces Balzac "deleted" in 1842 are present today in all reliable editions. The duration of the paratext is often intermittent, therefore, and this

¹⁰ [Allais (1854-1905) was a humorist who wrote light verse, tales, and sketches.] *Anthumous* is the term Allais used to designate those of his works that had appeared in a collection during his lifetime. We should also remember that *posthumus*, "after burial," is a very old (and wonderful) false etymology: *postumus* is merely the superlative of *posterus* ["following" (compar. *posterior*: "following after"; superl.: "hindmost, last")].

intermittence, which I will speak of again, is very closely linked to the basically functional nature of the paratext.

The question of a paratextual element's *substantial* status will be settled, or eluded, here – as it often is in practice – by the fact that almost all the paratexts I consider will themselves be of a *textual*, or at least verbal, kind: titles, prefaces, interviews, all of them utterances that, varying greatly in scope, nonetheless share the linguistic status of the text. Most often, then, the paratext is itself a text: if it is still not *the* text, it is already *some* text. But we must at least bear in mind the paratextual value that may be vested in other types of manifestation: these may be iconic (illustrations), material (for example, everything that originates in the sometimes very significant typographical choices that go into the making of a book), or purely factual. By *factual* I mean the paratext that consists not of an explicit message (verbal or other) but of a fact whose existence alone, if known to the public, provides some commentary on the text and influences how the text is received. Two examples are the age or sex of the author. (How many works, from Rimbaud's to Sollers's, have owed part of their fame or success to the glamor of youth? And do we ever read "a novel by a woman" exactly as we read "a novel" plain and simple, that is, a novel by a man?) Another example is the date of the work: "True admiration," said Renan, "is historical"; in any case, it is indisputable that historical awareness of the period in which a work was written is rarely immaterial to one's reading of that work.

I have just tossed together the most unsubtle and patently obvious characteristics of the factual paratext, but there are many others, some more trivial and others more basic. Examples of the more trivial are membership in an academy (or other exalted body) or receipt of a literary prize. Examples of the more basic (and these we will meet again) are the implicit contexts that surround a work and, to a greater or lesser degree, clarify or modify its significance. These implicit contexts may be authorial (the context formed around, for example, *Père Goriot* by the whole of *La Comédie humaine*), generic (the context formed around the same work [*Père Goriot*] and the same whole [*La Comédie humaine*] by the existence of the genre known as "the novel"), historical (the context formed, for the same example, by the period known as "the nineteenth century"), and so forth. I will not undertake

here to specify the nature or gauge the weight of these facts of contextual affiliation, but we must at least remember that, in principle, every context serves as a paratext.

The existence of these facts of contextual affiliation, like the existence of every kind of factual paratext, may or may not be brought to the public's attention by a mention that, itself, belongs to the textual paratext: a genre indication, the mention on a band¹¹ of a prize, the mention in a "please-insert"¹² of an author's age, the indirect disclosure of an author's sex by way of his or her name, and so forth. But the existence of these facts does not always need to be mentioned to be a matter of "common knowledge." For example, most readers of *A la recherche du Temps perdu* are aware of the two biographical facts of Proust's part-Jewish ancestry and his homosexuality. Knowledge of those two facts inevitably serves as a paratext to the pages of Proust's work that deal with those two subjects. I am not saying that people must know those facts; I am saying only that people who do know them read Proust's work differently from people who do not and that anyone who denies the difference is pulling our leg. The same is true, of course, for the facts of context: reading Zola's *Assommoir* as a self-contained work is very different from reading it as an episode of *Les Rougon-Macquart*.

The *pragmatic* status of a paratextual element is defined by the characteristics of its situation of communication: the nature of the sender and addressee, the sender's degree of authority and responsibility, the illocutionary force of the sender's message, and undoubtedly some other characteristics I have overlooked.

The sender of a paratextual message (like the sender of all other messages) is not necessarily its *de facto* producer, whose identity is not very important to us: suppose, for example, that the foreword of *La Comédie humaine*, signed Balzac, had in fact been written by one of Balzac's friends. The sender is defined by a putative attribution and an acceptance of responsibility. Most

¹¹ [The band is a strip of brightly colored paper – about 2-1/2 inches from top to bottom – that encircles a book or journal across its lower third. Some bands are unbroken and prevent the casual reader from flipping through the book or journal; others have a front and back flap that fold over the front and back covers of the book or journal. Printed on the band may be various kinds of publisher's information, as discussed in Chapter 2, "The Publisher's Peritext."]

¹² [The "please-insert" (*le prière d'insérer*) is what nowadays is called jacket copy. It is the subject of Chapter 5.]

often the sender is the author (*authorial* paratext), but the sender may equally well be the publisher: unless a please-insert is signed by the author, it customarily belongs to the *publisher's* paratext. The author and the publisher are (legally and in other ways) the two people responsible for the text and the paratext, but they may delegate a portion of their responsibility to a third party. A preface written by this third party and accepted by the author, such as Anatole France's preface to Proust's *Les Plaisirs et les jours*, still belongs (it seems to me), by the mere fact of this acceptance, to the paratext – which this time is an *allographic* paratext. There are also situations in which responsibility for the paratext is, in a way, shared: one example is an interview with the author in which someone else poses the questions and generally "collects" the author's remarks and reports them, faithfully or not.

The addressee may be roughly defined as "the public," but this is much too loose a definition, for the public of a book extends potentially to all of humankind. Thus some qualifications are called for. Certain paratextual elements are actually addressed to (which does not mean they reach) the public in general – that is, every Tom, Dick, and Harry. This is the case (I will come back to it) of the title or of an interview. Other paratextual elements are addressed (with the same reservation) more specifically or more restrictively only to readers of the text. This is typically the case of the preface. Still others, such as the early forms of the please-insert, are addressed exclusively to critics; and others, to booksellers. All of that (whether peritext or epitext) constitutes what I call the *public* paratext. Finally, other paratextual elements are addressed, orally or in writing, to ordinary individuals, who may or may not be well known and are not supposed to go around talking about them: this is the *private* paratext. Its most private part consists of messages the author addresses to himself, in his diary or elsewhere: this is the *intimate* paratext, so designated by the mere fact of its being addressed to oneself, regardless of its content.

By definition, something is not a paratext unless the author or one of his associates accepts responsibility for it, although the degree of responsibility may vary. From the language of politics I will borrow a standard distinction, one easier to use than to define: the distinction between the official and the unofficial (or

semiofficial).¹³ The *official* is any paratextual message openly accepted by the author or publisher or both – a message for which the author or publisher cannot evade responsibility. “Official,” then, applies to everything that, originating with the author or publisher, appears in the anthumous peritext – for example, the title or the original preface, or even the comments signed by the author in a work for which he is fully responsible (for example, Tournier’s *Vent Paraclet* [a book of essays about Tournier’s own novels]). The *unofficial* (or *semiofficial*) is most of the authorial epitext: interviews, conversations, and confidences, responsibility for which the author can always more or less disclaim with denials of the type “That’s not exactly what I said” or “Those were off-the-cuff remarks” or “That wasn’t intended for publication” or indeed even with a “solemn declaration” like Robbe-Grillet’s at the Cerisy colloquium. There he refused outright to grant any “importance” to “[my] journal articles haphazardly collected in a volume under the name of Essays” and, “all the more,” to “the oral remarks I may make here, even if I agree to their later publication” – a declaration amounting, I imagine, to a new version of the paradox of the Cretan.¹⁴ Also and perhaps especially unofficial is what the author permits or asks a third party (an allographic preface-writer or an “authorized” commentator) to say: see the part played by a Larbaud or a Stuart Gilbert in the diffusion of the Homeric keys to *Ulysses*, a diffusion Joyce organized but did not publicly take responsibility for. Naturally there are many intermediary or undecidable situations in what is really only a difference of degree, but these shadings offer the author an undeniable advantage: it is sometimes in one’s interest to have certain things “known” without having (supposedly) said them oneself.

A final pragmatic characteristic of the paratext is what – making free with a term used by philosophers of language – I call the *illocutionary force* of its message. Here again we are dealing with a gradation of states. A paratextual element can commu-

¹³ [The French words are *officiel* and *officieux*. *Officieux* means indistinguishably “unofficial” and “semiofficial” and will be rendered “unofficial” except in contexts in which only “semiofficial” makes sense.]

¹⁴ *Colloque Robbe-Grillet* (1975) (Paris: 10/18, 1976), 1:316. [The Centre Culturel International of Cerisy-la-Salle was the site of a colloquium on “Robbe-Grillet: Analyse, théorie.” The paradox: A man from Crete says, “All Cretans are liars.” If the statement is true, he must be lying ...]

nicate a piece of sheer *information* – the name of the author, for example, or the date of publication. It can make known an *intention*, or an *interpretation* by the author and/or the publisher: this is the chief function of most prefaces, and also of the genre indications on some covers or title pages (*a novel* does not signify “This book is a novel,” a defining assertion that hardly lies within anyone’s power, but rather “Please look on this book as a novel”). It can convey a genuine *decision*: “Stendhal” and “*Le Rouge et le noir*” do not mean “My name is Stendhal” (which is false in the eyes of the registry office) and “This book is named *Le Rouge et le noir*” (which makes no sense), but “I choose the pseudonym Stendhal” and “I, the author, decide to give this book the title *Le Rouge et le noir*.” Or it can involve a *commitment*: some genre indications (autobiography, history, memoir) have, as we know, a more binding contractual force (“I commit myself to telling the truth”) than do others (novel, essay);¹⁵ and a simple notice like “First Volume” or “Volume One” has the weight of a promise – or, as Northrop Frye says, of a threat. Or a paratextual element can give a word of *advice* or, indeed, even issue a *command*: “This book,” says Hugo in the preface to *Les Contemplations*, “must be read the way one would read the book of a dead man”; “It must all,” writes Barthes at the head of *Roland Barthes par Roland Barthes*, “be considered as if spoken by a character in a novel”; and some permissions (“You may read this book in one-or-another sequence,” “You may skip this or that”) indicate just as clearly, although discreetly, the peremptory potential of the paratext. Some paratextual elements entail even the power logicians call *performative* – that is, the ability to perform what they describe (“I open the meeting”): this is the case with dedications and inscriptions. To dedicate or inscribe a book to So-and-So is obviously nothing more than to have printed or to write on one of its pages a phrase of the type “To So-and-So” – an extreme

¹⁵ [The words “contract” and “contractual” as used in this book are based on Philippe Lejeune’s studies of autobiography. Lejeune makes the point that “autobiography is a contractual genre,” and he speaks of “the implicit or explicit contract proposed by the *author* to the *reader*, the contract that determines how the text is read” (“The Autobiographical Contract,” in *French Literary Theory Today: A Reader*, ed. Tzvetan Todorov, trans. R. Carter [Cambridge University Press, 1982], 219). In *Palimpsestes* Genette points out that “the term [contract] is obviously highly optimistic as to the role of the reader, who has signed nothing and who can take this contract or leave it. But it is true that the genre or other indications *commit* the author” (9).]

case of paratextual efficiency, for saying it is doing it. But there is already much of that in affixing a title or selecting a pseudonym, acts that mimic any creative power.

These comments on illocutionary force, then, have brought us imperceptibly to the main point, which is the *functional* aspect of the paratext. It is the main point because, clearly and except for isolated exceptions (which we will meet here and there), the paratext in all its forms is a discourse that is fundamentally heteronomous, auxiliary, and dedicated to the service of something other than itself that constitutes its *raison d'être*. This something is the text. Whatever aesthetic or ideological investment the author makes in a paratextual element (a "lovely title" or a preface-manifesto), whatever coquettishness or paradoxical reversal he puts into it, the paratextual element is always subordinate to "its" text, and this functionality determines the essence of its appeal and its existence.

But in contrast to the characteristics of place, time, substance, or pragmatic regime, the functions of the paratext cannot be described theoretically and, as it were, *a priori* in terms of status. The spatial, temporal, substantial, and pragmatic situation of a paratextual element is determined by a more or less free choice from among possible alternatives supplied by a general and uniform grid; and from these possible alternatives, only one term – to the exclusion of the others – can be adopted. A preface, for example, is necessarily (by definition) peritextual; it is original, later, or delayed; authorial or allographic; and so forth. This series of options and necessities strictly defines a status and therefore a type. Functional choices, however, are not of this alternative, exclusive, either-or kind. A title, a dedication or inscription, a preface, an interview can have several purposes at once, selected – without exclusion of all the others – from the (more or less open) repertory appropriate to each type of element (the title has its own functions, the dedication of the work its own, the preface takes care of other or sometimes the same functions), without prejudice to the subcategories specific to each paratextual element (a thematic title like *War and Peace* does not describe its text in exactly the same way a formal title like *Epistles* or *Sonnets* does; the stakes for an inscription of a copy are not those for a dedication of a work; a delayed preface does not have the same

purpose as an original preface, nor an allographic preface the same purpose as an authorial preface; and so forth). The functions of the paratext therefore constitute a highly empirical and highly diversified object that must be brought into focus inductively, genre by genre and often species by species. The only significant regularities one can introduce into this apparent contingency are to establish these relations of subordination between function and status and thus pinpoint various sorts of *functional types* and, as well, reduce the diversity of practices and messages to some fundamental and highly recurrent themes, for experience shows that the discourse we are dealing with here is more "constrained" than many others and is one in which authors innovate less often than they imagine.

As for the converging (or diverging) effects that result from the composition around a text of the whole of its paratext – and Lejeune has shown, apropos of autobiography, how delicately complex these effects may be – they can depend only on an individual, work-by-work analysis (and synthesis), at whose threshold a generic study like this inevitably leaves off. To provide a very elementary illustration (elementary because the structure in question is limited to two terms): a full title (or titular whole) like *Henri Matisse, Roman* [Aragon's *Henri Matisse, A Novel*] obviously contains a discordance between the title in the strict sense (*Henri Matisse*) and the genre indication (*Roman*) – a discordance that the reader is invited to resolve if he can (or at least to integrate into an oxymoronic figure of the type "to lie true" [*mentir vrai*]) and to which perhaps only the text will give him the key, which by definition is individual even if the formula seems likely to attract a following¹⁶ or, indeed, to become stereotyped into a genre.

One last point, which I hope is unnecessary: we are dealing here with a synchronic and not a diachronic study – an attempt at a general picture, not a history of the paratext. This remark is prompted not by any disdain whatever for the historical dimension but, once again, by the belief that it is appropriate to define objects before one studies their evolution. Indeed, basically this work consists of dissolving the empirical objects inherited from

¹⁶ Philippe Roger, *Roland Barthes, Roman* (Grasset, 1986).

tradition (for example, "the preface"), on the one hand analyzing them into more narrowly defined objects (the original authorial preface, the delayed preface, the allographic preface, and so forth) and on the other hand integrating them into broader wholes (the peritext, the paratext in general). Thus this work consists of bringing into focus categories that, until now, have been disregarded or misperceived. The articulation of these categories describes the paratextual field, and their establishment is a precondition for any attempt to provide historical perspective. Diachronic considerations will not, however, be omitted: this study, after all, bears on the most socialized side of the practice of literature (the way its relations with the public are organized), and at times it will inevitably seem something like an essay on the customs and institutions of the Republic of Letters. But diachronic considerations will not be set forth *a priori* as uniformly crucial, for each element of the paratext has its own history. Some of these elements are as old as literature; others came into being – or acquired their official status, after centuries of "secret life" that constitute their prehistory – with the invention of the book; others, with the birth of journalism and the modern media. Others disappeared in the meantime; and quite often some replace others so as to perform, for better or worse, an analogous role. Finally, some seem to have undergone, and to be undergoing still, a more rapid or more significant evolution than others (but stability is as much a historical fact as change is). For example, the title has its fashions – very obvious ones – which inevitably "date" any individual title the minute it is uttered; the authorial preface, in contrast, has changed hardly at all – except in its material presentation – since Thucydides. The general history of the paratext, punctuated by the stages of a technological evolution that supplies it with means and opportunities, would no doubt be the history of those ceaseless phenomena of sliding, substitution, compensation, and innovation which ensure, with the passing centuries, the continuation and to some extent the development of the paratext's efficacy. To undertake to write that general history, one would have to have available a broader and more comprehensive investigation than this one, which does not go beyond the bounds of Western culture or even often enough beyond French literature. Clearly, then, what follows is only a wholly inceptive exploration, at the very provi-

sional service of what – thanks to others – will perhaps come after. But enough of the excuses and precautions, the unavoidable themes or clichés, of every preface: no more dawdling on the threshold of the threshold.¹⁷

¹⁷ As one might suspect, this study owes much to suggestions from the various audiences who participated in its development. To everyone, my deep gratitude and my performative thanks.

Conclusion

However long – and, I fear, however fatiguing – this journey may have been, I must not conceal the fact that it is by no means exhaustive, nor was it meant to be. For one thing, each of these chapters merely skims over its subject at the very general level of a typology (this is really and truly only an introduction, and exhortation, to the study of the paratext); for another thing, this inventory of paratextual elements remains incomplete. Some elements (for example, the practices of non-European cultures) simply eluded me because I didn't pay much attention to them or have enough information about them. Other elements are not commonly used nowadays and my knowledge of them is too erratic for me to be able to study them in any meaningful way. For instance, certain elements of the documentary paratext that are characteristic of didactic works are sometimes appended, with or without playful intent, to works of fiction: Senancour's *Oberman* includes a sort of thematic index called "Indications," arranged in alphabetical order (Adversité, Aisance, Amitié [Adversity, Ease, Friendship] . . .); *Moby-Dick* opens with a comprehensive documentary dossier about whales; Updike's *Bech: A Book* ends with an imaginary bibliography of works by and studies about the hero (the studies are attributed apocryphally to real critics); the "appendix" of Perec's *Vie mode d'emploi* [*Life: A User's Manual*] contains a floor plan of the building, an index of persons and places, a chronology, a list of authors quoted, and an "Alphabetical Checklist of Some of the Stories Narrated in this Manual." Novelistic works like Zola's *Rougon-Macquart*, Thackeray's *Henry Esmond*, Nabokov's *Ada*, or Renaud Camus's *Roman roi* contain family trees constructed by the authors themselves.¹

¹ Actually, *Les Rougon-Macquart* contains two family trees, one published in 1878 with *Une Page d'amour*, the other in 1893 with *Le Docteur Pascal*, which shows the development of the system. See *Pléiade* 5:1777 et seq.

For the *Portable Faulkner* of 1946, Faulkner drew a map of Yoknapatawpha County; and Umberto Eco drew a plan of the abbey in *The Name of the Rose*. Still other elements, used more regularly, figure as little more than announcements – such as the dramatis personae for plays (but some novels, such as *Green Hills of Africa*, imitate this practice), which from the classical period onward includes a useful direction about place and, in our own time, often an equally valuable mention of the first cast. Beaumarchais adds various directions about dress and, most important of all, about the characters; everyone knows at least the directions ["Notes on the Characters and Their Costumes"] for *Le Mariage de Figaro*.

I have likewise left out three practices whose paratextual relevance seems to me undeniable, but investigating each one individually might demand as much work as was required here in treating this subject as a whole. The first of the three practices is *translation*, particularly when it is more or less revised or checked by the author, as Groethuysen's German version of *Les Nourritures terrestres* was by Gide; and all the more so when the entire task is undertaken by the author alone, in keeping with the established practice of a bilingual writer such as Beckett, each of whose translations must, in one way or another, serve as commentary on the original text.² The second practice, wholly different in kind, is *serial publication*,³ which is generally held to go back to *Robinson Crusoe* but which became widespread after 1836 and has continued right on up to our own day, with some vicissitudes.⁴ The operations – cuts and deletions – performed on texts at these times certainly do not always have the blessings of the author, who sometimes complains about them, but the particulars of the negotiations deserve close examination. Specialists (for France, notably specialists in Balzac⁵ and Zola) have already provided such examinations, but to my knowledge we

² But a commentary to be used with care, for the right to be unfaithful is an authorial privilege.

³ The norm is prepublication, but a book may be just as likely to go into serial publication after appearing in bookshops. This was exactly the case with *Robinson Crusoe* in 1719, and we know that Gide's *Caves du Vatican*, published in 1914, was reprinted in 1933 in *L'Humanité* after Vaillant-Couturier had somewhat forced the author's hand.

⁴ The first French novel published in serial form seems to have been Balzac's *Vieille Fille* in *La Presse*.

⁵ See R. Guise, *Balzac et le roman-feuilleton* (Plon, 1964).

lack a comprehensive historical study of the phenomenon – one that is of the utmost importance, for the massive fact is that, for a century and a half, hundreds of writers, including some of the greatest, accepted the disadvantages of such a system, which often ended up presenting the public first with a disfigured text pending publication in book form.⁶

The third of the three practices in itself constitutes an immense continent: that of *illustration*. This practice goes back at least to the ornamental capitals and illuminations of the Middle Ages, and its value as commentary, which sometimes has great force,⁷ involves the author's responsibility, not only when he provides the illustrations himself (Blake, Hugo, Thackeray, Cocteau, and many others) or commissions them in precise detail (see Rousseau's "subjects for engravings" for *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, a collection of instructions whose evocative liveliness is not always equaled by the engraver's performance) but also, and more indirectly, each time he accepts their presence. We know that such authors as Flaubert or James rejected illustrations on principle, either because they feared an unfaithful visualization or, more radically, because they objected to any kind of visualization whatsoever.⁸ All these positions indicate the authors' very keen sense of the paratextual capacity – whether apposite or ill advised – of illustrations. To examine this subject in its full scope, one would need not only the historical information I don't have but also a technical and iconological skill (think of the illustrations and frontispieces of the classical period) I will never have. Clearly, that study exceeds the means of a plain "literary person."

⁶ But we know that pirated editions, generally made in Belgium and called "préfaçons" [unauthorized preprints], often put into circulation volumes that had been typeset from the text of the serial. See P. Van der Perre, *Les Préfaçons belges* (Gallimard, 1941).

⁷ To measure the degrees of this force, we need only compare, for example, two cover illustrations: one (drawn by the author himself) is for *The Flounder* by Günther Grass, and the other is for *La Pensée sauvage* [*The Savage Mind*] by Lévi-Strauss. The illustration for *The Flounder* represents a flounder and therefore has only a corroborating, or redundant, value; the illustration for *La Pensée sauvage* represents a flower, and this immediately introduces an ambiguity that otherwise would probably have escaped some readers until they reached the pages where the author explains.

⁸ The second position is that of Flaubert, who expressed it several times and with the greatest energy. In one letter, for example, he describes himself as "fundamentally a born enemy of texts that explain drawings and drawings that explain texts." He continues, "My conviction about this is radical, and forms part of my aesthetic" (to A. Baudry, 1867 or 1868).

This is all the more true, undoubtedly, for the paratext outside of literature. For if we are willing to extend the term to areas where the work does not consist of a text, it is obvious that some, if not all, of the other arts have an equivalent of our paratext: examples are the title in music and in the plastic arts, the signature in painting, the credits or the trailer in film, and all the opportunities for authorial commentary presented by catalogues of exhibitions, prefaces of musical scores (see the 1841 foreword for Liszt's *Years of Pilgrimage*), record jackets, and other peritextual or epitextual supports. All of them could be subjects for investigations paralleling this one.⁹

What makes me all the less inclined to regret these provisional lacunae is that one of the methodological hazards attendant on a subject as multiform and tentacular as the paratext, it seems to me, is the imperialist temptation to annex to this subject everything that comes within its reach or seems possibly to pertain to it. Whatever the desire – inherent in any study (in any discourse) – to justify one's subject by magnifying it, to me the sounder and methodologically better course seems to be to react in the reverse way and, as I said apropos of notes, to apply the Occamian principle of economy, which deters us from multiplying "theoretical objects" unless the reason for doing so is of the utmost importance. Inasmuch as the paratext is a transitional zone between text and beyond-text, one must resist the temptation to enlarge this zone by whittling away in both directions. However indeterminable its boundaries, the paratext retains at its center a distinctive and undisputed territory where its "properties" are clearly manifest and which is constituted jointly by the types of elements I have explored in this book, plus some others. Outside of that, we will be wary of rashly proclaiming that "all is paratext."

The most essential of the paratext's properties, as we have observed many times (but, in concluding, I still want to insist on it), is functionality. Whatever aesthetic intention may come into play as well, the main issue for the paratext is not to "look nice" around the text but rather to ensure for the text a destiny consistent with the author's purpose. To this end, the paratext

⁹ See Françoise Escal, "Le Titre de l'œuvre musicale," and Charles Sala, "La Signature à la lettre et au figuré," both in *Poétique* 69 (February 1987).

provides a kind of canal lock between the ideal and relatively immutable¹⁰ identity of the text and the empirical (sociohistorical) reality of the text's public (if I may be forgiven these rough images), the lock permitting the two to remain "level." Or, if you prefer, the paratext provides an airlock that helps the reader pass without too much respiratory difficulty from one world to the other, a sometimes delicate operation, especially when the second world is a fictional one. Being immutable, the text in itself is incapable of adapting to changes in its public in space and over time. The paratext – more flexible, more versatile, always transitory because transitive – is, as it were, an instrument of adaptation. Hence the continual modifications in the "presentation" of the text (that is, in the text's mode of being present in the world), modifications that the author himself attends to during his lifetime and that after his death become the responsibility (discharged well or poorly) of his posthumous editors.

The relevance I accord to the author's purpose, and therefore to his "point of view," may seem excessive and methodologically very naive. That relevance is, strictly speaking, imposed by my subject, whose entire functioning is based – even if this is sometimes denied – on the simple postulate that the author "knows best" what we should think about his work. One cannot travel within the paratext without encountering this belief or, in a way, without assuming it as one of the elements of the situation, as an ethnologist does with an indigenous theory: the correctness of the authorial (and secondarily, of the publisher's) point of view is the implicit creed and spontaneous ideology of the paratext. This view, held almost unconditionally for centuries, is today, as we know, assailed for fairly diverse reasons, wherein a certain formalist approach ("There is no true meaning to a text") and a certain psychoanalytic approach ("There is a true meaning, but the author cannot know it") paradoxically hit it off well. This debate leaves me personally fairly perplexed, if not indifferent, but I don't think it has to be pursued here: valid or not, the author's viewpoint is part of the paratextual performance, sustains it, inspires it, anchors it. Once again, the critic is by no

¹⁰ Very relatively, of course, and very diversely: one has only to think of those medieval works of which no two texts are absolutely alike. But this "mouvance of the text" (Zumthor) has no connection to the *mouvance* of the public, which justifies the *mouvance* of the paratext.

means bound to subscribe to that viewpoint. I maintain only that, knowing it, he cannot completely disregard it, and if he wants to contradict it he must first assimilate it. Several times I have evoked the hermeneutic power of intimidation contained in just the title of *Ulysses*; and in Chapter 1, I suggested that a reader who was unaware of this title would perhaps no more "guess" the novel's Homeric reference than Julien Green would have guessed the "real" theme of Stendhal's *Armance* without the presence of some key. This unaware reader would read the novel differently, and to me this adverb involves no value judgment (Borges, if I am not mistaken, regarded the Homeric reference as factitious and useless). But that's how it is, this reader does not exist, and save for an experiment – itself factitious – à la Condillac,¹¹ he cannot exist. In a way, our study's whole thesis (if it is one) can be summed up in this obvious fact; and its whole lesson (if it is one) in this advice à la Wittgenstein, which follows from it: what one cannot ignore, one is better off knowing – that is, of course, acknowledging, and knowing that one knows it. (The effect of the paratext lies very often in the realm of influence – indeed, manipulation – experienced subconsciously. This mode of operation is doubtless in the author's interest, though not always in the reader's. To accept it – or, for that matter, to reject it – one is better off perceiving it fully and clearly. Such a consideration suffices, I hope, to justify if not this study of the paratext then at least another, or others, for which the deficiencies or defects of this one could provide the impetus.)

From the fact that the paratext always fulfills a function, it does not necessarily follow that the paratext always fulfills its function well. Several years of frequenting the paratext have at least convinced me of one thing that was not at all obvious to me *a priori*, and that is the great conscientiousness with which writers perform their paratextual duty (some would call it their paratextual drudgery). Contrary to the impression that could be created here and there by some behavior that is far too accommodating, most writers set their sights not on an immediate or facile success but indeed on a more fundamental and more "noble" success: having their work be interpreted correctly (according to their lights). The main impediment to the effective-

¹¹ [A (fictive) experiment that presumes a subject who is reared under a special artificial set of conditions.]

ness of the paratext generally does not arise from a poor understanding of its objectives but rather from the perverse effect (hard to avoid or control) that we have met several times under the whimsical name of the *Jupien effect*: like all relays, the paratext sometimes tends to go beyond its function and to turn itself into an impediment, from then on playing its own game to the detriment of its text's game. The way to neutralize this danger is obvious, and most authors manage to do it: use a light touch. Actually, the same principle holds (or should hold) for the author as for the reader and is summed up by this simple slogan: *watch out for the paratext!*

Nothing, in fact, would be more unfortunate, in my opinion, than to replace some idol of the closed Text – which held sway over our literary consciousness for one or two decades and which has now been destabilized, thanks in large part (as we have seen) to scrutiny of the paratext – with a new and even more hollow fetish: the paratext. [The paratext is only an assistant, only an accessory of the text. And if the text without its paratext is sometimes like an elephant without a mahout, a power disabled, the paratext without its text is a mahout without an elephant, a silly show.] Consequently the discourse on the paratext must never forget that it bears on a discourse that bears on a discourse, and that the meaning of its object depends on the object of this meaning, which is yet another meaning. A threshold exists to be crossed.¹²

¹² [On *threshold*, see Chapter 1, note 3.] *Postscript of December 16, 1986*. Like Walter Scott's postillion who asks for a tip, I take advantage of this last bit of space available for communication to draw attention to two undoubtedly important volumes that I have become aware of only now, when returning the proofs of this book: Margherita Di Fazio Alberti, *Il titolo e la funzione paraletteraria* (Turin: ERI, 1984), and Arnold Rothe, *Der Literarische Titel: Funktionen, Formen, Geschichte* (Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1986). I also draw attention to two articles: Laurent Mailhot, "Le Métatexte camusien: Titres, dédicaces, épigraphes, préfaces," *Cahiers Albert Camus* 5 (Gallimard, 1985), and Jean-Louis Chevalier, "La Citation en épigraphe dans *Tristram Shandy*," in *L'Ente et la chimère* (Université de Caen, 1986). Finally, I add this to the list of titles inspired by Raymond Roussel's title (on page 368): the wonderful *Pourquoi je n'ai écrit aucun de mes livres* [*Why I Have Not Written Any of My Books*] by Marcel Bénabou (Hachette, 1986).