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ABSTRACT

This project fills several substantial lacunae in Achebe letters. First, it provides a chronological bibliography of the 1950-1975 Achebe corpus. This establishes for the first time a comprehensive and accurate illustration of the relationships among all published Achebe texts from 1950 to 1975 and among those texts and related manuscripts, particularly noting text revisions over the life of each text. Second, it creates color-coded variorum text documents for each publication. These text documents, for the first time incorporate all textual evidence for a specific publication, tracking all text mutations, both compositional and publication variations. The formatting of the variorum texts is guided by social text theory that gives equal attention to all composition and publication mutation in order to demonstrate the synchronic and diachronic movement of each text. As such it presumes in advance no link between multiple versions and a progression of authorial intent or authorial teleology in order that the stages of completion might be appraised in relation to all others. Taken together, the chronological bibliography and the variorum text documents provide extensive evidence that text mutation is present across all genres of Achebe letters, including critical essays, poems, short stories, and novels. A survey of past textualist approaches to Achebe’s works reveals only minimal attention to text mutations in Achebe fiction and exposes the dearth of textual approaches to Achebe’s non-fiction, poetry, and manuscripts. The failure to take Achebe’s compositional and publication mutations into consideration ignores important evidence of evolving aesthetic and rhetorical responses to changing historical moments. A sample reading of one non-fiction text illustrates the issues at
stake when text mutation is ignored and establishes the study’s core claim that a textual materialist approach is the *sine qua non* for future Achebe critical studies. Finally, the study establishes text mutation as an ongoing element in post-1975 Achebe letters and calls for a comprehensive, chronological bibliography and the creation of variorum text documents for subsequent Achebe publications and manuscripts.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

“Arrow of God has ardent admirers as well as ardent detractors. To the latter nothing more need be said. To the others I can only express the hope that the changes I have made will meet with their approval. But in the nature of things there may well be some so steadfast in their original affection that they will see these changes as uncalled for or even unjustified. Perhaps changes are rarely called for or justified, and yet we keep making them.


“Note. The old order in conflict with the new [sic] is the early version…of what is widely known as “Beginning of the end” [sic]. Both texts are almost similar, the second being because of certain suppressions a shorter version of the former. We are underlying in the first text those passages or expressions which have been suppressed from the second. Although the changes may appear minor, they show the importance of rewriting in Achebe’s creative performances with a direct influence on rationality and the general poetic atmosphere of the world which is presented here.”

--Editor’s note appended to first page of Marriage is a Private Affair (Ms Eng 1406: Item 25, Chinua Achebe Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University), a short story in an unpublished collection edited by G. D. Killam and Thomas Melone (ca. 1970)

“There is nothing else to say about Achebe; we have eaten his flesh, we have scraped his bone, cracked them and extracted the marrow.”

---Dr. Chinyere Nwahuanya, 2007 African Literature Association

Taken collectively, the epigraphs above outline a fundamental and unrecognized problem in Achebe scholarship. The first epigraph establishes textual mutation as a central, ongoing component of Achebe’s work and links the mutations in the text to the highly contested space of cultural negotiation and change. The second epigraph, taken from an unpublished critical edition of Achebe short stories, explicitly links such mutations with the mechanisms utilized to create a literature that has become representative of the African world. Since a comprehensive, critical assessment of these changes in the Achebe corpus remains an enormous lacuna in critical approaches to Achebe’s literary production, the declaration of the end of Achebe criticism in the third epigraph is most certainly premature. At the core of this project is an Ezekiel vision: bringing new life to Achebe criticism through a textualist materialist approach to Achebe letters
whereby all extant texts are gathered back together into one complete chronological bibliography and multiple text versions or mutations are brought front and center in order to reconstitute the Achebe corpus. This project includes the most up-to-date and complete chronological bibliography of the 1950-1975 Achebe corpus, establishing the relationships among all published texts and manuscripts. Compiled from numerous books, articles, bibliographies, and library archives and double-checked against actual publication documents, this bibliography exists nowhere else. Such a bibliography highlights little-referenced Achebe texts as well as one text included in no other bibliography to date. For the first time, all available manuscripts are included. Furthermore, the bibliography unearths many early African publications not referenced in current Achebe bibliographies, highlighting the role of African publishing in the early establishment of Achebe letters.

The second part of the project, the creation of color-coded variorum text documents for all published texts and manuscripts in the 1950-1975 corpus, allows both a diachronic and synchronic reading of each text. Intra-textual dependencies are also noted for each variorum text. The variorum text documents establish widespread evidence of text mutation across all genres, including critical essays, poems, short stories, and novels. To date, no critical assessment of Achebe manuscripts exists. Thus the variorum text documents present both compositional mutations alongside publication mutations for the first time. Tracking the kinds of mutations that occur and forming a general outline of these mutations over time provides the requisite precondition for any critical discussion of these mutations. The text documents allow a new awareness of how each text variation functions in its particular historical moment within the contemporary literary debates over modern African literature, as well as within the rapidly changing social and political climate in which these texts were produced.
The lack of critical attention since the early 1980s to Achebe’s chronological production has historical roots in the post-World War II literary critical environment in which Achebe was educated and began to write. Developments in textual and literary theory, beginning with New Criticism’s tenet of intentional fallacy, shifted the critical focus away from authorial intent and towards reader-response readings of the text. Most traditional textual scholars, influenced by biblical and Shakespearean text critics, functioned within the supposition that a careful collection and collation of all existing textual evidence would evince the primacy and prevalence of various line readings, thereby elucidating the original authorial intent for a text. Their critical practice had one goal: creating an authorized, definitive text that best represented what an author intended for the text, or a text as close as possible to the “transparent conduit of an author’s unmediated words” (Bornstein 8). New Critics denied the assumption that an author’s intent was even important, advocating instead a critical focus on the text itself as a measure of its own meaning. Any acknowledgement of multiple versions of a text only reified authorial intent, since variations were indicators of the authorial agency they hoped to dethrone as the sole determinant of a text’s meaning. In the 1960s and 1970s, structuralism and post-structuralism as applied to literary criticism considered the notion of the intentional fallacy foundational for its reader-focused critical methodologies, but for different reasons. Structuralist readings focused on the invariant structure of a text in order to understand how each text resolved inherent narrative tensions. Since elements within the narrative only have meaning in relation to other elements, the existence of multiple versions that destabilized the structure of the narrative, at the least, exponentially expanded the parameters of the analysis. At most, multiple versions seriously interrogated any presupposition of an “invariant structure.” While post-structuralist thought emerged in part as a response to structuralism’s ahistorical methodology, which favored
deterministic structural forces, post-structuralism also accepted the fiction of an authorized text as an ahistorical object. Post-structuralism depended upon a stable text in order to illustrate how multiple readers, through a variety of perspectives, create a multifaceted, even conflicting, interpretation of an invariant text, as meaning shifts within the destabilized space between signifier and signified. Thus New Criticism, structuralism, and post-structuralism all depended upon a single, unified, and coherent, but quite arbitrary selection of, a text. The seeming divide between traditional textualist studies and developments in literary theory in fact served each one equally well, since “both posit a unique status for the art work as well wrought urn, at once unitary, authoritative, and superior to historical contingency” (Bornstein 5).

As traditional textualist studies grew out of fashion by the early 1980s, textualists began to incorporate ideas derived from structuralism and post-structuralism, challenging long-held assumptions in their field about authorial intent. These challenges centered on the limitations of editorial practice in the creation of authoritative texts. Traditionalists who clung to the concept of authorial intent insisted on a robust editorial authority that should choose a “best text” from a comparison of all versions, even to the extent that an editor might choose an earlier version over an author’s later emended version if the editor felt that later mutations did not adhere to the author’s original impulse or controlling force of the text. Despite its insistence on one final version, this approach acknowledged that an author might, in fact, have conflicting or varying intents over time for the same text. Others, less sure of the existence of a “best” authorial intent, refused to promote any one version over another, preferring the equal presentation of all versions of a text as representative of multiple authorial intent. The latter group’s approach, expanded to include editorial collaboration with an author, and even the publisher’s ongoing process of moving a composition into production, became associated with social text theory that sought a
greatly expanded notion of “text” beyond the linguistic page. As social text theorists gained acceptance among textualists, their insistence on a materialist textual approach impacted post-structuralist assumptions about the ahistorical, unitary text. Textualists now cautioned literary critics about their own naïve assumptions about a text: “Any text is an edited text, and critics and theorists neglect the principles of its editing and construction at their peril” (Bornstein 8-9).

Cultural materialists, and postcolonial theorists in particular, during the same historical period gave no more critical attention to textual issues than had European literary theorists in the postwar period. In “Beyond Postcolonial Césaire: Reading Cahier d’un retour au pays Historiquement,” A. James Arnold of the University of Virginia argues that the theory of the postcolonial has been “strong on the enabling discourse but weak on the history and details of cultural production” (259). Critics, for instance, have failed to note the four successive versions of Césaire’s Cahier, although text mutations in each version evince a development from a biblical, prophetic text to a surrealist text, to a socialist-realist text (258). In the same way, few critics addressed textual mutation in Achebe’s work beyond a few short stories and one novel.

Even when Africanist scholar Bernth Lindfors tried to bring a kind of historical perspective to the literary development of established African writers by comparing early juvenilia to later, more mature works, he was met with a strong negative response. For example, Nobel Laureate Wole Soyinka, stung by Lindfors’ conclusions, in his Inaugural lecture at the University of Ife, Nigeria in October 1980 declaimed: “The lucrative business of juvenile hagiography of everything that moves on two feet from pop stars to syndicated criminals is of course very much the life-style of American letters. It is to be hoped that it never becomes a way of life here (qtd. in Gibbs 16).” Soyinka’s rather odd use of the term “hagiography” to describe Lindfors’ critical assessment of his early work perhaps implies Soyinka’s unspoken expectations
of reverential treatment on the part of literary critics based on his elevated status among “pop stars and syndicated criminals.” On the one hand, Soyinka evidently despises the general practice of hagiography. On the other hand, he appears angry his hagiographer is insufficiently hagriographical. Whatever the case, other Nigerian critics, both at home and abroad, shied away from Lindfors’ approach and have made no further assessment of Soyinka’s early production. This critical omission on the part of African scholars extends to Achebe’s manuscripts or production versions. Lindfors, on the other hand, has continued unearthing important early texts with *Early Soyinka* (2008) and *Early Achebe* (2009), although much of the material for his latest books has been previously published elsewhere. Current critical reception from African critics has been largely positive for Lindfors’ contributions, but this was not the case in the early 1980s, when textual materialist approaches to Achebe virtually stopped.

Postcolonial critics perhaps avoided textual materialist concerns because they feared that dwelling on the coming-into-being of a work would undermine the lingering idealized and solidly humanist notion of “divine (or poetic) inspiration.” For the African author, that inspiration was reconfigured, or at least overlaid with, the “authentic” or recognizable African speaking subject. Focusing on the contingencies of composition, as the textualist materialist approach does, touches upon a particularly sensitive place in modern African writing—namely, the fear that the mechanism of emendation should be taken as a lack of surety or cohesion of being. The need for African authors such as Soyinka to “always have been,” is directly linked to the issue of that “authentic” voice. Many African critics archly noted that Barthes’ “death of the author” neatly coincided with the rise of the postcolonial modern author. Just as African authors began to write narratives designed to construct what Africans themselves recognized as African subjectivity, European critical theory now eschewed the “autonomous, liberal humanist subject
“(Schultz 5), as a construct that must be jettisoned along with authorial intent, pulling the theoretical rug out from under these emerging authors. Since the debate over authorial intent was an interrogation of the humanist subject, appropriating textualist materialist concerns depended in part upon accepting the concept of the fractured subject, a proposition most Africans were reluctant to do.

Some of Chinua Achebe’s first interviews after the publication of Things Fall Apart (1958) address this issue of authenticity; Achebe’s parents were African Anglican missionaries and Achebe had been educated in British government schools and at University College, Ibadan, the first British university established in Nigeria. Achebe had to defend his first-hand knowledge of traditional Nigerian culture even to his African interviewers, to the point of declaring, “I don’t particularly spend a lot of time polishing. As a matter of fact, Things Fall Apart was written straight, without any kind of draft (Lindfors Conversations 12),” although later interviews suggest otherwise. Achebe’s practice of making changes to already published texts might have been taken for an ambivalent or tentative relationship to his African heritage. More significantly, text mutations designed to more accurately reflect an “authentic” African character or worldview could be seen as evidence of his compromised status, given the generally static views of African culture in the west. “Real Africans” would “naturally” have an “uncorrupted,” even “pure” connection with their language and environment that would preclude any assimilation of alien cultural elements.

The rapid and widespread acceptance of Achebe’s novels as just such an authentic African assertion in the late 1950s and 1960s was testament to a vast lacuna in world literature: a modern African novel composed by an African author. Achebe’s works, speedily joined by many other African novelists, came to be regarded as an antidote to the simplistic European literary
renderings, if not distortions of, the African character. The African writer hoped to render a more realistic African world, a world that had been historically misunderstood and therefore misrepresented, even vilified, in facets of the European academy. Such a portrayal could become a means to counter those misrepresentations used as justification for European political and economic assimilation. Yet modern African novelists were all too aware of having to live and write at a crossroads of cultures, at once African and western.

As an undergraduate in the early 1950s, Achebe, along with other African students, had engaged their European professors in strenuous debate over who could or even should speak for the “real” African. On the one hand, Europeans argued that Africans were not yet ready to take the world stage in any field—literary, political, or otherwise. Europeans who had studied and ruled Africans for many years felt they knew Africans as well as, if not better than, Africans knew themselves. Africans, they argued, were not sophisticated enough to speak to their own condition. On the other hand, Africans educated in European-style schools in order to function within the colonial system could not be considered “authentic” since their assimilation into European culture alienated them from traditional African culture. As the product of colonial school systems, often educated abroad, these “evolués” were denigrated both as “not yet Europeans” and as not “real Africans.” Both “sides” of the argument had the same purpose: maintaining European hegemony.

Achebe’s works illuminated the power structure that disrupted any possibility for a unitary human subject in colonial and postcolonial Africa. In Things Fall Apart (1958) and No Longer At Ease (1960), novels written while Achebe was still a British colonial subject, the protagonists’ choices at critical moments fate them for destruction. Both the traditional African chief who hopes to preserve traditional Igbo values, and the European educated civil servant who tries to
adopt European ones, are trapped in a false dialectic and are destroyed. In the colonial world, a person’s “choice” can only be framed in a world where Europeans “hold both the knife and the yam”. To then have African subjectivity subjected to a prevailing European literary criticism that dissociated a text from its historical milieu or the biography of its author and elevated subjectivity to a textual “construction” flattened African/European power relations into false textual equivalencies. But not really, for although African textual constructions were theoretically as valid as any of those constructed by western scholars, early modern African writing was judged inferior by European aesthetic standards, which also “held the knife and the yam”.

The crucial test for modern African writers was to shape a novel, a European aesthetic form, into an appropriate vehicle that could carry the African experience. The second epigraph at the beginning of the chapter describes this mechanism of creating a modern African literature as a process of suppressions or omissions of western elements whereby an authentic “rationality” and “general poetic atmosphere” of the African world and mindset—its modes of thought and its aesthetic sources—is realized. But neither the traditional textual approach privileging the first intent for a text as its governing force nor the growing acceptance in textualist studies of multiple intents adequately theorized an African author’s colonial condition. In a traditional textualist approach, later textual mutations in a text might be taken as evidence that “corruptions” or “inauthenticities” existed in the initial compositional moment. Because that initial compositional moment was associated with the romantic notion of both the unitary human subject and the “pure” or “authentic” African subject, evidence that some elements of the texts were later removed or altered in order for a more “real Africa” to emerge, might undermine Achebe’s claim to have a more “authentic” African voice than most Europeans writing about Africa. Thus the
definition of text mutations as “corruptions,” fails to take into consideration that text mutations such as omissions, revisions, and substitutions might be a purifying process whereby “corruptive” European elements might be removed.

The rise of cultural materialist critics more interested in a specific ideological critique coincided with the post-war moment in European critical literary theory when the notion of the intentional fallacy was embraced along with the unitary text. These critics were not interested in the progressive, historical development of the postcolonial critique and by extension, were not interested text mutation. That lack of attention provided a kind of shelter, if you will, in which a modern African literature could develop. As the second epigraph notes, addressing text mutations brings the constructed nature of African literature to the fore. The decision not to publish a critical edition of Achebe’s short stories may be as significant a clue about what conditions helped create this “authentic” African literature as a historical comparison of mutations in the versions. If a traditional textualist methodology had been applied at the time to rapidly mutating texts in order to establish a definitive text, such an approach would have suppressed the multiple mutations of early modern African letters, texts often modified in order to respond to rapidly evolving aesthetic, social, and political conditions. It is in this sense that the lack of critical attention to mutations helped create an imaginative space in which modern African writers could create a recognizable African world peopled with recognizable African characters.

If a textual materialist approach has not historically been applied to African writing, African critics have embraced other parts of textual theory. The current popularity in textual studies of “a socialized concept of authorship and textual authority” (McGann Critique 8) that assesses the entire history of a text’s production from composition to publication and
republication, has found common ground with historical descriptions of the relationship of African writers and European publishing houses. The larger issues of publication and production and the roles that authors do or do not play in that process are important avenues of inquiry for understanding the development of modern African literature. In a recent interview with Achebe in *Transition*, Moore and Heath present Achebe with multiple, chronological versions of the cover art for his seminal novel *Things Fall Apart* (1958). Achebe comments that he had no role in the decisions about any of the cover art of his publications, revealing a prevailing lack of control by the early modern African writer over his or her own literary production.

The missing component in the application of a social text theory to African letters is the lack of attention to linguistic text mutation as a necessary corollary to the social mutation of the text, particularly when the relations of production frame the Achebe linguistic text. A. James Arnold argues that the lack of attention to the history and details of cultural production results in several types of critical errors. For instance, courses in postcolonial theory often pick and choose elements of cultural production that adhere only to ideologically driven readings. Such readings of texts simplify and compress the rich rhetorical history of postcolonial writing. Of particular concern, Arnold submits, is the neglect of successive revisions and publications of an author’s texts, a neglect that may produce factual errors when historical details or theoretical positions in an author’s final versions or publications are read back in time into first versions or publications of that text. A general neglect in postcolonial critical practice of producing reliable historical editions of major writers further contributes to this state of affairs in postcolonial studies (259).

Social text theory, combined with the foundational work of this project, the creation of synoptic text documents for all mutations of the 1950-1975 Achebe corpus, opens up multiple areas of critical assessment to the interplay of composition and production. Furthermore, this
approach addresses the issue of “authenticity” as it functions in the establishment of early African aesthetic norms and as it relates to textualist terminology regarding “authoritative texts,” or the relative position of a text to the original moment of composition, a most idealized moment of “pure, unedited” communication. While such an overarching approach to postcolonial writing must be utilized, the scope of this project primarily establishes what evidence exists for Achebe’s compositions and productions for given texts as a foundation upon which to make the aforementioned critical assessments. Without this critical textual evidence, much of what scholars proffer as a materialist approach to a text are in fact “not materialist enough,” but rather “innocent or primitive in their treatment of a book as a literal material object” (Bornstein 8).

Certainly Achebe scholarship in the last thirty years has not applied an historical approach to Achebe production, thus reifying a unitary status for his texts; however, some attention was given to multiple text versions in the 1960s and 1970s. Achebe himself only briefly notes text mutations: in the preface to the second edition of his book of poems, *Beware Soul-Brother: poems* (1972), and in the second edition of *Arrow of God* (1974). No mention is made of changes in republications of critical essays or in his short stories. When Achebe’s published texts are subject to both editorial and authorial mutation, mutations primarily occur in compilations of when previously published poems, short stories, and essay texts. For the novels, only *Arrow of God* appears in a second edition. The first collection of Achebe texts, *The Sacrificial Egg and Other Short Stories* (Etudo Press, 1962), is a revised chapbook collection of five previously published stories. This marks one moment of authorial text emendation primarily centered on bringing stylistic elements and English usage into line with the fictional world of the characters. Since the advent of his first published university texts, Achebe had become an established literary figure with the publication of the novels *Things Fall Apart* (1958) and *No
Longer At Ease (1960) and more confident in his artistic rendering of the African world. Critical interest in Achebe’s early compositional history and the desire to introduce African readers into African schools prompted the publication of the chapbook.

The five years just after the Nigerian Civil War (1967-1970) marks the second period of intensive revision. Achebe’s poetry is collected into three rapidly succeeding publications, each an emended and revised version of the previous one: BEWARE, SOUL-BROTHER and Other Poems (Nwankwo-Ifejike, 1971), BEWARE, SOUL BROTHER: poems (Heinemann, 1972) and Christmas in Biafra and other Poems (Anchor-Doubleday, 1973). Extensive emendations and rearrangement mark the Heinemann and Anchor-Doubleday versions from the Nwankwo-Ifejike publication of Achebe’s collected poems. The Heinemann and Anchor-Doubleday versions also rearrange the poems in a progression from pre-war, war, and post-war texts; however, the poems do not reflect a compositional chronology. Achebe wrote a second edition of Arrow of God (1974), removing “structural weaknesses.” He also collected a heavily revised edition of short stories entitled Girls at War and Other Stories (Heinemann, 1972), which he revised again a year later under the same title (Anchor-Doubleday, 1973). Achebe’s mature mastery of the short story form, evinced in new compositions such as “The Madman” and “Girls at War,” results in new authorial versions of earlier published short stories. Achebe heavily revised previously published essays and adds letters and speeches for Morning Yet On Creation Day (Heinemann, 1975), the first collection of critical essays, revised again by Achebe for the United States market (Anchor-Doubleday 1975). This first non-fiction collection presents a comprehensive picture of Achebe’s critical positions, although the essays are not presented chronologically by date of publication. In fact, the first essay, “Colonialist Criticism,” is the last composed, yet establishes the framework within which to understand the rest of the texts.
The lack of complete and accurate acknowledgements in the publication of Achebe’s works plague these collections. Two scholars, M. J. C. Echeruo and Austin Shelton, both drew limited attention to textual changes in specific Achebe short stories. M. J. C. Echeruo, collector and editor of *The Sacrificial Egg and Other Stories* (1962), Achebe’s first collection of short stories, perfunctorily cites title changes to “The Old Order in Conflict with New” (1952) and “Short Story” (1952) previously published in *The University Herald*, but not with any specific rationale in mind. He does not mention changes made in the text itself in previous versions of either of these stories, nor in the previously published “Chike’s School Days,” (*The Rotarian* 1960), “The Sacrificial Egg” (*The Atlantic* 1959), and “Akueke” (*Reflections* 1962). Neither does he mention changes in how these texts were framed in previous publications, such as the removal of explanatory notes for Igbo words originally part of *The Atlantic* version that are omitted in his version of “The Sacrificial Egg.”

Similar omissions of text versions characterized African literature anthologies as well. Austin Shelton’s treatment of one of Achebe’s short stories in *The African Assertion: A Critical Anthology of African Literature* (1968) makes a bid for a rationale regarding changes in Achebe’s short story “The Sacrificial Egg” by drawing attention to how specific stylistic changes in the text between an earlier and later version “function and the significance of the alteration in relation to the passage in which it occurs and to the story as a whole, or to its meaning in relation to matters extraneous to the actual story” (50). Shelton does not define the significance of those changes within the passage or the story, nor does he suggest how those changes are related to “matters extraneous”. He notes that the version of “The Sacrificial Egg” included in his collection is the “author’s latest” version written in 1966. (In fact the version included is the fourth version of the story, having already been published in *The Atlantic* (1959), *The Sacrificial
Egg and Other Stories (1962), and The Eagle (1965), although Shelton does not specifically cite these versions.) Shelton heavily glosses the short story with explanatory notes for Igbo words and other cultural references, a text clearly intended for the non-Igbo reader unfamiliar with places, names, and foods referenced in the text. Furthermore, he numbers each paragraph in order to reference specific passages included in a “Critical Exercise” immediately following the short story text. Shelton does not thoroughly examine all publication versions of the short story. In the “Exercise,” Shelton lists “additions, deletions, and substitutions,” but only compares Achebe’s “latest text” to the 1965 version without noting mutations from the 1959 or 1962 versions.

Incomplete and inaccurate acknowledgements plague the British Heinemann and Anchor-Double versions of Achebe’s post-war collections of short stories and critical essays. Such erasure through omission, partial information, or erroneous information dissociates the early versions of these texts, their production history, from the latest versions in collected form. By extension, the lack of acknowledgment of previous publication information and emendations shaped the critical evidence available for Achebe scholarship, a field which already had little interest in textual mutation. For instance, in the British Heinemann version of Girls at War and Other Stories (1972), notes text emendations for “The Madman” published the previous year. The acknowledgements also cite a “shorter version” of “The Sacrificial Egg,” published in the Atlantic Monthly, but none of the intervening versions prior to its collection here. “Marriage is a Private Affair,” it states, “was first published under a different title” but neither its first title, “The Old Order in Conflict with the New,” nor its next title, “Beginning of the End” is mentioned. Nothing is said of text mutations in “Dead Men’s Path” and “Uncle Ben’s Choice,” although previous publication citations are included. These errors are repeated in the Anchor-
Doubleday version. Similar omissions exist in the acknowledgements in the Anchor-Doubleday edition of *Morning Yet On Creation Day* (1975), but to an even greater degree. This edition of Achebe’s critical essays only notes the occasion for some of the texts and the year of each text’s first publication, but provides little specific bibliographic information and makes no mention of any text mutations.

An historical survey of the critical treatments of Achebe text mutations reveals that the lacuna outlined earlier has been primarily patched over with haphazard and outdated publications. The best critical treatments were published in the 1970s and early 1980s in response to the revised edition of *Arrow of God* (1974). A year after its publication, Alastair Niven, in “Another Look At *Arrow of God*” (1975) denies that the second edition is a “significant reappraisal of the work” (53), since “Achebe has flirted with revision but mercifully has resisted any temptation for wholesale ‘improvement’” (54). But Niven characterizes the two significant mutations Achebe makes, a shortened song and the omission of an African folk tale, as concessions to European aesthetic standards that unfortunately weaken its African content, specifically examples of African oral tradition (66). On the one hand, Niven acknowledges Achebe’s authority as an author to make changes to his own text, allowing for Achebe’s growth as an artist: “Implicit in a novelist’s decision to re-write certain areas of his fiction must be a vague apprehension that all was not well the first time around (53).” On the other hand, Niven specifically associates this “vague apprehension” with a general reassessment of the Achebe’s place in the world, “…pausing now, as the trauma of civil war and the disillusion of its aftermath settle in his consciousness…” (53). Furthermore, Niven argues that the second edition is merely Achebe’s prerogative “to try new forms…” (53), implicitly suggesting that the second edition is not a better version but a different one. Niven does not assess the hundreds of word variations
and formatting choices that characterize the second edition. Instead, Niven minimizes the extent of these text mutations by only citing the loss of African cultural elements: “…Achebe has shortened a song and cut an archetypal tale…” (66).

A year later in his article, “Achebe’s Revisions of Arrow of God” (1976) Robert Wren concurs with Niven’s general conclusion that Achebe’s changes do not constitute a wholesale revision of the text: “…there is only one structural change of significance; for the rest, his cuts, additions, and substitutions are all stylistic or merely typographical” (53). He disagrees with Niven that the loss of the full folktale in chapter sixteen diminishes the second edition. Instead, he privileges Achebe’s authorial and editorial assessment that its original inclusion was a structural weakness that should now be removed. Wren concludes, “Achebe has answered the question: the story is not consequential, it is not relevant to the priest’s [Ezeulu’s] state of mind…” (54). Equally dismissive of another significant omission of African oral tradition, Wren states he only mentions the loss of the song in chapter six because “it reduces the novel’s length by more than one page” (55). Wren discounts production variations as “inconsequential,” changes such as the new typesetting for the second edition, which “shortens the book as well as easing the eye,” and the “greater (if somewhat erratic) use of italic print for sacred speech…indirect speech, quotations within quotations, and non-English words” (54). While bowing to Achebe’s judgment concerning the omission of cultural elements, Wren seems perplexed by Achebe’s “hundreds of changes in wording” (54) and concludes they stem from Achebe’s “fastidiousness in style” (54). These changes “lack substance” (55), he argues, because they “make no difference in sense” (54).

Despite what appears to be a wholesale dismissal of these numerous, smaller mutations, Wren goes on to acknowledge that changes in elements of the text in fact impact the overall
meaning of a passage: “Less literally, it may be that the stylistic changes go further, some having structural significance (53).” For instance, he notes that the changes in the passage describing Ezeulu’s direct communication with the god Ulu intensify Ezeulu’s submission before his god, provide definitive evidence that the god Idemili preceded the existence of Ulu, and foreshadow Ezeulu’s slide into madness when Ulu laughs: “Only the insane could sometimes approach the menace and mockery in the laughter of deities…(56).” Wren concludes that perhaps most significant for the interpretation of the novel may be Achebe’s preface to the second edition linking Ezeulu’s fate with a ritual sacrifice made in atonement for the defection of his people (58), much like the crucifixion’s power of atonement in Christian belief, the religion that replaces traditional religious practice among the villagers by the end of the novel.

The previous examples of assessments of Achebe’s mutations illustrate the move from Echeruo’s simple acknowledgement of title variations in Achebe’s short stories in the early 1960s, to Shelton’s 1968 suggestion that text mutations, besides functioning to modify specific passages or the overall story might also resonate with broader aesthetic choices. The critical response to Achebe’s text variations in the 1970s centered primarily on the second edition of *Arrow of God*. Niven feared that Achebe’s mutations were a kind of cultural acquiescence to European aesthetic preferences. Wren, while respecting Achebe’s choices for change, is the first to begin to look more closely at how smaller mutations alter the meaning of the text in more subtle, but perhaps no less powerful, ways.

It is Bruce King’s treatment of textual variation in his short article, “The Revised *Arrow of God*” in *Chinua Achebe: Arrow of God et ses critiques* (1980), that most thoroughly grapples with the multiple text mutations in the second edition of *Arrow of God* (1974). King cites neither Niven’s nor Wren’s previous treatments and comes to quite different conclusions about the
nature of the differences between the first and second editions. King divides his critique between
the first and second halves of the novel, noting that while the “largest number or changes are in
the early chapters, there is probably no chapter in the second edition that has not been in some
way modified, and the later chapters of the book contain the most significant revisions” (89).
Although in the preface to the second edition, Achebe cites structural weaknesses in the first
edition as the occasion for the changes he makes, King states “…revisions are extensive and are
more of style and technique than ‘structural’” (89). Furthermore, “A detailed study of the
changes in the second edition would require a small monograph; it is possible here only to
summarise the kinds and effects of the revisions (89).”

Sampling changes in chapter one, King lists the following categories of stylistic text
mutations: syntax and word-order; additional information: setting, descriptions, etc.; verbal
economy; deletion of explanations; substitutions; internalization; accuracy; improved English
(King suggests that removing Igbo words makes it “more readable”); and Nigerian usage (93).
King draws several conclusions from these mutations: “The language of narration and the
dialogue is more in keeping with the enclosed world of the village,” since “English clichés are
replaced with phrases that sound more Nigerian and are more appropriate to the characters” (94)
and because the “narration is more internalized as if seen and felt from within the perspective of
the characters” (94), making it less didactic (91). “In general the sentences are more emphatic,
precise and dramatic (in the sense of arising from the response or interplay of the characters)”
(94), which “contribute towards a greater concentration on the action, on the texture of local
society, and on feelings” (93).

Unfortunately, King’s sound conclusions are based on a somewhat vague terminology,
primarily because he does not link “Nigerian usage,” what he defines as turns of phrase that
“sound more Nigerian,” to seamlessly embedded cultural information. He cites the text mutation from the first edition, “that the white man should come from so far to tell them the truth,” to the second edition, “that the white man whose father or mother no one knew should come to tell them the truth,” as better “Nigerian usage” (93). King neglects to note that the change in wording “sounds Nigerian” because the new phrase reflects the Nigerian sociological value (knowledge of ancestors) for building a foundation of communal trust, now embedded in the narrative in a non-didactic way. In addition, King compounds his lack of specificity by confusing categories. Under examples of “substitutions,” he explains the text mutation from “what” to “the part” (“This is what we do not understand,” to “This is the part we do not understand,”) as a movement from wording that is “vague and British” to one that is “stronger and sounds Nigerian” (92).

King’s analysis of the second part of *Arrow of God* functions at the macro level of the “craft of fiction,” which he defines as “the creation of character and how the English language can be used to show an active, dignified Igbo culture” (94). He notes the deletion or abbreviation of “anthropological material which often filled novels of cultural assertion during the independence period at the expense of narrative speed and focus” (95), including geographical descriptions in chapter four; Obiageli’s song in chapter six (reduced from 40 to 5 lines); and Ugoye’s tale (truncated from four and a half pages to six lines) (95). In addition, the shift to italics instead of single quotation marks for interior monologue, prayer and some public speeches as well as speeches that are reported by characters “clears up various ambiguities about who is speaking and contributes to the refocusing of the novel’s perspective more on the psychology of the characters than on a record of communal life” (95-96). On the other hand, in a brief footnote he emphasizes that the use of italicization merely cues specifically Ibo speech (although rendered
in English): “there are a lot of italics in the new edition but they are only intended to emphasize the ‘Ibo-ness’ of those passages and do not involve changes of language” (68).

King’s claim that the text mutations move the text away from anthropological explanation towards individual psychological complexity frames these emendations in reaction to an early critique of modern African literature. In 1963, while Achebe was writing the first edition of *Arrow of God* (1964), he had engaged in a critical debate with Martin Tucker, who specifically cited *Things Fall Apart* as a failure because “the West African novel lacked ‘true’ aesthetic proportions because of its emphasis on society rather than the individual” (829). Achebe had attacked the notion of a universal set of criteria by which African literature should be judged (*Transition* 9). Yet King’s assessment echoes Tucker’s critique: that the first edition is “still influenced by the methods used in *Things Fall Apart*, where there is often a double perspective shared between focus on the hero’s tragic *hubris* and the recording of the life of a community” (98).

King judges the weaknesses of the first edition: “The author of the first version is somewhat less secure in his craft and less consistent in his reshaping of the English language to a Nigerian context, the various explanations show the author’s relationship to foreign readers; the excessive anthropological material reflects a decade when the portrayal of traditional culture was a nationalistic assertion (97).” King specifically associates the textual weaknesses as fissures resulting from a divided authorial intent: attempting to write simultaneous cohesive narratives for vastly different audiences. King notes the shift of emphasis in the second edition from “an external to an internal perspective” (97), whereby the “perspective appears more from within the characters than that of the narrator or story teller” (94). Accordingly, King notes text mutations that “expand the feelings” (94) of characters, particularly Ezeulu, whose gravitas is elevated
through speeches that are “more emphatic and proud” (94), as well as revisions or additional
information on the thoughts of the European characters (96). Thus, “While the themes,
characterization and narrative form have to change, the second edition is better written,
technically more satisfactory and focuses more on the drama of individual emotions than on
reporting community life (97).” The European aesthetic expectation that a novel is primarily a
literary form for the portrayal of individual, psychological development controls King’s
assessment of the second edition: “The author of the revised edition is a more mature craftsman,
less concerned with explaining local culture to Europeans; he has a more secure control of
English and, relatively, is more interested in the drama and role of his main character within a
period of cultural transition (98).” Unlike Niven, who bemoaned Achebe’s mutations as a
potential diminishment of African cultural elements, King suggests these mutations make the
second edition “more novelistic” (98).

King’s treatment of text mutation in Achebe’s novel, despite its limited scope, is still the
most comprehensive treatment of any one text in the Achebe corpus; however, even in
combination with Niven’s and Wren’s treatments of the novel, these critical assessments do not
address many other Achebe texts with multiple versions. Two minimal treatments of text
mutation in Achebe’s poetry by Joseph Bruchac and K. L. Goodwin make a limited contribution
because like their predecessors, their narrow scope or incomplete data, actually do less to
illuminate than obscure the full scope of textual mutation in Achebe’s works. Joseph Bruchac, in
his article “Achebe as Poet” (1973), very briefly notes text mutations in Achebe’s collected
poems. Calling Christmas in Biafra [sic] Achebe’s “first book of poetry” (23), he goes on to note
that the collection was previously published in 1971 under the title Beware, Soul Brother [sic],
although the 1973 Anchor-Doubleday version “includes 7 new poems… and there are significant
revision in 6 of the original poems” (22). Bruchac fails to note the existence of the 1972 Heinemann version, *Beware, Soul-Brother: poems*, which included all the emendations attributed to the 1973 version, nor does he note changes between the 1972 and 1973 version. In his analysis of the poems, he makes only two references to actual text mutations: the omission of the dedication for the poem “Mango Seedling” (24) and a text mutation in “Mother and Child” (24), which clears up a reference. One is mystified as to why Bruchac makes no mention of the “significant” mutations from the 1971 to the 1973 versions, except that the mention of relatively minor mutations and the omission of significant changes privileges the last version as the only significant version, and maintains the illusion of the text as unitary. Similarly, K. L. Goodwin’s article, “A Rhetoric of Contraries in Chinua Achebe’s Poems” mentions all three versions of Achebe’s the book of poetry, but only notes variation in spelling and punctuation between the 1972 and 1973 versions in the footnotes in the article. Again, nothing is made of the substantial mutations from the 1971 version, other than to quote from Achebe’s preface in the 1972 version noting the existence of said mutations.

Berth Lindfors’ *Early Nigerian Literature* (1982) includes the last significant treatment of text mutation in his analysis of Achebe’s short story, “The Old Order in Conflict with the New,” what Lindfors calls “Achebe’s first true short story” (100). But even here, Lindfors’ analysis incorrectly states that the first version, printed in May 1952 in the *University Herald*, was *reprinted* under the title, “The Beginning of the End” in the collection *The Sacrificial Egg and Other Short Stories* (1962), and fails to note the text revisions made in the body of the text other than the title. He notes that the story was “revised and reissued” (100) when collected in *Girls at War and Other Stories* (1973), but he does not distinguish between the Heinemann and Anchor-Doubleday versions, which include one minor revision. Lindfors includes his
comparison of text versions as evidence for his critical position within a larger literary debate
over the short story’s role as an ur-text for the fuller thematic treatment in the novel *No Longer At Ease* (1960). M. J. C. Echeruo, in his 1962 preface to *The Sacrificial Egg and Other Stories*, had argued that the shift from the happy ending of the 1952 short story to the tragic one in the 1960 novel, might suggest an “intensification of Achebe’s tragic disposition (4),” an assessment echoed twenty years later by Robert Wren in *Achebe’s World: The Historical and Cultural Context of the Novels* (1980), but neither they nor Lindfors utilize the 1962 text mutations in the short story itself in order to assess whether or not some trajectory towards tragedy is at play from how the theme is treated in 1952, 1960, 1962. Lindfors’ simply characterizes the first version as “a rather crude, amateur effort when set beside the easy narrative grace of *No Longer At Ease* (101),” although he does not address specific mutations in the versions. Instead, Lindfors turns for evidence of change to another early short story, first printed under the title “Short Story” in the *University Herald* (1953) and later revised and published under a new title, “Dead Men’s Path” in *The Sacrificial Egg and Other Stories* (1962). Yet Lindfors does not address the text mutations in the first and second versions, albeit subtle ones, but collapses these changes with the more wide-ranging alterations to the 1972 version, missing an important developmental stage in the text mutation. Like other critics before him, Lindfors addresses the stylistic changes in the story, noting that the spoken idiom of the village priest is “Africanized,” although some of these changes occurred in the 1962 version and afterward were further developed in the 1972 version. Instead of King’s category of “Nigerian usage,” Lindfors suggests that the text mutations in African speech “eliminated the woodenness of the original dialogue, the pure Anglo-Saxon flavor of which seemed out of character for an African village priest” (105).
The foregoing survey of Achebe textualist studies illustrates the narrow scope of these studies that are usually limited to only one work or only treat a portion of that work, with the added problem of partial, incorrect, or omitted bibliographical history of the text. While *Arrow of God* has received the most attention, its most comprehensive treatment only addressed text mutations in chapter one for the first half of the novel, ignoring changes in chapters two through eight. As for Achebe’s short stories, the progressive mutations of all these texts have not been adequately examined nor have the kinds of mutations among the short stories been compared, either synchronically or chronologically. No comprehensive treatment of text mutations in Achebe’s poetry exists, particularly the striking changes in specific poems between the 1971 to the 1972 version. No treatments of text mutations in the critical essays exist at all. Perhaps most surprising of all is the total omission of any critical study of the manuscripts Achebe made available to the public over a decade ago.

Many contributing factors have coalesced to produce the current dearth of Achebe textualist criticism. The fierce struggle for the existence of an African voice in modern African letters, the coincidence of the rise of modern African letters and structuralist and poststructuralist literary theory that neglected textualist approaches, the omission of comprehensive bibliographies in Achebe publications and the difficulty in accessing early Achebe publications combined to both prescribe and obscure the scope and significance of Achebe text mutation. The current project, although limited to the 1950-1975 Achebe corpus, provides a way forward, illustrating what is at stake in Achebe letters when a textual materialist approach is adopted, filling in many of the early gaps in Achebe bibliographies, adding an early review to his bibliography, highlighting early African publications and bringing extant manuscripts to the fore. The bibliography also establishes the relationships among all texts. Equally important are text
documents providing a chronological reading of successive texts over time as well as a synchronic reading of all text variations, building blocks for a comprehensive approach to text mutations across all genres.

The succeeding chapters include the treatment of an early Achebe text, giving an example of how a textual materialist approach illuminates the interplay of aesthetic choices and ideological positions over time. The methodology chapter establishes the scope and nature of the variorum project, the history of text theory and the important intersection with literary theory as a theoretical foundation for the variorum project. The chronological bibliography in chapter four establishes the most up-to-date list of manuscripts and publications. The conclusion illustrates that text mutations in Achebe’s corpus have not stopped with the 1950-1975 corpus and calls for a similar textual materialist project addressing the remaining publications and manuscripts. The text documents in the supplemental section reveal the scope of text emendations across the board in all genres: novels, short stories, poetry and critical essays.
CHAPTER 2
TEXTUAL MUTATION IN “TANGANYIKA—JOTTINGS OF A TOURIST”

Chapter one establishes how post-war New Criticism, structuralism, and post-structuralism, as well as cultural materialist approaches, all neglected the compositional and publication history of literary texts in favor of a somewhat arbitrary selection of one particular version of a text. Such a practice protected the early modern African writer from a strict adherence to an initial authorial impetus, freeing up experimentation with form, content, and language. African writers attempted to carve out the most effective way to create a recognizable African literary world peopled with recognizable African literary characters while utilizing inherited western literary forms and a western vernacular. Unfortunately, post-war literary critics and postcolonial critics acceptance of “intentional fallacy” also created a kind of erasure of early modern African compositional and production history. The purpose of the example reading in this chapter is not to create a “best text” that reifies the traditional textualist goal of the “seamless architecture of a final, authoritative version” (Arnold “Césaire’s Notebook” 133) but to illustrate how an analysis of the genealogy of textual mutation can inform and even determine critical interpretation. This is so since a textualist materialist comparison of successive texts serves as a palimpsest of a writer’s critical and artistic development.

Achebe’s essay, “Tanganyika—Jottings of a Tourist” published in Morning Yet on Creation Day (1975), has a rich textual history prior to its final form in the collected essays, a history marked by mutations in genre, audience, theme, and content over the life of the text. Four
successive publications make up the material relating to Achebe’s 1960 trip to East Africa:

“CAN THERE BE A MULTI-RACIAL SOCIETY? At least, not in Tanganyika” published in 1961 in the *Daily Express* [Lagos]; “TOURIST SKETCHES (being part of an unwritten book)” published in 1962 in *reflections*; “People of the Kilimanjaro” published in 1973 in *Two Centuries of African English*; and “Tanganyika—Jottings of a Tourist” published in 1975 in *Morning Yet on Creation Day*. In addition, three manuscripts in the *Achebe Papers: 1963-1993*, Item 105 (dated to around 1960-1961), Item 106 (undated), and Item 107 (dated to 1973) are directly related to the published texts. Finally, an intra-textual passage in the novel *A Man of the People* (1966) echoes a motif in the essay. All of these texts are collated in the text document for “Tanganyika” located in chapter four under the “Essays” section.

Just as an analysis of the genealogy of textual mutation in “Tanganyika” can inform and even determine critical interpretations, collapsing multiple versions into one authoritative text obscures, or even worse, distorts its critical interpretation. For example, Ezenwa-Ohaeto’s encyclopedic biography of Achebe exemplifies problems associated with utilizing the 1975 version of the text as though it were an historical record of what Achebe thought and wrote at the time of his 1960 trip. First, Ezenwa-Ohaeto accepts the fiction of an early date for the final essay and cites events and opinions described within it as evidence for Achebe’s mindset in the early 1960s, leading to critical errors of chronology. Second, by accepting the text’s claim about itself, Ezenwa-Ohaeto does not note all successive revisions of the text, although he does cite both the 1961 newspaper article from the *Daily Express* and the 1975 critical essay in *Morning Yet on Creation Day* as separate historical sources. Though the 1961 text is the foundational text for the longer essay, he does not mention the dependency of the latter text upon the former publication. Certainly appending the 1961 date to the 1975 article should have triggered some notion of
textual dependency if not succession. But the authorial or editorial decision to append the earlier date creates the impression that the 1975 essay existed in the present form in 1961. As will be illustrated, by any number of standards the 1975 text only existed in skeletal outline.

In contrast to Ezenwa-Ohaeto’s approach, a diachronic comparison of all eight texts reveals a writer coming to grips with his experience in postcolonial Africa, as he works through a progression of positions. In the Daily Express text, Achebe began with the early optimism of a newly independent Nigerian citizen and adopted the relatively breezy tone of the “man on the spot” in his descriptions of Tanganyika. He then moved toward a more cautious and judicious position as thoughtful tourist in a travel-writing text, in which he evaluated the entrenched colonial geo-political and cultural problems African independent countries inherited under the colonial period. In the last version of the text, Achebe positioned himself as a weaver of a new pedagogic African history, redeemed from its colonial disruption through an elevation and exhortation of African valor and progressive values. The frame for this history, an elegiac memoir connecting his early childhood to a broader African narrative, tempers the spirit of the piece, casting Achebe as a somewhat disillusioned, but resolute realist.

Achebe’s progression of positions with regard to his text impacts the genre, audience and content of the texts, illustrating Achebe’s pragmatic approach to text mutation: what is the best message for the moment? The Igbo proverb, “You do not stand in one place to watch a masquerade,” describes the reciprocal relationship of the spectator and the masquerade. That relationship might also be applied to the writer and the text. Movement on the part of one elicits a corresponding movement on the part of the other. Achebe’s multiple versions resonate with his rapidly changing personal circumstances from colonial subject to Nigerian citizen, to disenfranchisement as a Biafran secessionist, to repatriation and temporary exile in the United
States, and finally back to a Nigeria citizen. In the case at hand, adhering to an idealized, final text, as Ezenwa-Ohaeto does, erases mutation not only as an important aspect of Achebe’s letters but also dissociates the text from its rhetorical, and thus its political history.

Background and Description of Texts

Immediately following Nigerian independence in October 1960, the Rockefeller Foundation sponsored Achebe’s travel to East and South Africa. As an employee of the Nigerian Broadcasting Corporation, Achebe took the trip for the purpose of assessing political and social developments in other parts of Africa. His expertise in broadcast media and as the author of two novels and a few short stories put him in a position of particular advantage to study Kenya, Tanganyika, and South Africa—territories with three widely variant trajectories of independence movements. What should have been a six-month project, Achebe abandoned after two months when he was asked to become Acting Director of Programs at the NBS. Shortly after his return to Nigeria, Achebe published “CAN THERE BE A MULTI-RACIAL SOCIETY? At least, not in Tanganyika,” in the January 1961 issue of the Daily Express (Lagos). The title of an early first draft (Item 105) entitled “SIX WEEKS IN TANGANYIKA,” attests to the brevity of his tour and may also account for the seemingly random structure of the first publication. An example of fairly straightforward reportage, Achebe’s impressions appear somewhat haphazard, beginning with a generally skeptical view of the widely touted “happy multi-racial society” of Tanganyika. As an example of Tanganyikan unity, the colonial government had just agreed to integrate the racially divided school systems, but Achebe witnesses an indignant Minister’s assessment of Tanganyika’s racial harmony: “…it’s all lies, lies, nothing but lies…” (4), a view shared by Achebe, who notes that European clubs in Tanganyika would not allow even Nyerere, then
Minister of the Assembly (and future president at independence in 1961), to drink at their bars. The Asian emigrant community in Tanganyika also complicates claims of racial harmony, since Asian citizens do not feel trusted, despite generous Asian philanthropy toward their African communities. Achebe’s desultory structure continues with sections on Nyerere; the Wachagga, an ethnic group living on the slopes of Kilimanjaro; his initial disappointment with the view of the mountain itself; Shabaan Robert, a Swahili poet; and the Wahehe (another ethnic group) and their defeat by the Germans in the late 1880s. The article concludes with the need for higher education institutions in Tanganyika.

Achebe excerpted and rewrote parts of this newspaper article, adding additional material, and published “TOURIST SKETCHES (being part of an unwritten travel book)” in reflections: Nigerian Prose & Verse the following year. The random impressions of reportage, the first version of the travel writing text, are structurally reshaped by excising all critique on race relations in Tanganyika and constructing an extended essay on the consequences of colonialism for the Wahehe and the Wachagga. Gone are the descriptions of Nyerere, Shabaan Robert, and education in Tanganyika. The new, highly concentrated three-part composition focuses solely on the two African groups previously described in the Daily Express. The descriptions of these groups frame the middle section, a richer description of the political fate of what Achebe now calls Mt. Kibo, using the African name of the highest mountain in the Kilimanjaro range. By centering the essay on the iconic image of Mt. Kilimanjaro, Achebe interrogates the position of “tourist” and that most casual and benign activity: sightseeing.

The next ten years would encompass Nigeria’s political division and tragic civil war. Rising political tensions and violence over regional power sharing among the Igbo, Yoruba, and Hausa led to a military coup in 1966, a coup gradually cast as an Igbo power grab. Igbos living
and working outside the predominately Igbo Eastern Region of the country were targeted throughout 1966 in a series of pogroms. Ethnic Igbos, including Achebe, hunted out of their homes and businesses, fled back to the Eastern Region, which ultimately chose to secede from the federal republic and establish the independent Republic of Biafra. From 1967 to 1970, Achebe traveled extensively on behalf of Biafra, soliciting political and material support. Accordingly, Achebe’s publications during the war years mainly consist of republications of previously published essays and excerpted portions of his novels in collections of African literature. This kind of recycling continued after the war as well. Part of the previous “TOURIST SKETCHES,” an excerpt entitled, “The People of Kilimanjaro,” is included in Two Centuries of African English: A Survey and Anthology of Non-fictional English Prose by African Writers Since 1769 (1973), a collection of texts providing evidence of a long history of the use of English by Africans and providing support for its continued use, despite some African critics’ opposition to the use of European languages in African literatures.

After the war, Achebe’s disillusionment with post-independence and his personal struggle to come to terms with a radically different personal and political situation from that of 1962 becomes evident in a fourth published essay. As part of a general project of revising and republishing many of his earlier works in collected editions after the war, Achebe rewrote portions of the previous articles and published this version under the title, “Tanganyika: Jottings of a Tourist,” collected in Part II1 of Achebe’s first collection of critical essays, Morning Yet on Creation Day (1975). In two unpublished typescripts of this essay, Items 106 and 107, Achebe reinstated material excised from “CAN THERE BE A MULTI-RACIAL SOCIETY?”, material now revised with additional text, and added in the rewritten sections of “TOURIST


1 Part I is principally literary criticism. Part II reflects broader concerns.
SKETCHES,” all combined into a new, third version. A new conclusion completes a former, partial frame for the 1962 essay, based on a childhood memory of the word WAHEHE painted on the side of a popular lorry in Nigeria. By rounding out the frame, Achebe shifts the text away from either straight reportage or travel writing to a valorous African history and elegiac memoir.

Analysis

The first chronological text, Item 105 in the Achebe Papers, entitled “SIX WEEKS IN TANGANYIKA” dates to around the time of Achebe’s actual travels in late 1960 since it appears to be a first draft of “CAN THERE BE A MULTI-RACIAL SOCIETY?” and differs little from the January 1961 first published news report. Achebe opens with an example of the frustration of an African member of the Tanganyikan Legislative Counsel over ongoing racial discrimination, comparing this experience to the views expressed in his preparatory reading prior to the trip: a general acclamation of Nyerere’s positive leadership in Tanganyika and the claim that Tanganyika is a showcase of a “happy multi-racial community.” Achebe dismantles the notion of such a community with two examples of obvious discrimination: the denial of blacks in whites-only clubs and the discrimination against the Asian-African community. He exclaims, “Coming from West Africa I found it incredible that in a country that may get independence in a matter of months there should exist in its very capital city a European club to which a member could not take even Nyerere to have a drink.” Furthermore, a “rich and good-natured Asian…complained bitterly that in spite of all the money he had spent on charity and African welfare he is not trusted or wanted.” Achebe concludes, however, on an upbeat note: “Altogether not my idea of a happy multi-racial community. Undoubtedly happier than Kenya, of course.”
The published version of the typescript, the 1961 *Daily Express* article, while differing little in content, frames the title and bolds and/or underlines two particular sections of the text for added emphasis: the example of the African Minister denouncing a superficially integrated society and Achebe’s comment on the whites-only club, focusing the reader’s attention on the racial rather than the ethnic divisions. The rest of the article appears in standard type, with section titles in larger print. By bolding these particular passages in the text, the report appeals to current tensions during decolonization. Racial divisions and not African ethnic divisions preoccupied much of the anti-colonial rhetoric associated with independence movements at the time, since ethnic divisions were often subsumed in the joint goal of African self-determination. Although Nigeria had been independent for only a few months, Tanganyika had yet to achieve that goal. Still, examples of racial disparities and segregation particularly grated on Africans who were impatient for new, egalitarian societies. Achebe’s title question, “CAN THERE BE A MULTI-RACIAL SOCIETY? At least not in Tanganyika” followed with the editorial comment, “Answers CHINUA ACHEBE who has stayed in that country for six weeks (4),” establishes Achebe’s credibility as a commentator on Tanganyikan race relations.

The sections on Nyerere and the description of the Wachagga in Item 105 differ little from the *Daily Express* text. Achebe sets a positive tone, describing Nyerere’s leadership as “unusually good.” He asserts, “I do not think that anyone could seriously challenge the view…”; however, a growing dissatisfaction among Tanganyikans, spear-headed by the popular Bibi Titi, also an African member of the Tanganyika Legislative Counsel and leader of the women’s wing of TANU, frames the context for a political event at which he hears Nyerere speak. Despite Titi’s criticism of Nyerere’s leadership as “too democratic,” Achebe is struck by what appears to

---

2 The Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) was the principal political party in the struggle for sovereignty.
be Nyerere’s total lack of concern, perhaps even dissociation from, the complaints being directed at him. Casually smoking cigarettes and sporting a brightly colored American shirt, Nyerere hardly instills confidence that he warrants political allegiance. When Nyerere rises to speak, he surprises Achebe by his quick management of the crowd that are soon “laughing and clapping and cheering,” “a most magnificent performance.”

Little change exists between the text of Item 105 and the Daily Express article in the section on the Wachagga. Achebe describes the Wachagga, living on the slopes of Mt. Kilimanjaro, as the epitome of “progressive” Africans. Having developed a highly successful cooperative, eagerly adopted western dress and automobiles, eschewed autocratic politicians and elected an American-educated economist as their president, Achebe appears to heartily approve of this kind of “go-head” spirit. As for the mountain itself, Achebe is initially disappointed by its lack of grandeur, although as the sun sets, he notes the view becomes “overpowering.” Jokingly, he repeats a well-heeled myth about the mountain’s colonial history, “One cannot help admiring the effrontery of Queen Victoria in presenting the highest mountain in Africa to her cousin, the Kaiser, as a birthday present! Perhaps she did it out of consideration for her Prime Minister, Gladstone, who found ‘kilimanjaro’ unpronounceable.”

Achebe does alter the discussion of Shabaan Robert in Item 105 for the Daily Express article. Robert, the famous Tanganyikan poet, laments the fact that fellow Tanganyikans are uninterested in original Swahili literature. Despite having translated many English works, such as the English translation of The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam into Swahili, Tanganyikans are primarily interested in English translations of Swahili works. Part of Robert’s frustration lays in his suspicion of the publication policies of the East African Literature Bureau. Item 105 reads:
He is very critical of Mr. Richards of the East African Literature Bureau\(^3\) who according to Robert is more interested in translations of English classics than in original Swahili poetry. He also thinks that Mr. Richards who began as a Christian missionary is a little suspicious of Swahili literature with its large Moslem content. (Item 105)

Achebe omits this section in the *Daily Express* article, perhaps because it was conjecture, perhaps because he did not want to sour a professional relationship between Robert and his publisher by revealing a confidential conversation. However that may be, Achebe does conclude with a discussion of the issues such translations raise, particularly those of the market and the difficulty a writer has supporting himself when he has little control over his own literary production. Self-publishing has brought no added success for Robert, since without a promotional apparatus, Robert’s works languish in obscurity. Still, Achebe notes that Roberts hopes to expand his publishing for his and other African writers’ works.

No significant mutations mark the concluding section on the Wahehe in Item 105 from the same section in the Item 105 text. Achebe describes their famed military prowess, having defeated both the Masai and held off German pacification for over three years before finally being overcome, its leader having committed suicide rather than be captured by the Germans. Achebe drolly notes that this leader’s head was shipped to Germany where it was housed in Bremen among thousands of others only to have been recently returned and presented to a decidedly unwarlike grandson, Chief Sapi, “very well-educated and completely unassuming,” with whom Achebe had tea. Achebe wraps up the article by deploring the general dearth of

\(^3\) State publisher of the East African Countries, set up upon the recommendation of the Phelps Stokes Commission in response to the demands of East African war veterans for literacy materials.
educated professionals among Tanganyikans, with only one practicing barrister in the country, and thus emphasizes the need for institutions of higher education, despite reluctance on the part of some. He concludes, “But one remembers that in 1944 when the Eliot Commission\(^4\) recommended the building of one university for the whole of British West Africa some experts had said it was premature. Experts can be so foolish (4).”

In 1962, sections of the *Daily Express* newspaper article were excerpted, rewritten with additional material, and published under the title, “TOURIST SKETCHES (being part of an unwritten travel book)” in *reflections: Nigerian Prose & Verse*. In the preface to the collection, South African critic Ezekiel Mphahlele notes that the prose sketches rival the fictional prose, “because they are personal and this fact gives them vitality and enthusiasm” (9). Achebe’s new essay includes additional vivid details and narratives that enliven the text, but what Mphahlele terms the “personal” nature of the text is not just a vague, universalized subject but a particular political person. For instance, the title of the new piece disrupts the casual, yet coded language of sightseeing. “TOURIST SKETCHES” intrigues, considering that at the time “tourist” did not connote an African tourist on the same continent; rather, tourism in Africa was primarily the provenance of Europeans and Americans. After an initial adjustment to Achebe’s assertion of his position as tourist (and by extension, a refusal to be part of a faceless African humanity that was the face of Africa in most European travel writing), he adds the parenthetical phrase “(being part of an unwritten travel book),” a literary move that underscores the tentative nature of the narrative, as an incomplete, unfinished text. As a text still very much in process, “unwritten” might also imply that a narrative, yet come to light, remains to be written.

\(^4\) In June 1943, the British government appointed the Eliot Commission to report on the organization and facilities of institutions of higher education in British West Africa.
Within this disrupted literary space of traditional travel writing, Achebe structurally reshaped his “CAN THERE BE A MULTI-RACIAL SOCIETY?” into a carefully crafted description of the impact of colonial expansion and domination on the Wahehe and the Wachagga and their individual responses during the imperial conquest and into the colonial period. In order to focus attention on these two groups, Achebe excised sections of reportage on Nyerere, Shabaan Robert, and education in Tanganyika, thus moving away from the relatively breezy “man on the spot” political and social description of Tanganyika as a progressive “New African” nation with growing pains. The text is now more reflective. As a fulcrum between his description of the historical resistance movement among the Wahehe and the arbitrary fate of the Wachagga, Achebe presents an expanded description of what he now calls Mt. Kibo, using the African name of the volcanic crater at the top of the highest and iconic mountain in the Kilimanjaro range. By avoiding the western “Kilimanjaro,” a corruption of its original Swahili name, Achebe makes a standard African assertion typical of the postcolonial moment.

With this second description of the Wahehe people, Achebe establishes a distant affinity between these people and his Nigerian experience. In entirely new material, we learn that Achebe had seen the term “WAHEHE” written on the side of a lorry that was quite popular among the children in the town where he grew up. As a child, he had often wondered about its meaning; therefore, when he learned that a people with the name Wahehe lived in Tanganyika, he decided to visit them. He now speculates that perhaps this unlikely contact between East and West Africa was the consequence of one of the world wars when many African soldiers fought together in far-flung areas of the world and might have come to know of each other. This reflection becomes a partial frame narrative for an expanded description of the history of the Wahehe. Achebe concludes the description of the Wahehe with a prophetic announcement:
“When the story of the colonization of Africa comes to be written by Africans…” the ignominious end of their leader “will be given an honoured place” (114). Only by comparing the version of the description in the *Daily Express* article to the new version in “TANGANYIKA” does it become evident that Achebe’s travel writing recuperates the story of African colonization, recasting African resistance as heroic.

In this new narrative, the Wahehe people are described as “great warriors” with an “astonishing military record.” Achebe draws out the story of their resistance to German military invasion, the Wahehe having initially defeated the Germans, who then returned three years later with greater armaments. Despite defeating the Wahehe in battle, Achebe now notes that the Germans discovered that each hut had to be individually overcome in order from them to enjoy a total victory, a testament to the Wahehe’s “intransigence.” Achebe adds a graphic description of the officer who discovers the chief’s body and then collects his monetary reward of 5000 rupees, like any common headhunter. This image is extended when Achebe notes that “his dried head” was placed in “a museum in the Fatherland” (115). Even Chief Sapi’s quiet demeanor is ramped up: “He wore a smart lounge suit and after tea he drove us furiously in his Mercedes car to see a the new house he was building” (115).

From this historical example of resistance to colonization, the text now focuses on the “forward-looking” Wachagga, compared favorably to the revanchist Masai, a group who “took one look at western civilisation and turned their back on it; the Wachagga plunged in without taking a look” (116). The Masai do not fare well in this essay. Achebe had already noted in the passage on the Wahehe that the Masai were held in such contempt that in battle, the great Mkwawa sent his sister to defeat their warriors. Nor does Achebe have much nostalgia for the Masai’s new role as tourist attraction in postcolonial Africa—a vestigial repository of “true
Africa.” Achebe editorializes: “Personally I think New Africa belongs to those who, like the Wachagga, are ready to take in new ideas. Like all those with open minds they will take in a lot of rubbish. They will certainly not be a tourist attraction. But in the end Life will favour those who come to terms with it and not those who run away (116).”

While “TOURIST SKETCHES” has only two labeled sections, “The Warlike Wahehe” and “The People of Kilimanjaro,” the first two paragraphs of this latter section expand upon the historic, even spiritual significance of Mt. Kibo. Previously described as “overpowering,” even “spectacular,” (note the remnant of the tourist “eye”), Achebe now describes the last moments of daylight over the mountain as “something of a ritual at sunset when it reveals itself from the thick clouds which cover it during the day” (115). Achebe moves beyond a simple observation of the mountain, to its personification as it “reveals itself” as part of a ritual, conferring religious significance to the clouds’ evaporation at dusk. It inspires the further poetic description of the mountain “lit up by the last rays of light while the foothills and the surrounding country sink into darkness” (116). Achebe completely removes the joking tone about the mountain as a birthday present to the Kaiser, reframing the story as “a brief historical digression” into the tensions among the British and Germans at the 1885 Berlin Conference. While the British appear to appreciate that the decisions made at the conference will greatly affect the “natives,” Achebe stingingly notes that only a year later the fate of the mountain—not to mention that of the Wachagga living on its slopes—turned into a “birthday present,” without any consultation with the “natives.” In the first instance, the joke about the mountain is a colonial narrative signifying the landmark’s importance in colonial history, hence Achebe’s initial dismissal of its power. In the second instance, he refigures the joke into a poignant, ironic narrative, recasting the
mountain’s significance as a symbolic landmark of an African future shaped by the values of the African people.

This shift of tone from the blithe, if ironic, repetition of a joke, to the weightier implications of colonial whimsy represents the greatest difference between Achebe’s newspaper article a year earlier and the new essay. What perhaps was not even linked in Achebe’s own understanding just a year earlier, now seems to preoccupy him; he is, in fact, refashioning his own previous travel writing by taking stock of the significance of what he saw and experienced a year earlier. The tragic fate of the resistant Wahehe during the imperial invasion of the land and the arbitrary fate of the progressive Wachagga caught in the colonial desire for ever greater territory are mirrored in the description of a sacred mountain that briefly yet gloriously shines, only to sink into “darkness”. Achebe creates an overall somber tone that appears at odds with the seemingly lightheartedness of the title. Thus the title, which implies the potential existence of what is (was?) “unwritten,” may also imply a different kind of knowledge he had not realized in the first moment. That awareness appears to be a curative that disrupts Achebe’s initial reportage, a kind of “horizontal,” panoramic view of Tanganiyika created in part as a response to expectations set up when he was recipient of the Rockefeller grant. His rather superficial, topical understanding of the country, a geographically-proscribed colonial entity, is now replaced with a “vertical” view that contemplates the deeper political and social implications of the colonial impact. What Mphahlele suggests makes his piece compelling is that it is “personal,” an implicit recognition that who is seeing affects what is seen. Once the colonial power is gone, just as the clouds clear over Mt. Kibo, the African landscape is no longer a conquered space, but an African homeland to its indigenous people, whose geographical landmark is no longer a colonial joke but figures as a clear-eyed cipher for the African point of view.
Outside of the genealogical progression from Item 105, to the *Daily Express* report to the *reflections* travel writing, the motif of Kilimanjaro/Kibo has implications for other texts as well. In the *reflections* (1962) text, Achebe utilized the vision of the cloudless mountain as a clarifying lens through which to understand the fate of the Wahehe and the Wachagga. In Achebe’s *A Man of the People* (1966), the main protagonist, Odili, also describes how he receives “enlightenment,” deeper levels of understanding which “crystallize out of the mist” through discussions and experiences in the house of the savvy politician Chief Nanga. Even in the compositional process for *A Man of the People* there is compelling mutation from the typescript carbon manuscript of the novel (Items 9-15) written around 1965, with the 1966 published version (italicized):

> But sitting [around Chief Nanga now][at Chief Nanga's feet I received *enlightenment:*] many things began to *crystallize* out of the mist—some of the emergent forms were not nearly as ugly as I had suspected but many seemed much worse.

Like the more serious assessment of the African situation in the *reflections* piece, Achebe notes “the emergent forms” were both “not nearly as ugly as I had suspected” but also “many seemed much worse.” In the *reflections* text, Achebe’s understanding of African history and its people is altered by a similar shift in perception. His own position changes from a kind of grudging admiration for the “winning effrontery” of the colonial powers to an awareness of how such a capricious act had profound implications for the people who lived on its slopes.

Another correspondence between the *reflections* text and the novel text is the shift from a superficial, somewhat naïve understanding of a situation, exacerbated by meaningless distractions to a focused and sophisticated knowledge:
[But][However,] I was not making these judgements at the time, or not strongly anyhow. I was simply too fascinated by the almost ritual lifting of the clouds, as I had been one day, watching for the first time the unveiling of the white dome of [the][omitted] Kilimanjaro at sunset.

In the same way that the reflections text more fully develops the implications of the 1961 reportage, the novel’s character acknowledges a similar shift from his knowledge at the time of the events described to his later appreciation of the implications of those events: “However, I was not making these judgements at the time, or not strongly anyhow.” Odili’s speechlessness over the mountain’s grandeur does not correspond to Achebe’s reported response in the Daily Express text in which he describes his initial disappointment in the mountain’s appearance. In the novel text, he includes a pause, a lacuna, between the experience and the linguistic frame of the experience:

I stood breathless; I did not immediately say: [Ah! this is the tallest mountain in Africa or It isn’t really as impressive as I had expected.]["Ah! this is the tallest mountain in Africa", or "It isn't really as impressive as I had expected"][All that had to wait.

In the temporal lacuna between the publication of his initial reportage and the publication of the travel writing text, a greater appreciation for the mountain’s significance for African historical and cultural recuperation occurs, but in the novel text, Odili’s breathlessness corresponds to the fascinating and dramatic process of the revelation and not the consciousness of the revelations themselves. The novel text takes the reader back to the moment of seeing, corresponding to the moment before the Daily Express article was written. If the novel text corresponds to Achebe’s initial response, he was not, in fact, disappointed with the sight of the mountain, but only
described it that way in the *Daily Express* text, perhaps affecting a kind of worldly wise position over that of breathless tourist or young innocent. Like Odili, it would take some time before he was able to process his experience. The second, more contemplative description of his response to seeing the mountain for the first time, is the product of “what had to wait” in order to be known, which accounts for the differences in position in the *Daily Express* text and the *reflections* text.

An excerpted second section of “TOURIST SKETCHES,” appears in *Two Centuries of African English: A Survey and an Anthology of Non-fictional Prose by African Writers Since 1769* (1973) edited by Lalage Bown. Although the excerpted text is not altered, it is re-titled “The People of Kilimanjaro” and appears in a section of African reportage entitled, “The Range of African Prose.” In his introduction, Bown describes Achebe’s piece as “journalism” or “literary reportage” in the tradition of the “vigorous and lively” Edward Blyden, editor of *Negro*, the first pan-African journal in West Africa and Attoh Ahuma, editor of the anti-imperialist *Gold Coast Methodist Times*. Bown designed the anthology in order to illustrate “some of the ways in which English has been used by Africans since the language was imported into Africa (3),” for the purpose of establishing the breadth and duration of English usage in Africa. “Africans” he specifically defines as those born in Africa who still regard themselves as African (3). He situates Achebe’s piece as part of a long history of African prose writing in English beginning in the nineteenth century with “the official dispatch or report” (4), although he cautions that all texts included in the anthology “are quoted as literary texts” (15). Other famous authors in the reportage section include Nigerian Samuel Adjai Crowther, the first African to become a Protestant bishop, and the Ghanaian surveyor George Ekem Ferguson, whose descriptions “are
told in a straightforward and sensible style, without any of the self-conscious drama of many travel books by European explorers…” (5).

Bown’s anthology is part of the African assertion (that Achebe supported) concerning African composition in western vernaculars. Achebe had been a chief participant in a decade-long debate over English as an appropriate medium of communication for African peoples. The scope of the debate over how to manage imposed European languages, signifiers of colonial domination, ranged from outright rejection, as Obiajunwa Wali called for in “The Dead End of African Literature?”, to co-optation, a position Achebe staked out in 1964 in “The English Language and the African Writer⁵.” Of his use of English, he suggests that the language is now a worldwide language and anyone can learn to use it effectively. As to the purist notion that second-language learners will never speak “like natives,” Achebe dismisses this as completely undesirable since “The price a world language must be prepared to pay is submission to many different kinds of use (“Handicaps” 43).” Besides, he adds in a later version of the essay:

…the nondescript writer has little to tell us, …so he might as well tell it in conventional language and get it over with. If I may use an extravagant simile, he is like a man offering a small, nondescript routine sacrifice for which a chick, or less, will do. A serious writer must look for an animal whose blood can match the power of his offering. (“English” Moderna Språk 444)

Achebe already had a sense of his writing, especially creative writing, as a “ritual” act in which the English language might be “sacrificed,” or refigured, into something more effective than standard usage or straightforward representation. Just as he had described the lifting of the clouds over Kilimanjaro as “something of a ritual” symbolizing clarity of perception, he extends the same significance to a manipulation of the English language whereby it might be made into a more transparent linguistic vehicle for the African experience.

Between the time of the publication of the reflections text and the excerpted section of the text in Bown’s anthology, Nigerian history took a dramatic and destructive turn. The Nigerian Civil War (1967-1970) brought radical changes for Nigeria and for Achebe’s personal fortunes. In 1966, the country was torn apart by waves of targeted killings of Igbo people, Achebe’s ethnic group. As a highly visible figure in Nigerian public service as Director of External Broadcasting for the Nigeria Broadcasting Corporation, producing “Voice of Nigeria,” and as an international figure as general editor of Heinemann’s African Writers Series and author of four highly successful novels, Achebe was shocked that he himself was objectified and targeted as an undesirable element in his own country. Fleeing with his wife and children back to the Eastern region, Achebe found a role in the breakaway Republic of Biafra’s Ministry of Information.

Although Achebe did not publish a new version of the Tanganyika material, his experiences in Tanganyika during his trip in 1960 came to bear on his responsibilities as Chairman of the National Guidance Council, Biafra. Since his trip to Tanganyika, the country had won its independence from Great Britain, had been renamed Tanzania, and had elected Julius Nyerere as its first president. Nyerere instituted African socialism, an African adaptation of classical socialism utilizing distinctively African mechanisms for sharing economic resources.
By 1968, Nigerian assaults on Biafran territory and its devastating food embargo had radicalized Achebe’s political position. When he and the National Guidance Council were tasked with producing *The Ahiara Declaration: Principles of the Biafran Revolution*, they drew upon Nyerere’s 1967 *Arusha Declaration* that directly linked “freedom, development, and discipline” as the foundation for African socialism. *The Ahiara Declaration* also incorporated Frantz Fanon’s theoretical ideas of black consciousness and identity, nationalism, and the inherently "violent" task of decolonization. Decolonization must occur in order for Biafrans to establish “a progressive, prosperous, stable, just and humane society.” *The Ahiara Declaration* directly linked Biafran independence from Nigeria as part of the task of ongoing decolonization, as Great Britain, Nigeria’s former colonial ruler, propped up the Nigerian government with financial and military aid and contributed to the devastating blockade of Biafra that starved hundreds of thousands of people before Biafra’s defeat. Britain’s ongoing involvement in Nigerian politics convinced him that “The strength of Biafra lies in the fact that it is fighting a people’s war (‘Biafra’ 31).”

After the war, Achebe made a general re-assessment of his prose production from 1950 through 1966, heavily revising some of his essays, with particular attention given to “CAN THERE BE A MULTI-RACIAL SOCIETY” and “TOURIST SKETCHES.” Item 106 of Achebe’s papers, a partial, untitled and undated typescript, appears to be an early revision of “CAN THERE BE A MULTI-RACIAL SOCIETY” that incorporates the text of “TOURIST SKETCHES” in a restructured form. Item 107, a photocopy of a typescript dated to around 1973, is a revised manuscript of Item 106, but because Item 106 is only a partial manuscript, a comparison of its wording with “TOURIST SKETCHES” and with Item 107 still leaves its composition date indeterminate. Sometimes the wording appears to predate the “SKETCHES”
article but in other places it appears to build off of the “SKETCHES” text. Item 107, the last extant manuscript of the essay prior to its 1975 publication, is almost verbatim the text of the third published essay titled “Tanganyika: jottings of a Tourist,” in Part II of his first collection of critical essays, *Morning Yet on Creation Day* (Heinemann 1975) and in a slightly revised collection under the same title by Anchor-Doubleday (1975).

An inconclusive date for Item 106 makes this analysis of Achebe’s critical development problematic, since if in fact he composed Item 106 as early as 1962, much of the “new” material in Item 107 would have already been composed much closer in time to the events described therein and would alter the interpretation of those text mutations. If the inclusion of part of the “TOURIST SKETCHES” essay in the Bown anthology triggered a fuller description of all the subject matter in the *Daily Express* article, Achebe’s new essay would be placed within his broader, post-Nigerian Civil War project of refashioning his critical output. If Achebe had in fact already begun a full treatment of the *Daily Express* article as part of his “unwritten” travel book as far back as 1962, with Item 106 being evidence of such a project, Achebe’s *reflections* piece is now reframed as a kind of excerpt of a larger manuscript never brought to publication. Certainly the subject of the essay—a six weeks’ survey of Tanganyika—does not appear to warrant the attention Achebe gives it after the cataclysmic events of the war years, except it must be remembered that of all the African countries Biafra appealed to for international recognition, it was Tanzania that first recognized Biafra as a sovereign republic, a moment of national jubilation that “Biafra’s terrible isolation was over” (Achebe “Biafra” 24).

Whatever Achebe’s reasons for creating a new essay and whatever the compositional date of Item 106, Item 107 (ca. 1973) continues to build off of Item 106, and is now titled, “TANGANYIKA—jottings of a tourist (1961).” The generally somber tone of the essay reflects
the same trajectory of his position from a critical, yet hopeful one concerning Tanganyika’s current racial situation, toward a greater appreciation of the historical roots of those racial barriers under colonial rule. In the third essay, Achebe rewrote and added new material to the sections already established in the *Daily Express* (1961) text. The informative, opinionated reportage was transformed into a new didactic African history. Achebe took each element in turn and scrutinized the external and internal pressures on modern African nations and people. By embellishing the Wahehe resistance to imperial invasion and elevating progressive Wachagga values, Achebe pointed the way forward for troubled African states. Ever mindful, perhaps, of the pitfalls of these states, he positioned himself as a somewhat disillusioned, but resolute realist, by framing the essay with an elegiac narrative memoir more in keeping with a post-war weariness.

Achebe outlined just such a recuperation of African history in his critical essay, “The Role of the Writer in the New Nation” (1964):

> Historians everywhere are re-writing the stories of the new nations—replacing the short, garbled, despised history with a more sympathetic account. All this is natural and necessary. It is necessary because we must begin to correct the prejudices which generations of detractors created about the negro…The worst thing that can happen to any people is the loss of their dignity and self-respect.

(157)

Achebe appears to comment on the relationship between his *Daily Express* article and later versions of the text: “After all the novelist’s duty is not to beat this morning’s headline in topicality. It is to explore in depth the human condition. In Africa he cannot perform this task unless he has a proper sense of history (157).”
Shifting a text from topicality to historical narrative was not without problems. The first section of Item 107 begins the same way as the *Daily Express* article, with the example of the African minister railing at the assembly, but now a date is inserted, “[Date: November 1960]” (Item 107). Inserting the date in the text temporarily disrupts the text because it interrupts the text flow by reminding the reader that the present text’s compositional moment is long removed from the event it describes. Adding the date “1961” to the title while simultaneously signaling the temporal distance from the event by inserting the date of the event “[Date: November 1960]” destabilizes the facticity of the date for the essay rather than anchor it in time, since those familiar with African decolonization, widely covered in international newsmagazines, would not have needed such a signpost in a composition supposedly written so close to the event. In fact this date does not appear in the *Daily Express* text, written shortly after Achebe’s trip to Tanganyika. This rather harmless sleight of hand would go unnoticed except when a textual materialist approach is applied to the text. But a comparison of this text with its previous version reveals that, given its multiple revisions and additions, it is in fact a substantially revised text, one not in existence in 1961.

The revisions to the *Daily Express* article compound his difficulty in syncing up his contemporaneous position in relation to that event with his current position fifteen years later. Achebe rewords the original conclusion to the first section of the *Daily Express* piece as the last sentence of the introductory paragraph. He states, “Perhaps the much advertised difference between, say, Kenya and Tanganyika in racial tension was a difference in degree rather than kind, despite popular fiction (Item 107).” This sentence bears some scrutiny. He notes the “advertised difference” in colonialist rhetoric comparing the debacle of British resistance to Kenyan sovereignty (based on white settlers’ violent reaction to black equality) to the “popular
fiction” of the harmonious racial society of Tanganyika. He concludes that the statement is mere propaganda, a sharp contrast drawn over a difference in scale. In the 1961 “CAN THERE BE A MULTI-RACIAL SOCIETY?” Achebe certainly was not taken in by the claims regarding Tanganyika, but note the shift in his view concerning its comparison to Kenya: previously he had claimed that race relations in Tanganyika were, “Undoubtedly happier than Kenya, of course (4).” By replacing his surety then with tentativeness now, Achebe appears prescient with regard to Tanzania’s ongoing, entrenched racial problems that mirrored those of postcolonial Kenya. At the same time, his new comment resituates his 1961 evaluative claim about race relations as a fiction, albeit an honestly made observation at the time. In Item 107 Achebe does not acknowledge the fact that he himself was taken in by prevailing opinion in late 1960; instead, he now projects that “popular fiction” upon a generalized other. The new placement of the comment, from its previous position at the conclusion of this section to the closing statement of the first paragraph sets the entire section in a more pessimistic light.

This introductory paragraph prepares the reader for five examples of racial discrimination, two of which are entirely new to the 1975 essay, the other three revised, the effect of which is to cast a critical eye on the various ways non-indigenous Africans perpetuate racial tension. The first example is the “rich and good-natured Asian,” frustrated over his position in Tanganyikan society. In “CAN THERE BE A MULTI-RACIAL SOCIETY?” (1961), he argues that he sends his children to “English public schools” but also gives money for “charity and African welfare”; however, he is “not trusted or wanted” despite the explanation that “I was born here…I have no other home but here” (4). Achebe amended this description, emphasizing the Asian’s ironic position of sending his children to “expensive public schools in England” (Item 107), emphasizing the Asian man’s wealth which allows his children to be educated
separately from the system most African children have available. The man’s complaint that despite “the large sums of money he had contributed to African charity” (Item 107), he still is unable to comprehend why he is “neither appreciated nor trusted” (Item 107) appears less of a legitimate beef with reverse discrimination and more the blindness of class privilege. The substitution of “appreciated” (Item 107) for “wanted” implies that trust is gained in solidarity with African society and not as a separate and privileged ethnic community in Africa.

The second example of racial discrimination in Item 107 repeats the *Daily Express* story of the whites-only European club members in the ironic position of denying access to a black man who would soon be president of their country. The *Daily Express* reads, “Coming from West Africa I found it incredible that in a country that may get independence in a matter of months there should exist in its very capital city a European club to which a member could not take even Nyerere to have a drink (4).” Achebe omits the first part of the sentence, effectively removing any sense of personal incredulity over such an injustice. In its place is a new scenario of members of the club “debating whether it ought to amend its rules so that Julius Nyerere, Chief Minister, might be able to drink there on the invitation of a member (Item 107).” The shock factor is still there, but now he concludes, “It did not seem to occur to anyone that Nyerere might not wish to have the honor of drinking there (Item 107).” The text now reflects less of a sense of an injustice that should be corrected—full integration—as it does an ironic observation informed by Fanon’s stance of transcending the imposed identity of the other. By establishing this ironic distance from traditional racial inequities, Achebe positions himself above race. A whites-only establishment no longer merits any outrage, as the club is more a reflection of the ignorance and/or moral poverty of its white members than a symbol of a black person’s lack of status. As before, the example of the European yacht club that removed its facilities as a
concession to officers of the King’s African Rifles at the same time the first African officer cadets were commissioned, draws this additional arch comment: “Perhaps only a coincidence (Item 107).” Achebe continues to build tension into the section by adding two more examples of personal racial discrimination, neither of which appears in the Daily Express article. The first relates his rude treatment by a representative of the British Council who does not recognize him even though he has been scheduled as part of their speakers’ program. The second describes a conversation he has with a condescending European hotel receptionist, who gushes over the fact that a former African guest could speak “such beautiful English” (Item 107). Achebe creates a new conclusion and solution for racial integration by moving his discussion of the importance of a fully integrated and egalitarian education system from the final section of the Daily Express article to its new location as the conclusion of the first section.

The second section in the Daily Times article, “Nyerere’s Leadership” is re-titled in Item 107 as “A Mass Meeting of TANU”. The adoption of a socialist vocabulary shifts the focus away from Nyerere, whose unpopular economic policy forced people onto communal farms and ultimately bankrupted the country. Certainly his vocabulary is in keeping with another contemporaneous essay. Around the time Achebe was revising his Tanganyika material, he rewrites his foreword essay for Emmanuel Obiechina’s Literature for the Masses: An Analytical Study of Popular Pamphleteering in Nigeria. In Item 109 of the Achebe Papers, a typescript photocopy of the foreword with author manuscript alterations, Achebe incorporates Fanon’s ideas and vocabulary into a new essay entitled, “Onitsha, gift of the Niger.” In his description of Onitsha, the great market on the banks of the Niger River, he specifically cites Fanon as the source of his terminology for the city as “a zone of occult instability,” a zone in transition between the traditional system of barter and the new “cash nexus.”
In “A Mass Meeting of TANU” Achebe omits all previous personal description of Nyerere, completing the shift from the focus on the political power of the individual leader to that of the people themselves. Additional picaresque material not in the Daily Express article reveals that the huge crowd gathered to hear Nyerere is not only there to hear political speeches, but has also gathered for a far more pedestrian reason—to see the first black Tanganyikan barrister just back from England with his new bride. The couple does not show up after all, but this is “soon forgotten” and the crowd nevertheless remains for the political speeches. The first new detail adds subtle characterization, attributing to the “masses” a fallible humanity; the second sets up an important contrast between the general appeal of spectacle and genuine social involvement. In additional new material, Achebe now contrasts this crowd with his experience of boisterous Nigerian mass meetings. When Achebe does address Nyerere’s role, he reframes the original critical context described in the Daily Express article of the political meeting organized to address criticisms of Nyerere’s leadership, led by the “incredible leader of the women’s wing of TANU, Bibi Titi” (4). Now Bibi Titi’s remarks are simply a show of criticism, “an indulgent attack” (Item 107). Nyerere’s portrait is softened from the sharp contrast of his seeming aloofness and his brilliant political rhetoric; now his apparent isolation makes him seem “frail and out of place” (Item 107).

Achebe moved up the section entitled “A Swahili Poet” and places it next, since in the original essay, it occurred between the descriptions of the Wachagga and the Wahehe peoples. Since Achebe has already rearranged and rewritten these sections for the “TOURIST SKETCHES”, he may not want to disrupt that essay’s cohesiveness by adhering to the original Daily Express structure. Achebe reframed the section on Shabaan Robert titled “A Swahili Poet” by adding two new introductory paragraphs concerning the use of Swahili. In “CAN THERE BE
A MULTI-RACIAL SOCIETY?” he makes a passing remark on the role Swahili played in the marked lack of tribalism in Tanganyika. Now Achebe expands on that point, describing a conversation with “a European scholar” (Item 107) who suggests that Swahili is a more powerful and unifying force than nationalism. Although Achebe comments that this assessment is “a bit unbalanced,” he notes it is certainly true that the primarily foreign-owned radio stations, now in a “new Scramble for Africa” (Item 107), fill the airwaves with Swahili language programming, no doubt believing that the effectiveness of the message is elevated by the use of indigenous language that “naturalizes” the theme. Achebe, at the time of his 1960 visit, would have noted radio programming for the area, being involved in the same profession, and this early impression of the power of a foreign political agenda in indigenous language programming would have informed his programming goals for the “Voice of Nigeria,” which began broadcasting in 1962. Although these introductory paragraphs are not part of his Daily Express piece, they are included in Item 106, the partial, undated typescript that could have been written as early as 1962, as noted above. Achebe’s attentiveness to the use of an indigenous language as a tool might be evidence of a later dating for the material since his perspective also seems informed by Fanon’s critique against the use of the language of the colonized, for both nation-building, but certainly in this case for more sinister, neo-colonial propaganda. His response to indigenous language use is wary: “What effect does it all have? I just wonder (Item 107).” He pessimistically concludes that the use of indigenous languages like Swahili in broadcasting gives him little hope that it will transfer into a preference for Swahili literature.

Whether Achebe became concerned about competing political rhetoric in indigenous language broadcasting during his original trip, or whether this sentiment is a later construction based on his later experience as the producer of “Voice of Nigeria” between 1962 and 1966,
hinges on establishing a date for the composition of Item 106, an earlier text than Item 107, composed around 1973, but possibly written as early as 1962, an extract of which was used for the “TOURIST SKETCHES” essay. Some additional evidence that Achebe might have been thinking along these lines quite early in his career comes from a quote in the first 1963 issue of *Voice of Nigeria* regarding similar ambitions for the use of various languages in “Voice of Nigeria” programming:

Consequently we are now in a position to offer a much enlarged service directed in the first instance to the following targets—West Africa, East, Central and South Africa, North Africa, Western Europe and the Middle East. The languages will be English, French, and Arabic. It is proposed to start Hausa and Swahili later. (6)

Achebe’s motivation for using multiple European and indigenous languages was based on his desire to reach Africa, Europe, and the Middle East in order to spread Nigerian influence in African and world politics. “The fact is that Nigeria occupies a very important position in contemporary Africa, and what she says or does is of enormous significance, and ought to be known and understood (5).” On the other hand, Achebe appeared at pains to distinguish “Voice of Nigeria” from merely being an oppositional voice to foreign broadcasting in multiple indigenous languages:

‘Voice of Nigeria’ is not designed for ‘teaching other nations how to live,’ which Milton saw in the 17th century as England’s responsibility, and which many countries in and outside Africa today have taken upon themselves with missionary zeal…It is not the voice of the schoolmaster but the voice of a friend. Our news
broadcasts will strive to be accurate and our commentaries to be objective… In all we do we shall try to avoid hysteria and all types of posturing. (6)

Clearly Achebe tried to craft a neutral position for the role of “Voice of Nigeria” within the atmosphere of contemporary Cold War rhetoric. The emerging African nations, beset by competing international interests hoping to carve out new spheres of influence in the postcolonial world, needed a “friend” that would “avoid hysteria…and posturing.” Shaping Nigerian broadcasting as such would have provided an antidote of a kind for what he experienced in East Africa and would provide some evidence to suggest that Achebe composed Item 106 much earlier.

Achebe continued to follow the structure of the *Daily Express* article, but radically reshaped the descriptive material on Shabaan Robert, omitting discussions of Robert’s popularity as a translator of Western work into Swahili, Robert’s own frustration with a foreign audiences’ desire for these translations vs. works in original Swahili, and Robert’s financial difficulties. In the *Daily Express* text, all these original elements appeared framed within a mode of literary production controlled primarily by a Western reading audience and a Western publishing apparatus. Achebe now lays blame for the lack of a Swahili reading audience at the feet of Kenyan writers (perhaps as a stand-in for the African reading public), who tell him they “would not care to read a work written in Swahili” (Item 107). Achebe’s discussion of radio programming and African reading habits reflects the intense critical debate among Africans over the use of English, or any Western languages, in the writing of African literature as discussed earlier. Achebe shifted the focus from a struggle between Western audiences and publishers on one side and African writers on the other, to an internal struggle among Africans themselves over their writing and reading preferences. Ultimately, it is Africans, Achebe now appeared to be
arguing, both writers and audiences, that have more to do with the production of indigenous language literatures than the West.

Achebe concluded his essay with the previously revised sections from the *reflections* text but switched the order. “The People of Kilimanjaro” comes first followed by “The Warlike Wahehe.” Beginning with a newly amended description of Mt. Kibo, he interjects the metaphysical element even earlier, now suggesting that the initial letdown he felt upon seeing Mt. Kibo is because, “It lacks the spiritual majesty of Mt. Kenya (Item 107).” The previous description of the “thick clouds which cover it” now becomes “the mantle of cloud which hides it,” an obvious biblical allusion to the mantle of clouds that covered Mt. Sinai where Moses communed with God before receiving the Ten Commandments—a mythical place of epiphany.

The earlier comparison of the white dome of the mountain with the “darkness” of the “surrounding country”—a geographical reference—in Item 107 becomes a more abstract contrast between the sun-lit dome and “the rest of the world.” Coming as it does before new descriptions of the progressive Wachagga and the resolute Wahehe elevates these examples as epiphanies of hope and revelation beyond the confines of Africa alone. The metaphysical and metaphorical significance he bestows on Mt. Kibo heightens the drama of its trivialization as a birthday present by the British monarch. Achebe appears to balance this “winning effrontery” (Item 107) by adding that the British concern for the lack of native representation at the Berlin Conference was “unusual and quite unexpected” (Item 107). One wonders on whose part? The phrase assumes a long history of determined European exploitation, now surprisingly interjected with humanitarian motivations. Is this Achebe’s surprise as he learns of this debate and an apparent attention to the welfare of African people in an age supposedly bereft of such emotion? The comment appears to be a set up for a trenchant critique. He drily notes a deeper racism behind
Western liberal concern for other peoples of the world, a concern that often cannot entertain a true equality among peoples, since, at the moment of Mt. Kibo’s transfer to the German Empire, “nobody thought to consult the natives” (Item 107).

The material on the Wachagga is not much changed, which is of interest because of what Achebe did not excise. He retained the sentence, “In a speech to the Chagga Council Mr Nyerere praised their go-ahead spirit, but suggested obliquely that there was also virtue in giving a system [a fair trial (“TOURIST SKETCHES”)] [time to prove itself (Item 107)] before embarking on a new [experiment (“TOURIST SKETCHES”)] [one (Item 107)].” Certainly the turmoil attending Nyerere’s leadership in the early 1970s might have tempted others to discretely omit this line. But Achebe’s loyalty to Nyerere’s leadership of Tanzania remained steady, buoyed by the inspirational example of a Tanzanian ancestor, Chief Mkwawa of “The Warlike Wahehe,” described in the final section of the essay. The narrative of the Wahehe resistance to German colonization, already expanded in “TOURIST SKETCHES,” received even greater emendation here.

A comparison of the progression of the text from Item 106 [undated], to Item 107 [ca. 1973] to the Morning Yet on Creation Day (1975) text reveals Achebe’s effort to elevate the elements of honor and glory in an historical rendering of the Wahehe resistance from an African perspective, and conversely, by adding ignominious details concerning the behavior on the part of the German forces, remind the reader of German war atrocities carried over well into the twentieth century. Achebe elaborated on the conflict between the Wahehe and the “terrible” (Item 106) Masai, now refashioned as the “much celebrated” (Morning 75) Masai, and the conflict between the Wahehe and the colonizing Germans, “more feared” (Item 107) than the Masai, now become “more ruthless” (Morning 75), shifting the focus from an African response
to the cause for such a response. Germany’s “colonization of Africa” (Item 106) became “the subjugation of Africa by European races” (Item 107) and finally “African resistance to European subjugation” (*Morning* 75). Both renderings in Items 106 and 107 place Africans in a passive position and Europeans in the active position. Achebe now emphasized the African response to the European threat. Achebe intensified the descriptive terms for the Wahehe, who in a future African history yet to be written, will receive “an honoured place” (Item 106), “prominence and recognition” (Item 107) and finally, “prominence and honour” (*Morning* 75).

The Germans, now described as “an invading army” (*Morning* 76) that is “shocked and humiliated” (*Morning* 76) by a much smaller African force, “took three years” (Item 107) to respond to this defeat. The description that the Germans “sent over five companies of men” (Item 107), became “sent well over five companies of men” (*Morning* 76), the addition of the word “well” shifting the meaning from simply a change in locale to the implication that the Germans, through fear of the Wahehe, were unsure of the outcome of the conflict and thus committed an over-abundance of troops. Meanwhile, the narrative continues, Mkwawa uses the interim in hostilities “to good advantage” (Item 106). Achebe changed this phrase to “to fortify his kingdom” (*Morning* 76), substituting an English idiom with a grander description of Mkwawa’s political position. The description that Mkwawa builds an eight-mile wall around his “village” (Item 106) became “his capital” (Item 107), a change in the text that elevates Mkwawa’s status.

Although the Germans ultimately defeat Mkwawa’s forces, in the new narrative Achebe expands upon the description of the period of resistance: “They easily” (Item 106) defeat the Mkwawa’s forces became “With their immensely superior forces they easily” (Item 107) and finally, “With their immensely superior armament they easily” (*Morning* 76) overcame the Wahehe. Achebe removed a sense of the inevitability of the Wahehe’s defeat and replaced it with
a specific cause for that defeat—superior forces. Yet he caught the implication of implied superior intelligence and training on the part of the Europeans in Item 107 and substituted the phrase with “superior armament” in Morning, thus relocating the superiority of the German forces in technological advantage. Mkwawa’s effort to escape capture is first described as “three years” (Item 106), then changed to “three years more” (Item 107), before finally settling on a desired emphasis on an unexpected and extended duration, “for three long years” (Morning 76). In the description of Mkwawa’s death, Achebe removed the passive description of his beheading, “The chief’s head was cut off” (Item 106) and replaced it with the more vividly active voice, “The young officer cut off the head” (Morning 76), specifically attributing the action to the German himself. The Germans’ “unusual taste” (Item 106) for collecting heads, now becomes a “curious taste” (Morning 76), a subtle substitution that removes any sense that this practice is particular to Germans. By refusing to attributive special significance to this German headhunting, Achebe undermines the European obsession with “savage” (read inhuman) African headhunters normally garnered in European literature. On the other hand, the German practice of collecting heads appears even more grotesque because of how the practice has been normalized as part of a museum collection—a practice sanctioned by the elite of Germany.

Achebe stretched out the horror of the devastating end of Wahehe power by elaborating upon the strange history of the return of Mkwawa’s head to Tanganyika in 1954. After World War I, when the British took possession of the German colony, the British Governor, now realized “how much the Wahehe still suffered from the trauma of that event” (Morning 76) and “made moves to recover Mkwawa’s head. It was a long and morbid story. But in the end Mkwawa’s skull was identified from among the 2,000 others in a museum in Bremen...” (Morning 76). Achebe added gravitas to the description of the ceremony watched “in silence”
(Morning 76) by thousands of Wahehe people. The silent response of the people to their fate heightens the poignancy of the moment, as words seem inadequate to express their feelings upon this occasion.

Achebe struggled to draw the majesty of Mkwawa’s resistance, death, and return in the imagination of his people with the modern day image of his descendant, Chief Adam Sapi. Described in the Daily Express article as “very well educated and extremely unassuming,” Achebe then tries “sophisticated and very unassuming” in reflections. Not satisfied with that either, he tried “highly civilized and very unassuming” (Item 106) and then “highly civilized and totally unassuming” (Item 107) until, perhaps realizing that the equation of “very well educated,” “sophisticated” and “high civilized” is highly problematic, considering the behavior of the Germans, finally settles on “quiet and totally unassuming” (Morning 76). Still trying to bind the generation and historical gap between the two figures, Achebe added additional comment: “But perhaps Sultan Mkwawa himself would have looked peaceful and unassuming in 1960 having seen his territory overrun first by the Germans and then by the British and now hearing rumours of independence, albeit of a different kind (Morning 76).” The statement collapses the identities of Mkwawa and Sapi, suggesting that under different circumstances, Sapi might have been as fierce as Mkwawa, and under the yoke of extended oppression, Mkwawa might have adjusted accordingly. Achebe continues his extended contemplation on Sapi’s character by presenting new material concerning his own interaction with the chief. He writes of Sapi’s last minute going away gift of a miniature Wahehe spear, a gesture by which Achebe “was most flattered” (Item 106), which he amended to the idiomatic “was truly touched and flattered by such attention from the grandson of the great Sultan Mkwawa” (Item 107) and finally to a weightier “was greatly
moved and flattered by such attention from the grandson of the great Sultan Mkwawa” (*Morning 77*).

As mentioned earlier, the new conclusion of this essay rounded out the new introduction to this section written for the reflections text, completing a frame narrative for the Wahehe material. Achebe rephrased the question concerning the origin of the lorry’s legend from “How did their name…?” to the more personal “Now, how did the name of his [Mkwawa’s] people…?” (*Morning 77*). What in the reflections text was mere conjecture—that Achebe suspected that Nigerian soldiers might have met Tanganyikan soldiers during the First or Second World Wars—becomes partial fact:

I have discovered that a few Nigerian soldiers fought under the British in Tanganyika in the two wars. Perhaps one of them liked the sound of that name [Wahehe] and took it home; but we cannot be sure. And perhaps it is appropriate that that little residue of mystery should remain. Which actually pleases me, for I like a residue of mystery always to remain. (*Morning 77*)

Knowledge strips away mystery. He admits to “mixed feelings” (Item 106) now that the word Wahehe has “lost its magic” (Item 107), feelings “we always do” (Item 106) (in Item 107 changed to “we always should”) have at the loss of “wonder and innocence” (Item 107). Such an emotional response to such a loss is appropriate as “knowledge settles in” (Item 107).

The elegiac ending of the final published form of the text further removes it from its origin as reportage or travel writing, to a profound commentary on his current emotional state with regard to not only the knowledge of a seemingly trifle, or “esoteric legend” (*Morning 75*), WAHEHE, but to Achebe’s experiences of the last fifteen years—years that spanned the sweeping changes of African nationalist movements with all the anticipated potential of new
African nations, to their devolution into bloody civil war, corruption and failed economic policies. Achebe’s loss of wonder and innocence encompasses so much more than the knowledge of a word; it encompasses the loss of a national identity, the loss of his national media platform, the loss of safety and security, the loss of property and free movement, all denied him on the basis of ethnicity, certainly not outcomes he had anticipated on the eve of Nigerian independence. Even in 1975, he does not seem quite ready to admit those losses in the present moment. He deftly writes this emotional state back into the past by banishing it to the time, “after my visit” (Morning 77), appending the date “1961” to end of his essay, and completing, by fiat, that banishment.

The movement from reportage, to travel writing, to history, to creative writing traces a trajectory of Achebe’s struggle to come to terms with the postcolonial experience. In many ways he set the literary critical standards of the day by which Africans came to theorize their experience, yet his positions were not static. A careful reading of successive publications opens up the shifts and turns his positions took as he struggled with rapidly changing circumstances. To utilize only the final version of the essay as though it was written intact in 1961 creates a fiction that obscures important knowledge of Achebe’s development as a writer, an important element in the creation of a legend. A. James Arnold is right: without a critical historical approach to a writer’s literary production, scholars may miss the ways they become complicit in the so-called “monumental status” of a writer, especially with a writer like Achebe who among many other writers “is complicit in forging his own legendary persona…” (259).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Traditional variorum editions meet three criteria: the author is considered a “classical” author, that is, an author whose central importance in the field of literature is widely recognized; second, variorums should cover the entire corpus of an author’s work; and third, the variorum, besides presenting an authorized or final version of a text, also references the collected notes of various commentators or editors of the text, particularly with regard to the presence of textual variations and the editor’s evidence and reasoning for choosing one text out of all variants. The more recent, simplified use of the term variorum denotes a text that shows variant readings from manuscripts or earlier editions. This definition best describes the present project of creating a chronological bibliography of Chinua Achebe’s 1950-1975 corpus and variorum text documents for each text. This chapter establishes the critical support for the claim that variorum editions of this kind are the sine qua non for all textualist materialist readings.

This project meets the traditional criteria of variorum editions in specific ways. Certainly the late twentieth century debate over what should constitute the English language literary canon has opened up the opportunity for a writer like Achebe to be considered a “classical” author. Prior to this period, the writings of Africans or any colonial subjects typically were not included or taught as part of English language curriculum in the west. During the late colonial and early independence era, modern African literature written in English began to emerge. Achebe’s first major publications, the novels Things Fall Apart and No Longer At Ease, published while he was
still a British colonial subject, and his later, post-independence works coincide with momentous political, economic, and social transitions in African history. His novels have centered on themes of interpretative contestation. On the one hand, his novels are a recuperative project of the African past and African person through vivid, realist descriptions that overwrite the a-historical, dehumanized African domain depicted in so much of European literature and science. Thus Achebe’s works serve as a new history, a new anthropology, a new sociology, a new political science, and even embodies a new linguistic roadmap for many Africans. Besides serving as primers of African values and aesthetics in the face of cultural onslaught from the west, for many African writers the novels serve as a template of how to write a modern African novel in English. For all these reasons, Chinua Achebe is a profoundly important figure in African letters and increasingly has come to represent the face of African literature in classrooms in the West.

For the purpose of this project, the scope of the Achebe corpus is limited to the years 1950-1975, beginning with Achebe’s first published college pieces and concluding with the first published collection of his critical essays. Even with this limitation, the task of collecting all available textual evidence for this time period comes with special difficulties. First, the quantity of Achebe production for these years is impressive. Even by limiting the bibliography in this way, the scope of the corpus consists of four novels, fifteen short stories, thirty poems and fifty-one non-fiction essays, introductions, and reviews. As the chronological bibliography of Achebe’s texts and text documents compiled for this study illustrate, the Achebe corpus proliferates even further when all extant compositional and publication versions of each text are factored in as well. And for the first time in Achebe textual studies, the chronological bibliography compiled for this project and the text documents that track text mutations over time include all available manuscripts for this period.
Achebe manuscripts have not been included in previously published Achebe bibliographies. For the years 1950 through 1975, the following libraries contain correspondence, manuscripts, and other relevant materials related to Achebe. By far the largest collection of manuscripts are held in the Chinua Achebe Papers (1963-1993) at Houghton Library, Harvard University, acquired from Chinua Achebe in 1996. Other items from the 1950-1975 period are included in the Harvey Swados Papers (1933-1983) in the Special Collections and Archives of the W.E.B Du Bois Library at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, the Archives of Harold Ober Associates (1913-1999) in the Princeton University Library, University Place Book Shop Papers (1968-1988) and David R. Clark Papers (1957-1989) in the Special Collections Department at the University of Delaware Library, the Harry Levin Papers (1912-1994) at Houghton Library, Harvard University, and in the Heinemann African Writers Series Manuscript Collection (1964-1986) at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

While these manuscripts are available for study, obstacles of distance and terms of access prevent a problem-free examination of these texts. For example, the Harvard collection, where the bulk of Achebe manuscripts are housed, can only be studied in-house, thus an examination and transcription of these manuscripts for this project entailed extensive travel and expense, not to mention many hours of transcription. Similar obstacles prevented an examination of Achebe manuscripts housed at the University of London.

The lack of an established, all-inclusive chronological bibliography of Achebe’s publications one might consult makes collecting Achebe textual evidence quite difficult. The task of filling that lacuna in Achebe studies with the chronological bibliography found in chapter four of this project was fraught with problems of reconnaissance and visibility since bibliographical evidence for these texts as well as the texts themselves are dispersed across a
highly complex, intercontinental range of sources. In the process of compiling the chronological bibliography for this project, I utilized a variety of both online and published Achebe bibliographies, cited works at the ends of books and articles, *Books in Print, South of the Sahara: Index to Periodical Literature, 1900-1970* compiled by the Library of Congress, and the online World Catalogue, a global catalogue of library collections, none of which is comprehensive of the period selected or comprehensive across all genres. As an example illustrating how easily an omission may occur because of this lack of a comprehensive bibliography, I discovered a 1966 book review by Achebe never before cited in any consulted bibliographies, simply by leafing through the pages of *The New Statesman*.

Many bibliographic sources are often limited in scope. *Books in Print*, while useful, only covers books. The Library of Congress index cited above primarily referenced international publications, not African publications, thus many of Achebe’s publications in Nigerian newspapers or magazines are not cited. The World Catalogue, also extremely useful, only cites books currently available in electronic catalogues around the world. African library holdings, not yet available on the Internet, are seriously underrepresented. For instance, the National Archives of Nigeria are not available electronically, a particular problem since much of Achebe’s early production is included in journals that no other library catalogue currently holds.

The best print sources of Achebe bibliographies currently available include the following in alphabetical order, although none is comprehensive and all include some inaccuracies and/or omissions. Few note revisions and emendations. These include Joseph C. Anafulu’s “Chinua Achebe: A Preliminary Checklist” (1978); *Approaches to Teaching Achebe’s Things Fall Apart*, edited by Berth Lindfors (1991); David Carroll’s *Chinua Achebe: Novelist, Poet, Critic* (1990); *The Chinua Achebe Encyclopedia* edited by M. Keith Booker (2003); Victoria K. Evalds’

Since no authoritative bibliography can be consulted, limitations in the corpus might also occur because of inaccurate or incomplete bibliographic entries. For example, most online sources vary widely in accuracy and border on useless; any use of such sources should be compared carefully to previously published bibliographies, although these also often contain mistakes. For example, in the case of the Library of Congress’ index, Achebe’s short story, “In a Village Church” mistakenly gives the improper item and page number. It also attributes two unsigned poems to Achebe, “Mr. Jones” and “Waste,” merely because the items fall on the successive page immediately following his signed lyric, “There Was a Young Man.” Unfortunately, many currently available bibliographies repeat errors from online sources. For these reasons, whenever possible, I acquired an original print copy of all versions of Achebe’s works for the selected period in order to cross-check available bibliographic information with the document itself.
At this time it is difficult to say if the chronological bibliography compiled here is complete, yet I am confident that all possible resources available in the United States have been consulted. There is still the potential for other discoveries in numerous presently unavailable African publications or in other manuscript collections. Every bibliographic entry has been checked against an actual print document, if available, so all citations for these items are accurate. If an item is unavailable, a notation appears in the bibliography and citation accuracy cannot be guaranteed, given the unstable nature of current Achebe bibliographies.

The third criterion of a traditional variorum edition has three component parts. It establishes an authoritative text, one that comes as close as possible to an author’s original intent through an evaluation of all available manuscripts, publications, and author notes and correspondence. It also references the collected notes of various commentators or editors of the text, particularly with regard to the presence of textual variations and the editor’s evidence and reasoning for choosing one text out of all variants. Most traditional forms of variorum editions create charts or lists of text variations that are appended at the end of the authorized text. The theory of a text as well-wrought urn, at once unitary and a-historical, governs the goal of an authorized text, and by extension, the way the variorum edition is structured. This accounts for the inclusion of textual evidence for the choice of any one text over another and the editor’s rationale for that choice of the “best text” for the purpose of creating a “clean text” devoid of text mutations and footnotes for ease in reading. The ability to create a clean text, however, is predicated upon the compilation of textual evidence in order to create a stable archive whereby a knowledgeable choice for a “best text” can be made. Textual materialist projects, such as the present study, must precede any such critical textual choice.
Since the goal of the textualist materialist approach is to present all the textual evidence available for a particular text as a means of elucidating the text’s genealogy, no attempt is made to select one text from among all variations or collapse all manuscript evidence and multiple versions into a sole, ideal text. Instead, each collated text document illustrates the nature and scope of all linguistic text variations, both in the compositional process, publication and republication. Maintaining all text variants within each text document connects the manuscript evidence of the creative process to the evolving publication history of each linguistic text, which in the case of Achebe’s works brings a richer texture to Achebe’s compositional history.

This particular presentation of the text documents in the project posits a different approach for tracking text mutation from the way those changes are presented in traditional variorum editions. Applying a traditional tracking model of appended charts or lists of variation to the 1950-1975 Achebe corpus at once becomes impractical due to the large number of variations that exist in many of the texts. For instance, a comparison of available texts of Achebe’s novel *Arrow of God* reveals hundreds of variants in five separate sources, requiring the production of hundreds of charts. The text documents devised for each of Achebe’s publications for this project illustrate the variations of each text through a combination of strikethroughs, brackets, curly brackets, spacing, and color-coding that allows a reader to visualize easily and concisely multiple variations in a text. Each text document begins with a chronological bibliographical list of all known manuscripts and publications for each text. Each bibliographic entry is a different color font. The earliest known manuscript or published text is the foundational text of the document. Chronologically later variations in the text are added to that foundation text, using a different color font, coded to each bibliographic entry listed at the beginning of each document. This system simultaneous illustrates the diachronic life of the text.
and allows for a reconstruction of a synchronic text for each bibliographic entry. The temporal sequencing of the texts should not be confused with promoting an order of authorial intent or prioritizing a chronological, even teleological trajectory for the author’s intention for that text over time. The assumption of such an implication arises in part from a general expectation that the first or original text is the best evidence for an author’s original creative impulse or controlling force of the text. Later text mutations, if attributable to the author, are authoritative as well. Thus the final authorial mutations reflect the final intent for a text. This project takes a social text theory approach whose purpose is to draw attention to the existence and extent of text variations, not for the ultimate purpose of creating an authorized text, but in order to illustrate both the synchronic life of a text over time and the diachronic life of a text by showing all variations simultaneously, allowing for a multivalent experience of the text. Unfortunately, for the purpose of this project, the electronic platform could not accept color font in the body of the project and therefore the text documents are included in a supplemental file attached to the project. Including these text documents within the body of the project and not as a separate appendix to the project would have been apropos to the central thesis of the project.

Review of Variorum Methodology

W.W. Greg, the British textualist and Shakespeare scholar, established the first modern copy-text principles widely adopted in both Britain and the United States. In his seminal article, “The Rationale of Copy-Text” (1950-51), he sums up these principles, “It is therefore the modern editorial practice to choose whatever extant text may be supposed to represent most nearly what the author wrote and to follow it with the least possible alteration (22).” Greg argued for a robust role for the textual editor when establishing a copy-text, or an authoritative text for
publication, from amongst all “substantive” (mutations that affect meaning) textual variants for a text by suggesting, for example, that a slavish copy of an author’s obvious errors was not warranted (19). On the other hand an editor should adhere conservatively to the form of the text or “accidentals” (spelling, punctuation, word division, and so forth) first established in any manuscript and in the first published edition of a text, particularly if it is “part of the author’s habit of expression to go beyond words and into the forms these take together with the punctuation that helps to shape the relationships of these words (22).” Greg privileges the first edition, set from manuscript, as presumably the closest to an author’s original intention for the form of his or her words. Greg made room for the advent of a revised edition based on changes an author might make to substantive elements, but Greg still insisted that an author’s original accidentals, the forms of the words, should be faithfully maintained and subsequent publication variations in accidentals be removed (22). Fredson Bowers, who follows Greg’s methodology, gave an updated summary of what has come to be called the Greg-Bowers approach to scholarly editions in “Some Principles for Scholarly Editions of Nineteenth-Century American Authors (1964).” Bowers stated that the purpose of the editorial role remains authoritative: “The first step in critical editing is the so-called establishment of the text. The first step in this process is the determination of the exact forms of the early documents in which the text is preserved and of the facts about their relationship to one another (224).” Establishing the text is essential for the creation of what Bowers calls an authoritative edition, “one set directly from manuscript, or a later edition that contains corrections or revisions that proceeded from the author (224),” an edition given added authority through the editor’s attempt to realize, through that “ideal” text, the author’s ultimate intention for that text. For Bowers the basic goal for an authoritative text remained a constructed combination of “the superior authority of most of the words in the
revised edition with the superior authority of the forms of words in the first edition (225).”

According to G. Thomas Tanselle in “Greg’s Theory of Copy-Text and the Editing of American Literature,” Bowers’ unique contributions to the Greg-Bowers school were developed in his article, “Multiple Authority: New Problems and Concepts of Copy-Text.” With regard to variorum editions, Bowers insisted upon the inclusion of what he termed “radiating texts,” any publications of a text that could not be traced back to single manuscript, where “two or more texts stand in exactly the same genealogical relationship to a lost ancestor, with no earlier texts surviving (183).” Bowers contrasted documents of this kind to “ancestral series,” a number of documents where a straight chronology from manuscript to last published text could be established (183). As Tanselle points out, Greg’s principles did not adequately deal with the textual issues confronting Bowers. Bowers’ position with regard to radiating texts was a small concession of editorial authority to versions as “multiple authorities.” Furthermore, Bowers recommended all versions should be included in an appendix in the back of the edition, including any rationale for an editor’s final choice of an authorized text (183). Tanselle, who also follows in the Greg-Bowers tradition, notes that the development of these textualist principles was not based on a philosophical or ideological stance, but on pragmatics—how writers actually behave and how texts get created and published. Bowers further identified five classes of material impacted by these editorial principles: single edition variants due to the printing process, emendations made by the editor in the copy-text, substantive differences in editions published during the author’s lifetime (or posthumously), all rejected readings and revisions during the process of inscription (pre-copy-text variants) and hyphenations, particularly compound words at the end of lines in the text (Tanselle 188-189).
By 1967, the Greg-Bowers principles were incorporated into the Modern Language Association’s Statement of Editorial Principles and adopted by the Center for Editions of American Authors (CEAA), an official committee of the MLA. The Statement is “a step-by-step explanation of the processes of bringing together the ‘authentic forms’ of a text, selecting the copy-text, performing collations (by machine and by "sight" -- that is, without a machine), presenting the evidence, writings notes and introductions, and proofreading (Tanselle Greg’s Theory 191). The CEAA, following Greg and Bowers, preferred the establishment of an authoritative or "clear text," pages of text free of editorial apparatus (193). If scholars adhered to the principles in the Statement, the CEAA gave an edition its stamp of “An Approved Text.” As Tanselle notes, Greg, Bowers, and the CEAA did not delineate a particular apparatus for these editions, merely that the principles should be followed. These CEAA editions were “the specific combination of two elements -- a text edited according to Greg's theory, combined with an apparatus providing the essential evidence for examining the editor's decisions (193).”

By the early 1970’s, these principles were increasingly problematized by scholars such as Morse Peckham, whose “Reflections on the Foundations of Modern Textual Editing” (1971) suggested that “text” and “author” were “exalted terms.” An “author,” he argued, is simply an organism making utterances, combining utterances into a discourse that is continually shaped by other discourse utterances, including the original organism, editors, and later editions. Thus there can be no “single, ideal” text and hence no author’s intended text (qtd. on Tanselle Greg’s Theory 211). Peckham’s work was a direct challenge to traditional textualist principles. In Tanselle’s “The Editorial Problem of Final Authorial Intention” (1976), he notes that up to this point, the goal of all text editing was a close adherence to an original manuscript and author communications about that manuscript, and utilizing their best assessment of an author’s original
intention for a text as that text was in the process of being composed, making judgments among competing authorial and editorial variations in order to create an idealized, final, and authoritative or definitive text which, in the editor’s assessment, represented an author’s ultimate and final intention for his or her text (167). An authorized text was considered an historical reconstruction designed “to discover exactly what an author wrote and to determine what form of his work he wished the public to have (168).” Peckham’s claim that this type of reconstruction was merely another construct, and not some distilled essence of authorial intent, directly interrogated the authority of an editor’s role in the compilation of variorum editions.

Peter Shillingsburg, in “An Inquiry into the Social Status of Texts and Modes of Textual Criticism,” points out that the Greg-Bowers perspective reflects “an author-centric view of textual criticism” (71) that privileges an authorial autonomy with regard to texts. This traditional belief in the possibility of retrieving, even rescuing an author’s original intention through the collation of all surviving manuscript evidence and publications and by extension, that the textual editor has the authority to derive that original intention from the available evidence, has been largely superseded by the Jerome McGann’s theory of the social status of texts. It is important to pause here, however, because as Shillingsburg points out, even within this supposedly conservative methodology, fueled perhaps by a naïve belief in the possibility of recreating an original “moment” of the author’s intention in the process of composition, great variation exists in the levels of authority presumed by the editor with regard to his or her capacity to make decisions about authorial intention, “depending on the sense of historical or documentary integrity one espouses” (72).

Shillingsburg parses out the various levels of “authority” involved when speaking of textual evidence for an author’s final intention. Texts directly derived from the author, such as an
author’s manuscript or any author alterations in proofs or setting-copies and author instructions or notes for publication, would be classified as “primary authorial authority” (70). “Secondary authorial authority” describes a text "having a demonstrable, though not precisely known, relation to the author" (70); for instance, a handwritten manuscript is not extant, but a typescript survives and “it is generally known that the author did revise or proofread the text which is said, therefore, to have authority…[and] where the fact of authorial revision is not in dispute but the details of specific revisions cannot be recovered (70).” A third kind of authority, “primary documentary authority,” is primarily distinct from “secondary authorial authority” because it refers to a published text that the author may have had no hand in the typesetting or proofreading, yet is “the closest known text to one the author wrote or otherwise supervised” (70). This designation is given to any first published piece with no prepublication evidence, since such documents presume the prior existence of some "primary authorial authority” text (70). Finally, “radial documentary authority” refers to instances where there is no one authoritative source for a piece of writing, and therefore no way to establish a precedent; instead, surviving documents have “an unknown relation to the author and may or may not preserve the authorial forms” (70). For example, a text may appear in different published forms, “whose differences are probably traceable to publication house decisions and not authorial intention” (70).

Shillingsburg points out that the word “authority” in these definitions is really being used “evaluatively” (71). When editors assess how closely a published text adheres to an author’s manuscript or how much a text is altered by later hands it is for the purpose of determining “the relative amount of intentional and unintentional alteration introduced by compositors or other production personnel” (71). While the previous definitions and editorial principles appear fairly straightforward, Shillingsburg notes that Hershel Parker, in Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons,
disagrees with the supposition that editors should always follow author preferences for a particular work over time, including later emendations of an original composition. Parker limits authority to the product of the act of creativity at the moment of creation, a product of what he calls the “controlling force of the work” (72). Contrary to an author’s publication preferences over time, preferences that may change from the original moment of creation, it is the editor's aim to edit the work in accordance with the original intent at the moment of creation and not adhere to “editorial tinkering that the author may have done to the text after he had lost the creative urge that produced the work” (72). This more radical approach is in fact a purist point of view concerning authorial intent and to a much greater extent privileges the evaluative authority of an editor even over an author’s own management of his or her text. Though Parker rejects a simplistic application of the Greg-Bowers principles as too limiting an approach that does not take into consideration an author’s sometimes failed attempt to achieve an original intent or whose later emendations disrupt an original intent, Parker still operates under the presumption of the existence of, and the editor’s capacity to discern, an original authorial intention.

As Robin Schulze points out in her introduction to *Becoming Marianne Moore*, editorial and authorial authority in the Greg-Bowers approach is based on the presumption that the original artistic intent of “an autonomous liberal humanist subject (5)” is discoverable. This presumption held true even through the rise of post-war New Criticism, a literary theory defined by W. K. Wimsett’s and Monroe C. Beardsley’s delineation of the “intentional fallacy” that completely ruled out author’s intent in the process of interpreting and evaluating literary works (Tanselle *Editorial Problems* 173). These seemingly opposed points of view converge, however, in “that both posit a unique status for the art work as well wrought urn, at once unitary, authoritative, and superior to historical contingency (Bornstein 5).” Still, textualists and New
Critics each felt the other held unproblematized presumptions. Shillingsburg points out that it was Hershel Parker, utilizing textualist principles, who launched an attack against New Criticism’s unproblematic acceptance of art works as already unified and making sense, merely waiting for the critic’s examination and elucidation. By not reading historically and denying authorial intent, these critics merely projected their theoretical model upon the text. For Parker, such a presumption completely ignored the problematic nature of arriving at such a unified text. By making the argument that authors themselves often created “flawed texts” by problematizing their original creative work through later emendations or by failing to achieve their own stated intent, Parker tried to disrupt the notion of the verbal icon as “a unique, perfect, and essentially authorless entity” (ix). Parker’s methodology, called “The New Scholarship,” called for the use of multiple sources, including economics, politics, the psychology of creativity and book production, along with an author’s statements or manuscripts that might impinge upon and therefore elucidate an author’s original creative process (59). As stated before, Parker felt that when the author moved from original intent into an editorial mode after the original moment of creation, it was the editor’s job to “bring back” a text from these later corruptions (59). Steven Mailloux tried to resolve the notion of authorial intent and the New Criticism accusation of “intentional fallacy” by distinguishing different kinds of intent: active, operative and inferred. Active intent had to do with “the actions that the author, as he writes the text, understands himself to be performing in that text” (97). Operative intent assumes the above intent as well as “the immediate effects he understands these actions will achieve in his projected reader “ (99), since the author and reader must meet on a common ground of shared literary and interpretive conventions (107). Mailloux distinguishes between active and operative intent on the part of the author and that of inferred intent, or “the critic’s description of the convention-based responses
that the author, as he is writing, understands he will achieve as a result (or at least in part) of his projected reader’s recognition of his intention” (99). By distinguishing the intent of an author from the editor’s special problems associated with discovering that intent, Mailloux allowed the concept of authorial intent to survive but a concept filtered through the editorial lens.

While textualists like Parker were beginning to problemmatize the notion of final authorial intent, other textualists influenced by structuralism began to adopt a different approach to textual variation. George Bornstein notes that Hans Zeller, along with American scholars Donald Reiman and Stephen Parrish, argue that text variations should be treated as multiple text versions (6). Since a text is a “complex of elements that form a system of signs” (Zeller 241), it is not the elements themselves that make up the work but the relationships between those elements. When an author changes one element, the relationships between all elements are changed, even though other elements remain unchanged. Contrary to the traditional methodology collapsing all texts into one authorized text, each text should be treated as an individual version: “A version is a specific system of linguistic signs…and authorial revisions transform it into another system (Zeller 241-242).” If each text is an individual version, it must follow that “A new version implies a new intention (Zeller 242).” As Schulze notes, the acceptance of individual texts as multiple versions gives room for a broader notion of authorial intent, since for any text and its mutations, an author may choose conventions that are appropriate to a specific time, place, and culture (13).

Zeller’s approach, because it allowed for multiple authorial intents, both the presumption of authorial intent in the Greg-Bowers principles and the complexities of intent introduced by Parker and Mailloux, was a way forward in textual theory. In Romantic Texts and Contexts, Donald Reiman, an advocate of Zeller’s approach, extended Zeller’s argument treating textual
variations as versions by suggesting that critical editions should also show the stages of production of a text, rather than divide “all but one version into small pieces and then mix and sprinkle these dismembered fragments at the bottoms of pages, or shuffle them at the back of the book as tables of ‘variants’ or ‘collations’ (169).” The acceptance of text mutations as versions deserving of individual evaluation led to Stephen Parrish’s argument that “each steady state of the text as it changes in confused, unpredictable ways, through patterns which the author may never have foreseen, let alone ‘intended’ (349)” should actually be preferred over a single, final intention. Parrish cuts the link between multiple versions and a progression of authorial intent or authorial teleology and replaces it with multiple “stages of supposed completion” (Shillingsburg 59). By moving from a teleological, progressive view of a text and allowing the multiple versions of a text to stand on their own, Parrish laid the groundwork for the critical treatment of versions as multiple contestations, all of which are “transformed by conflicting or mutually exclusive intentions” (Shillingsburg 59).

Treating mutations of a text as multiple-texts or "versions" of a text is not as author-centric as the Greg-Bowers-Tanselle approach that insisted on the existence of a sole authorial intent, but still accepts the possibility of that intent, albeit multiple and production-influenced. But Bornstein points out that the implication of such an approach for both textualists and literary theory, is that it “offers a middle ground between stable, unitary notions of the text on the one hand and poststructuralist freplay of endless deferral on the other” (7).

The acceptance of Zeller’s approach among textualists had an effect on the future form critical editions would take. In the Greg-Bowers-Tanselle approach, textual variations typically were included in appendices at the back of the book or relegated to footnotes. With a heightened appreciation for multiple-text versions, a new format for critical editions emerged, represented
by Hans Gabler’s 1984 edition of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, whose left-hand side of the page included the compositional text while the right-hand side included the “established” text of the first edition. Zeller, Reiman and Parrish claim that multiple or developing authorial intentions cannot be adequately represented in a single text; therefore, all versions should be included so that a text may be read “radially, each version in relationship to its other manifestations” (Shillingsburg 60). The multivalent text gives greater latitude to the critical perception of authorial intent during the creative process and by extension, a better understanding of a work’s meaning. These textualists, unlike the Greg-Bowers-Tanselle group, do not privilege a specific authorial intent over any another, preferring to allow all to be present in a critical edition (60).

While the previous textualist debate primarily centered on the linguistic text, Jerome McGann, in his *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*, called for “a socialized concept of authorship and textual authority” (8). For McGann, even the critical issues delineated so far did not adequately incorporate the social aspect of book composition and production. Even when editors accepted multiple, conflicting intentions, they still held some presumption that each version embodied an authorial intent. In McGann’s positive review of Gabler’s *Ulysses*, he hailed the inclusion of the compositional text, but also called for an additional edition that would track the “continuous production text” of the novel (283). Such an edition would expand the notion of “author” and by extension, “authorial intention” from “an isolated originator of a text” to an “extended social network that produces a text and of which he or she is but a part” (Bornstein 8).

As Shillingsburg points out, McGann’s emphasis on the text as a social construct was not new; textual scholars such as James Thorpe, drawing on a distinguished list of writers such as Wordsworth, Byron, Brontë, and Yeats, all of whom actively consulted their publishers for help
with punctuation, suggested that a work of art was only a “potential” work until it was actually published. Thorpe’s idea that the production process both helped the author finalize his or her text and was the vehicle through which the text was made available to readers laid the groundwork for McGann’s later positions. At the same time, Thorpe’s conclusions supported one of Greg’s original principles that a manuscript should be followed on substantives, but the first published edition should be followed for incidentals, given the frequent collaboration of authors, editors, and publishers (57). Thorpe’s emphasis on the role of the editor, even during the creative process, a process that previous editors attributed solely to the author, opened up a greater appreciation of text as collaborative creation.

Another precursor of McGann’s position, Donald Pizer, argued that the purist motivation to derive the “real” text from later “corruptions” through a strict adherence to first forms of the text, in order to “better” reflect an author’s sole and unified intention, in fact created confusion between what constituted the “real” text and the form of those texts most familiar to the public. Even if, in the eyes of these editors, later “corrupted” editions were not the original intent of an author, these editions were what had been available to the public and were editions by which these authors were “known” as those authors (Shillingsburg 58). Changing an author’s text in fact changes the relationship of that author’s text to his or her reading public. Instead of “purifying” an author, editors might introduce yet another kind of corruption, even disruption of that conventional relationship.

Despite Thorpe’s and Pizer’s interrogations of “original intent,” Shillingsburg argues that both Thorpe and Pizer, while giving legitimacy to the role of the editorial and production processes, still assumed that those processes were an extension of the notion of authorial intent, in as much as an author had a voice in the choices made throughout that process (58). The idea of
the social text shifts the concept of authority from a judgment about the effect of publication on the author’s word to vesting authority for the text in a socio-economic environment that includes both the author’s creative process and the publisher’s ongoing process of moving a composition into production (64).

Textualists have always been grounded in the search for a text’s historical situation and contingency, even when the authorized edition creates an idealized text or established text. The establishment of that idealized text necessarily entails an exhaustive search for all extant texts, both manuscripts, author communications, and various publications prior to any judgments made about a final text. Despite the naïve idea that an evaluation of the evidence could recreate an author’s original intent for that text, it cannot be denied that it was the textualists who took the material conditions of the creative process more seriously than later literary critics, who on the other hand, equally naïvely accepted a text as unified, as a closed system or “transparent conduit of an author’s unmediated words” (Bornstein 8). Shillingsburg notes that because of the difference in orientation between textualists and literary theorists, “the major question, the question of authority, may usually be argued and settled before the evaluation of specific evidence concerning the composition and production of a given text takes place (72).” As Bornstein points out, much of what passes as a materialist approach to a text is in fact “not materialist enough, but instead innocent or primitive in their treatment of a book as a literal material object (Bornstein 8)”. He continues, “Any text is an edited text, and critics and theorists neglect the principles of its editing and construction at their peril (Bornstein 8-9).” Shillingsburg cautions:

Editors may approach a text with preconceived ideas about the authority of the author or the social contract or the roles of publishers that will predispose them to
interpret the evidence in certain ways. In general terms the evaluation of specific evidence may not be determined by its intrinsic meaning -- that which ‘the facts cry out’ -- but rather by some previous determination concerning the nature of the work of art. (72-73)

A full textual inquiry will necessarily remind textualists of the many social and historical forces besides the author that contribute to the constitution of a text (Bornstein 8-9), and at the same time help theorists create a distinction “between a work of art and its embodiment in any given physical text” (Bornstein 14).

While it is Jerome McGann who championed the creation of critical editions that include both the versions of the linguistic text and the socio-history of a text, it is the advent of electronic media as an appropriate platform for the realization of the socio-historical text that has enabled these editions to become reality. Digital text has revolutionized the theory of the text and how readers come to a text because of the apparent limitlessness of the size of a text. Traditional printed variorum editions were often constrained by the impossibility of publishing all versions in toto, a limitation that no longer exists. Now it is possible to include manuscript facsimiles, all published versions, copious collation charts and data, all tagged to each line of a text, a myriad of footnotes, links to references that allow readers to read additional texts or view images alluded to in the text. Each of these tools can be activated by levels of complexity depending upon the audience and its desire for a specific kind of engagement with a text, whether a generalized curiosity, an undergraduate or graduate academic level, or a specialized textualist. Moreover digital formatting provides the added possibility of interactivity—where people can interact with a text by adding comments and reactions and engage in discussion boards with others participating in the same site. These possibilities are all changing what a text means and how it
means. Finally, a digitized text can be instantly altered, forgoing the expense and time involved in print productions, a facility that maintains an up-to-date, dynamic version of the text.\(^6\)

Project Findings

Establishing the corpus, tracking text variations, and constructing a 1950-1975 chronological bibliography accomplish three important tasks that fill a lacuna in Achebe studies. First, the project provides a comprehensive chronological bibliography of all texts, including manuscripts and publications, establishing the exact forms of all documents in which a text is preserved and establishing the facts about their relationship to one another. Second, the individual text documents establish both the synchronic and diachronic mutations for each text by tracking all mutations of known manuscripts and published versions of each text. Taken together, the first and second tasks accomplish a third by providing substantial evidence of linguistic mutation across all genres in the Achebe corpus, establishing linguistic mutation as a defining characteristic of the Achebe corpus. These three major contributions to Achebe studies provide the requisite groundwork for any critical approach to the study of Achebe’s creative process, from composition to publication and republication.

This textualist materialist project finds much support in current text theory. Jerome McGann, in his praise of J. C. C. Mays’ edition of Coleridge’s *Poetical Works*, cites Mays’

\(^6\) Some critics have noted that with the advent of digitized texts, text versions that at one time might have been maintained as typscripts of final manuscripts may be overwritten as the text is refreshed, erasing the existence of multiple versions, a rich source that would be forever lost to textual materialist studies. If each sequential manifestation of a text wipes out its former existence, it reifies the romantic notion of the text as well-wrought urn, leaving no trace of its composition or emendation. Of course there are ways around this problem. Many institutions that house digital projects maintain a stable platform that protects texts. A digital record of a project, a digital snapshot of site, can be made from time to time in order to have a record of changes over time.
rationale for creating a synoptic text of Coleridge’s poems to “enable a reader to hold in mind a sense of the way the poems move…simultaneously in several planes: that is, the way the poems move laterally, as a series of independent versions, and vertically, as one version overlays and succeeds another (qtd. in McGann *From Text to Work*). The chronological bibliography and the text documents of Achebe’s manuscripts and publications in this project have been created for the same purpose. A social text addressing the socio-historical process of these versions is an essential future task, but this project is limited primarily to what McGann calls, “the masoretic wall of the linguistic object,” or the “words on the page” (Dino and McGann). Certainly production mutations of Achebe’s texts occur in tandem with text mutations; however, this project is a beginning, a foundation upon which to build further critical considerations of Achebe’s texts.

Achebe himself, while rarely calling attention to text mutations, appears to find no real difficulty with emendations, additions and omissions in already published texts, given the frequency with which the mutations occur. This practice suggests that Achebe is more concerned with *le mot juste* than how mutations affect a previous version of the text and disrupt a clear authorial intention for any one text. Robin Schulze notes that authors who engage in such “incessant” revision, must inspire editors to search for methods better suited to a conception of authorial intention as “varied and diachronically changing…a series of intentions in regard to a given text rather than a single, teleologically driven intention (6).” The text documents for this project facilitate an appreciation of Achebe’s “varied and diachronically changing” texts.

The purpose of the text documents is to allow both a lateral and vertical sense of the text and not a “telescoped, acontextual, ahistorical moment” (Schultz 16). Since each text documents begins with a chronological bibliography and uses the earliest text as the foundational text upon
which all other changes are tracked, the reader may be tempted to infer a teleology for each text, with the attendant implication of a final “resting place” for a text.⁷ No teleology is implied; rather, the format of the text documents is chosen for its conciseness. While a traditional synoptic version of all versions of each text would be ideal, it is not practical. The method for tracking changes used in this study allows for the maximum amount of information to be collated into the smallest number of words. Therefore, if a text existed chronologically prior to another, the words that a later version has in common with the former are not printed again, but are presumed to be the same as the prior version, unless otherwise noted. In this way, scholars may appreciate the vertical flow of the text, as each text overlays and succeeds the next. When a chronology among texts can generally be established, incorporating the chronology of mutations, whether authorial or editorial, into critical work avoids errors and assumptions regarding the author’s production.

In addition to a lateral, diachronic reading of the text, the text documents also allow for a vertical, synchronic reading. The varied colors in the text documents corresponding to text versions show multiple, simultaneous mutations that illustrate the “fluid” quality of the composition. The text documents follow Schulze’s methodology and do not distinguish between what she terms “selected and unselected mutations” (15); therefore, changes are tracked as changes, whether authorial or editorial. However, bibliographical entries for each text document distinguish between authorial and editorial change when known.

⁷ Such a resting place is a provisional conclusion given that Achebe is still alive and continues to republish works.
Levels of Authority in the Corpus:

*Primary authorial authority*

Achebe’s 1950-1975 corpus includes texts with primary authorial authority, secondary authorial authority, primary documentary authority and radial documentary authority as defined by Shillingsburg. Considering the size of the corpus, not much has survived that could be classified as primary authorial authority, that is, the author’s handwritten manuscripts. Only Chapters 9-19 of the first edition of *Arrow of God*, a facsimile of the first few pages of the manuscript of *A Man of the People*, the preface for *Morning Yet On Creation Day*, partial manuscripts of “Chike and the River,” the article “Onitsha Market Literature” (the manuscript for the later published article entitled “Onitsha, Gift of the Niger”), five short stories including “The Madman,” “Girls at War,” “Sugar Baby,” “Civil Peace,” and “Girls at War,” and the five poems “Vultures,” “Bull and Egret,” “Love Cycle,” “Generation Gap,” and “Harmattan” (re-titled “Penalty of Godhead” when first published), are available.

*Secondary authorial authority*

The next group of texts is a combination of secondary authorial authority (for instance, typescripts of texts) and primary authorial authority (author manuscript alterations, that is, changes made to a typescript in an author’s own hand). For Achebe’s novels, this group of combined primary and secondary authorial authority includes the typescript with author manuscript alterations of the complete text of the first edition of *Arrow of God*, a carbon typescript with manuscript alterations of the complete text of *A Man of the People*, and a typescript with editorial corrections for Heinemann’s *African Writers Series* publication of
Things Fall Apart. For critical essays, introductions, reviews, and prefaces, the available documents include a carbon typescript of “Six Weeks in Tanganyika,” an early draft of a carbon typescript of “Tanganyika: Jottings of a tourist” and a photocopy typescript with author manuscript alterations of “TANGANYIKA—jottings of a tourist (1961)” published in Morning Yet on Creation Day. Other documents include a photocopy typescript with author manuscript alterations of “The African Writer and the Biafran Cause”; two typescripts with author manuscript alterations of “Africa and Her Writers”; a carbon typescript of the introduction to This earth, my brother by Kofi Awoonor, a carbon typescript of “What do African Intellectuals Read?”; a mimeograph typescript with author manuscript alterations, a typescript with author manuscript alterations, and a typescript setting copy of “Chi in Igbo Cosmology”; a carbon typescript of “Thoughts on the African Novel”; and a mimeograph typescript with author manuscript alterations and a typescript with author manuscript alterations of “Colonialist Criticism.” The complete typescript of the Heinemann publication with authorial corrections of Morning Yet on Creation Day, includes all of the above essays as well as “Language and the Destiny of Man,” “The Novelist as Teacher,” “Where Angels Fear to Tread,” “The African Writer and the English Language,” “Named for Victoria, Queen of England,” “In Reply to Margery Perham,” “In Defence of English? An open letter to Mr Tai Solarin,” and “Onitsha, Gift of the Niger.”

Achebe’s short stories are by far the richest collection of secondary authorial authority combined with primary authorial authority texts. For the earliest short stories, secondary authorial authority includes the typescript with author manuscript alterations of a never-published collection of seven of Achebe’s short stories, including “Akueke,” “Beginning of the End” (re-titled “Marriage is a Private Affair” in the typescript), “Dead Men’s Path,” “The
Sacrificial Egg,” “Chike’s School Days,” “Uncle Ben’s Choice,” and “The Voter.” This collection, compiled and edited by G. D. Killam and Thomas Melone, whose separate prefaces are included in the Achebe Papers, includes an early, partial typescript entitled “The Old Order in Conflict with the New The Beginning of the End” that offers a tantalizing glimpse into an abandoned effort at a variorum version of Achebe’s short stories. Finally, a typescript with author manuscript annotations, the 1965 typesetting copy, and page proofs with manuscript annotations are available for Achebe’s children’s story, “Chike and the River.”

Other secondary authorial authority texts include mimeograph typescripts with author manuscript alterations of “The Polar Undergraduate” and “In a Village Church” along with the typescript setting copies of each story for the 1972 Heinemann short story collection, Girls at War and Other Stories. Texts for “Civil Peace” include a typescript with author manuscript alterations revised from the author manuscript. Other texts include two typescripts with author manuscript alterations of “Girls at War,” a typescript with author manuscript alterations for “Vengeful Creditor,” and a typescript of “Sugar Baby,” not included in the 1972 Heinemann collection.

Typescripts with no author manuscript alterations should be treated with care. Even if a typescript is the sole compositional evidence available for a later published text, the role of the typist cannot be discounted as an editorial hand between the manuscript and the typescript. Documents of this kind include a carbon typescript of Beware, Soul-Brother and Other Poems (1972).

The complete typesetting copy for the 1972 Heinemann short story collection, Girls at War and Other Stories includes “The Polar Undergraduate,” “In a Village Church, “Marriage is a Private Affair,” “Dead Men’s Path, “Chike’s School Days,” “The Sacrificial Egg,” “Akueke,”

*Primary documentary authority*

Only primary documentary authority exists for much of Achebe’s work, meaning there are no manuscripts, typescripts, or author manuscript alterations available for these texts, only first and subsequent publications. This is true for the first editions of Achebe’s novels, Things Fall Apart (1958) and No Longer at Ease (1960); however, as noted above, a typescript does exist for the later Heinemann African Writers Series edition of Things Fall Apart. Most of Achebe’s critical essays, introductions, and reviews exist only in published and republished form, a complete list of which is included in the chronological bibliography. These include editorials, letters and articles in The University Herald, The Bug and Nsukkascope (Nigerian university publications); articles in Radio Times, Voice of Nigeria and The Service; introductions to Dream of Twilight: A Book of Poems by Delphine King and Places and Bloodstains [Notes for Ipeleng] by Keorapetse Kgositsile; reviews of Christopher Okigbo’s Heavensgate, Jean-Joseph Rabearivelo’s Twenty-Four Poems, Janheinz Jahn’s Muntu and John Masefield’s Grace Before Ploughing; the forewords to A Selection of African Prose and Literature for the Masses: An
Analytical Study of Popular Pamphleteering in Nigeria; the first publications of “Where Angels Fear to Dread,” “Writer’s Conference: A Milestone in Africa’s Progress,” “A Look at West African Writing,” “Are We Men of Two Worlds,” “Handicaps of Writing in a Second Language” and “The English Language and the African Writer” (later published together as “English and the African Writer” and finally re-titled “The African Writer and the English Language”), “Racial Bigotry in Three Continents,” “The Role of the Writer in a New Nation,” “The Novelist as Teacher,” “In Defence of English: An open letter to Tai Solarin,” “The Black Writer’s Burden,” “Biafra: The Darkness in Africa,” “Biafra’s Reply” (later titled “In Reply to Margery Perham”), “The African Writer and the Biafran Cause,” “Culture and International Understanding,” “Publishing in Africa,” “Thoughts on the African Novel,” and “An Image of Africa.” While it is true that the first publications of these texts have no primary authorial authority, many of these texts are published multiple times, with surviving typescripts with author manuscript alterations of those revisions. Later versions of many of these texts do have secondary authorial authority and if they include author alterations, also have primary authorial authority.

Like Achebe’s prose texts, many of Achebe’s first published versions of short stories have no primary or secondary authorial authority, including “The Polar Undergraduate,” “In a Village Church,” “The Old Order in Conflict with the New” (republished as “Beginning of the End” and then “Marriage is a Private Affair”), “Short Story” (republished as “Dead Men’s Path”), “The Sacrificial Egg,” “Chike’s School Days,” “Akueke,” “Uncle Ben’s Choice,” and “The Voter,” and the short children’s story, “How the Leopard Got Its Claws.” Finally, many of the first published versions of Achebe’s poetry have no primary or secondary authorial authority, including “There was a Young Man,” “Mango Seedling,” “Those Gods are Children,” “Love Song (for Anna),” “Their Idiot Song,” “NON-commitment,” and much of Achebe’s first

*Radial documentary authority*

The final category of authority, that is, the confidence an editor has that a text is as close as possible to an author’s hand, is that of “radial documentary authority,” describing a situation where no one authoritative source for a piece of writing exists, and therefore no sure way to establish a precedent exists other than by comparing publication texts. “The Role of the Writer in a New Nation,” a lecture given to the Nigerian Library Association, was first published in June of 1964 in *Nigeria Magazine*. In September of the same year, a slightly different text was published in *Nigerian Libraries*, the publication of the Nigerian Library Association. Since no primary or secondary authorial authority texts exist for this essay, only a careful assessment of the text’s mutations suggests that although the *Nigerian Libraries* article was published after the *Nigeria Magazine* version, it appears that it is the earlier version of the original address. Immediately the question arises as to what kinds of mutations would suggest an “earlier” or “later” version. In this case, the *Nigerian Libraries* text has fewer commas, suggesting that commas were added to the *Nigeria Magazine* version, and when words are changed, the wording tends from the simple to the more complex, suggesting a reworking of the text after its original oral presentation. These clues might indicate that the *Nigerian Libraries* text is closer to the oral speech than the *Nigeria Magazine* version, although the latter was published first. To
complicate the picture, the article was collected in *Africa is People* (1967) edited by Barbara Nolen, and acknowledged as a reprint of the *Nigerian Libraries* version; however, a comparison of the linguistic texts reveals that the *Africa is People* was reprinted from the *Nigeria Magazine* version, although emended and heavily abridged for the collection. The article was also collected in *African Writers on African Writing* (1973) edited by G. D. Killam who acknowledges the article is a reprint of the *Nigeria Magazine* version. While this text, although published after the *Africa is People* version, reverts back to the complete text of the *Nigeria Magazine* version, Killam does not acknowledge the separate emendations and text omissions made to the text for this version. McGann’s notion of the social text certainly comes into play in the case of “The Role of the Writer,” where the mutations in these texts are not necessarily attributable to the author, although the first two published texts are the earliest and longest versions, suggesting the closest approximation to what the author actually wrote. The mutations in the later texts suggest the hand of the editor, mutations presumably made with Achebe’s assent, further complicating the notion of the “text”.

Radial documentary authority issues also emerge in assessing Achebe’s corpus and reconstituting the relationships of text versions to each other. Two examples will suffice to illustrate the difficulties involved. “The Novelist as Teacher,” first presented as a speech at the first Commonwealth Literature Conference at Leeds University in September 1964 was published in 1965 in *Commonwealth Literature: Unity and Diversity in a Common Culture* and in a slightly different version in the 29 January 1965 issue of *New Statesmen*. Achebe bibliographies cite the *New Statesmen* version as the first version, but a comparison of the linguistic texts suggests that the *Commonwealth Literature* text is the earlier, based on the same criteria of simple to more complex syntax and colloquial usage to standard usage and
punctuation. But caution should be taken when attributing these changes to primary authorial authority. Bowers notes that texts with no primary authorial authority often exhibit separate ancestral series, suggesting little authorial involvement in subsequent publications of texts. For instance, one particular sentence in the Commonwealth text reads, “He said he would be laughed out of class if he did such a thing!” while the contemporaneous version in New Statesmen reads, “He said the other boys would call him a bushman if he did such a thing!” For the 1966 Spear Magazine version, the sentence is truncated, “He replied that the other boys would call him a bush-man.” The contemporaneous 1973 Readings in Commonwealth Literature version edited by William Walsh reprints the 1965 Commonwealth sentence, while G. D. Killam’s 1973 African Writers on African Writing version reprints the New Statesmen version of the sentence. Thus the Commonwealth and the Readings in Commonwealth Literature texts, both published by Heinemann, constitute one ancestral series while the New Statesman, Spear Magazine, and African Writers texts constitute another. Much more of Achebe’s prose and fiction involve these same issues of radial authority and separate ancestral series but are too numerous to describe here. The bibliographical entries at the heading of each text document in this project note these relationships or any difficulties determining those relationships.

Expanding Shillingsburg’s Levels of Authority: Secondary Intra-Textual Documentary Authority

The above description includes a discussion of how the Achebe corpus fits within established text categories. These categories, while helpful, do not adequately encompass other kinds of textual dependencies. In order to accurately reflect all ways in which texts relate to each other, beyond specific genealogical categories, it was necessary to create another category of authority not included in Shillingsburg’s schema. I propose the addition of a new category called

Intra-textual issues stretch the notion of textual variants, yet add another nuance to how texts change and mutate according to each creative moment. When multiple text versions are created within an author’s lifetime, and when the author appears to assent to the simultaneous existence of separate ancestral series and multiple text versions, Schulze suggests it would be more useful to use the term “authorial selection” versus “authorial intention.” “The author’s goal in each new version of his or her text is, in fact, the local fitness of that text in relation to its social, cultural, or textual environment rather than the achievement of some always present abstract ideal of perfection (11).” For this kind of reading, all texts would receive “equal weight” as “multiple authorial selections” vs. multiple versions. Schulze notes that this is equally true for collections of material that reshape the material’s relationship to itself, so that even though the linguistic texts do not change, the texts are changed by their association with other texts (14).
Achebe’s 1950-1975 corpus includes two short story collections, *The Sacrificial Egg and Other Short Stories* and *Girls at War and Other Stories*, the second collection having two versions; two versions of the essay collection *Morning Yet on Creation Day*; and three versions of a poetry collection, the first titled *Beware, Soul-Brother and Other Poems*, the second titled *Beware, Soul-Brother: poems* and the last version titled *Christmas in Biafra and other Poems*. Each collection includes changes in content, mutations of the individual linguistic texts, different groupings of texts and even new titles for each version. These mutations create a myriad of ways in which the text has been changed with relation to itself.

Text Mutations

Accidentals

Once the nature of the text documents have been established, and the relationship of those documents to each other, the next level of analysis involves mutations in the linguistic text itself, utilizing Greg’s division between “accidental” and “substantive” changes. The “accidentals” of the published versions, the formatting and typesetting chosen for each linguistic text, can be divided into three groups. Typically, the American publications follow the American system of punctuation, the British and European publications follow the British system of punctuation, and Nigerian publications tend to be mixed, particularly in the choice of single or double quotation marks and the placement of quotation marks and end punctuation. Interestingly, although Achebe was educated in British colonial schools, he uses the American system of punctuation in the earliest extant author’s manuscript, Chapters 9-19 of *Arrow of God*. Whether he followed the same use of double quotation marks during the composition of his first novels, *Things Fall Apart* (1958) and *No Longer at Ease* (1960) is unknown. Certainly the use of double
quotation marks can be traced back as early as one of his first published short stories, “The Old Order in Conflict with the New (1952)” published in *The University Herald* at University College, Ibadan.

Other areas of divergence in punctuation among published versions include capitalization, italicization, hyphenation, and spelling. British texts favor greater use of capitalization and the hyphenation of compound words while American texts favor greater use of the comma. British and American spelling differences such as “favour/favor,” “neighbour/neighbor,” defence/defense,” and “organise/organize” divide along publication houses, but British spelling is favored in authorial manuscripts. The practice of italicizing Igbo words is of particular interest, since such a rendering of Igbo words in the text immediately sets them off as “foreign” or different from other words in the text. In as much as Achebe was determined to defamiliarize western readers to connotative values for English words in order to create a vehicular English, an English capable of carrying his African experience, the manuscript and typesetting choices reflect an ambivalence about how best to render Igbo words and concepts into an English text. Interestingly, the earliest texts contain no Igbo at all, besides capitalized proper names, but *Things Fall Apart* (1959) includes many italicized Igbo words as well as capitalized proper names. In the mid-1960s, texts often included footnotes or glossaries explaining Igbo words and concepts. By the early 1970s, Igbo words in many of the texts were not distinguished from other English words at all, suggesting, depending upon the audience, a totally “naturalized” vehicular English, or the adoption of Igbo words into English vernacular. This same pattern holds true for individual versions of texts as well. For example, one sentence in “The Sacrificial Egg,” first published in the American *The Atlantic* in 1959, exemplifies this trend. The first version of the text reads, “…she bought bean cakes or *akara* and *mai-mai* which
the Igara women cooked.” Note the italicized Igbo with an immediate English interpretation of the first Igbo word, but not the second, and the use of regular font for the proper Igbo noun, apparently an attempt to strike a balance between an explanatory and self-evident reading of the Igbo words. The 1962 version collected in the Nigerian Etudo publication, *The Sacrificial Egg and Other Short Stories*, reads, “…she bought *akara* and *mai-mai* which the Igara women cooked.” The explanatory English, “bean cakes” is completely omitted, but the italicized Igbo remains, presumably because the target Nigerian audience would have understood these Igbo words. The 1968 version, collected in Austin Shelton’s *The African Assertion: A Critical Anthology of African Literature* published by Odyssey Press of New York reads, “…she bought bean cakes and *mai-mai* which the Igara women cooked.” The symbol “º” after the Igbo words designates notes at the bottom of the page. The first note reads, “º*mai-mai*: cooked bean flour,” and the second note explains, “º*Igara*: Igala, a tribal group living northwest of the Igbo, near the confluence of the Benue and Niger Rivers, and upstream along the Anambara River, which pours into the Niger near Onitsha. The foods referred to derive from the Yoruba peoples of Western Nigeria, and the entire passage suggests the great mixture of ethnic groups at the market, which is paralleled by an equally great number of spiritual forces, some of them antagonistic.” Note that Igara is italicized in the footnote but not in the text, and even re-named “correctly” Igala, and that the note is primarily an anthropological and not an aesthetic interpretation of the passage. The 1972 British Heinemann version collected in *Girls at War and Other Stories* reads, “she bought bean cakes and mai-mai which the Igara women cooked.” None of the Igbo is italicized and the explanatory notes are removed.

Interestingly, African publishers themselves often maintained the Western publishing preference for the inclusion of glossaries of “foreign” words along with African texts. In the case
of Heinemann Educational Books, Ltd., a branch of Heinemann publishing marketed for Africa, African texts were published with glossaries and study aids for use in African classrooms. The inclusion of such was not necessarily with a European audience in mind, for whom the text might need further explication. Nigeria alone has over four hundred languages in a geographical area the size of Texas and Oklahoma. Glossing words could equally serve other African readers not familiar with an author’s indigenous language. Etudo Press, located in the city of Enugu, the heart of Igboland, printed a 1971 collection of civil war short stories that included Achebe’s “The Madman,” with a short glossary of Igbo terms enigmatically entitled, “STRANGE WORDS.” When “The Madman” was collected in Girls At War and Other Short Stories, published by Heinemann in 1972 and Anchor-Doubleday in 1973, the glossary is removed.

Substantives

Substantive changes to the text occur in both primary authorial authority and secondary authorial authority texts as well as in chronological primary documentary authority texts, or published versions of texts over time. Care should be taken in specifying substantive changes that may be directly attributed to the author and those changes that are indeterminate because of the lack of manuscript or typescript for that text. While some of the text mutations, especially in the case of shortened or abridged versions of the text or excerpted texts, may be attributed to an editor’s hand, Achebe’s acceptance of those changes may at the least suggest a passive primarily authorial authority for those changes.

The discussion of previous text mutation studies in chapter one of the project reveals that scholars have primarily focused on how substantive changes affect the overall themes of the text. A survey of the following survey of substantive changes elucidates a more nuanced impetus for
changes his texts. In Achebe fiction, text mutation has less to do with changes in action or characterization and more with the overall texture of the text. In Achebe’s poetry and critical essays, that evince a clearer authorial “voice”, text mutations have more to do with the author’s shifting position in relation to the text in light of historical, political, and personal changes over time. Thus the following categorization of substantives and subsequent examples are initially organized by the overall effect those changes both with regard to a particular text. For example, mutations that alter a shifting subject position may include different categories of change but those changes are organized around its governing principle. This is equally true for shifting authorial intent, stabilizing meaning in the text, and reframing the text. In addition, more scattered additions, omissions and substitutions are also included as examples of Achebe’s focus on the texture of the text.

**Shifting subject position**

Substantive changes directly attributed to the author include changes in the position of the speaking subject with regard to the material presented—usually an emendation that distances the speaking subject from an “extreme” or “unbalanced” point of view. An example of shifting subject positions can be found in Achebe’s manuscript alterations during the composition of the preface of *Morning Yet On Creation Day* (1975) and through its two published versions exemplifies the struggle of the speaking subject to frame a balanced position five years after the end of the civil war that resulted in Biafra’s total defeat. In this example, the addition (or omission) of adjectives and adverbs intensifies, softens or sharpens descriptions, while the shifting dynamic of the text moves from a triangulated exchange of Nigerian, foreign journalist, and speaking subject (and former Biafran) to an exchange among Nigerians alone. The first
rendition in the author’s hand reads, “A Nigerian once asked by a foreign interviewer what he considered the lesson of the civil war replied smugly “Secession does not pay.” The mutation reframes the Nigerian’s response from a brash, off-the-cuff retort to a self-righteous, arrogant response. The second version reads, “A Nigerian intellectual was asked by a foreign journalist what he considered the big lesson of the civil war. His answer: Everybody has learnt that secession does not pay. The text adds, and then removes, the elite status of the Nigerian suggesting ambivalence towards modifying the noun “Nigerian” by adding status to the subject of the sentence. The text now reads as a flat description that merely frames the Nigerian’s response within a corporate awareness of the consequences of secession, a less pejorative rendering of the first version. The third version, the 1975 British Heinemann publication, reads, “A Nigerian was asked what he considered the big lesson of the civil war. His reply—facile, smug: Secession does not pay.” The text appears to revert to the original emotional stance towards the speaker in the first version—a description of a self-righteous Nigerian’s response, but with the added nuance of superficiality (facile). The scenario changes as well: a “foreign journalist” no longer asks the question. The new text removes the “objective” European arbiter of truth, the journalist, from between the Nigerian and the speaking subject and relocates the exchange within a national conversation. The fourth version, published in the 1975 American Anchor-Doubleday edition reads, “A Nigerian was asked what he considered the big lesson of the civil war and he replied with typical smugness: “Secession does not pay.” Merging the separate sentences into one sentence removes the dramatic pause of the earlier versions; the suggestion of superficiality on the part of the speaker merely becomes pedestrian reaction (typical). The versions alternate between a grudging, even angry speaking subject to a worldly weary one.
Shifting authorial intent

Mutations in two letters collected in the same edition illustrate the difficulty of establishing a clear authorial intent for the collection, a combination of both literary criticism and documents associated with events of the Nigerian civil war. The preface’s general conclusion that suffering criticism for the inclusion of war documents should not trump remembrance appears to be the impetus for the mutations to the letters, although these mutations are not acknowledged in the preface. For example a letter written in response to Tai Solarin’s position that the mass killing of Igbos might have been averted if they had been fluent in Hausa, solicited a stinging response in “IN DEFENCE OF ENGLISH: An open letter to TAI SOLARIN” published 7 November 1966 in the Lagos Daily Times. The sarcastic exclamation, “Obviously you have yet to hear of translations!” is tempered into a rhetorical question, “Have you not heard of translations?” in the collected version in Morning Yet On Creation Day (1975). The letter of 1966 accuses, “You are either being dishonest or you have acquired the dog’s facility for being sick, throwing up and then turning round to eat the vomit.” By 1975, the possible accusation regarding Solarin’s lack of good faith is removed. Even the second accusation of hypocrisy in couched in a rhetorical question: “Have you acquired the dog’s facility for being sick, throwing up and then returning to eat the vomit?” Similarly, a response letter to Margery Perham’s London Times appeal for Biafran surrender, “BIAFRA’s Reply,” in the 19 September 1968 Times, emphatically states, “I had lived most of my adult life in Nigeria outside the Eastern Region, now Biafra. I knew and loved Nigeria. Now I hate it.” The last sentence of the text in Morning Yet On Creation Day (1975) moves from this intense emotional agony and sense of betrayal to the mere negation of his former love, “I do no longer.” As if to underscore that the
loss of love does not imply hatred, the next sentence that originally read, “The hatred was brought about by a terrible traumatic experience which we call genocide” is emended, “The change was brought about by a terrible traumatic experience which we call genocide.” The desire to strike just the right tone in a highly charged historical moment, even five years after the end of hostilities results in substantive changes to previously published texts.

Stabilizing meaning in the text

Adding concluding sentences or phrases in order to stabilize the interpretation of a preceding paragraph typify mutations among early and later published versions. A descriptive paragraph about riverain traders visiting the fictional city of Umuru in the 1959 short story, “The Sacrificial Egg,” concludes with the image of a husband and wife returning home by way of canoe at end of day, “…two dark bodies swaying forwards and backwards in it.” The 1972 Girls at War and Other Stories version adds the following sentence to the end of the paragraph, “Umuru then was the meeting place of the forest people who were called Igbo and the alien riverain folk whom the Igbo called Olu and beyond whom the world stretched in indefiniteness.” The text shifts from a quaint description of African life that adds “local color” to the narrative to the deeper significance of the great city as the intersection of disparate peoples. The couple are not just picturesque but representative of the unknown dimensions of the world beyond Igboland. A paragraph from “English and the African Language” (1964) exemplifies the use of a concluding sentence to solidify the argument in the preceding paragraph. The first version, published in Spear Magazine (Lagos) concludes:

The African writer should aim to use English in a way that brings out his message best without altering the language to the extent that its value as a medium of
international exchange will be lost. He should aim at fashioning out an English which is at once universal and able to carry his peculiar experience. I have in mind here the writer who has something new, something different to say.

The second version, published the same year in _Moderna Språk_, adds the following sentences:

The nondescript writer has little to tell us, anyway, so he might as well tell it in conventional language and get it over with. If I may use an extravagant simile, he is like a man offering a small, nondescript routine sacrifice for which a chick or less will do. A serious writer must look for an animal whose blood can match the power of his offering.

The first paragraph establishes the general principle of fashioning an English that first serves the needs of the speaking subject yet is not so altered as to impede comprehensibility on the part of other English speakers. The second version grounds the principle of linguistic mutation and the role of the earnest African writer in African ritual imagery and practice.

_Reframing the text_

Besides concluding statements, the addition of, or change in, the title of a text reframes or refocuses meaning in the text. The title of the first published short story, “The Old Order in Conflict with The New” (1952), the story of a young couple whose marriage defies an indigenous taboo, implies an inexorable motion of the “old” (indigenous or traditional values located in rural communities) giving way to the “new” (European or “modern” values located in metropolitan communities). The tension implied in the title of the first version gives way to its “happy ending,” in which the father (the old order) gives in to the emotional appeals of his
daughter-in-law (the new order), “That night he hardly slept a wink. In the morning, he wrote to Nene asking her to come home with her husband and children.”

The second version of the title, “Beginning of the End” (1962) takes its title from a neighbor’s statement upon hearing the news of the marriage, “‘It is the beginning of the end,’ said another.” The “End” implies an inexorable motion towards the demise of the “old.” The 1952 version continues, “It was indeed the beginning of the end, not of the world, but of the old order.” The 1962 version omits the sentence, severing the association between what is “beginning” and what is “ending” with what is old (past) or new (future). Ambiguity replaces clarity in the new conclusion as well, “That night, he hardly slept a wink, from remorse.” The last sentence is omitted. Remorse on the father’s part might imply a happy ending, but what future action he will take is no longer evident.

The third version of the title, “Marriage is a Private Affair” (1971), omits any reference to the dual oppositions of “old” and “new” and existence/non-existence. The new title emphasizes the young couple’s ironic belief that western values that are grounded in “private,” and isolated, individual action are opposed to collective and familial responsibilities. The daughter-in-law’s dismay over the grandfather’s isolation from his grandchildren suggests family values are shared in both spheres. This version’s conclusion splits the difference between the pat resolution of the first version and the ambiguity of the second version, “That night he hardly slept, from remorse--and a vague fear that he might die without making it up to them.” The dualities of the first version find a new synthesis.

The progression of titles of an early critical article, part one and two initially entitled “The Handicaps of Writing in a Second Language” and “The English Language and the African Writer” (1964), respectively, illustrate a similar struggle for an apt title that best represents the
content of the text. Both titles belie the general argument of the article, a hearty defense of English as an adequate vehicle for the African experience. Beyond the use of the “handicaps,” the order of nouns in the title “The English Language and the African Writer” gives first place not to the African writer but to the English language, implying that the language shapes the writer and not the other way around. The article expressly states that the “price” of a world language is that it must submit to many uses. The parts one and two were emended and published in the Swedish journal *Moderna Språk* under the seemingly neutral title “English and the African Writer” (1964), although the order of nouns remained the same. The title for the 1975 Heinemann version, “The African Writer and the English Language” reverts back to the original wording of part two of the first version, but the order of words establishes the role of the writer first and then the language, a title that more accurately reflects the argument of the article.

*Substitutions*

Other mutations in the texts distill or filter out heavily connotative English and English colloquial usage for “culture neutral” English usage. For example, in the first version of “Short Story” (1953), an untitled university publication later titled “Dead Men’s Path” (1962), the word “cemetery,” a word indicating a designated area for European burial practices, is changed to the more neutral “their place of burial.” The word “cemetery” suggests the existence of tombstones, memorials, graveside services, and the ritual placement of flowers, none of which existed in the setting of the story. In the same story, the original text “from time immemorial,” is exchanged for “from before you were born and before your father was born,” a nod to the importance of ancestral tradition in African cultural.
This same filtering also occurs in the 1952 version of “The Old Order in Conflict With The New.” Scholars have noted that this version of the story served as a practice run for the central plot of what would become the novel No Longer at Ease (1960). When the story was collected in the 1962 The Sacrificial Egg and Other Short Stories, multiple mutations occur in English usage register. “Aspect of our engagement” is simplified to “thing”; “he will forgive the outrage” becomes “he will forgive you”; “sequestered retreat” is simplified to “retreat” (although “sequestered” is added back in the 1972 version); “has led you into a folly whose consequence is life-long” is simplified, “might as well have cut your throat”; and speaking subject asides such as, “It is universally accepted that at such times people should not be over-scrupulous about minute details of quotation. It is entirely permissible to isolate from its context a short phrase, or even a word, to prove one’s case,” are entirely omitted. Achebe also filters out connotative elements by changing the phrase, “It is against Nature!” the belief in a constructed personification of the natural world alien to African philosophy, becomes “It has never been heard.” The use of European pejorative terms for cultural roles such as “witch-doctor” is changed to “herbalist.”

*Substitutions: use of Igbo language*

By far the best early source for an examination of substantive changes is the author manuscript for the first edition of Arrow of God, even though only the second half of the manuscript has survived. A second early, partial author manuscript for A Man of the People is the only other primary authorial authority that survives the pre-war period (1950-1966). All other author manuscripts can only be dated with surety to the post-war period (1970-1975) and are useful comparative texts for the early manuscripts.
A comparison of the manuscript with the first edition of the novel illustrates a number of competing concerns, beginning with the judicious use of Igbo words. First drafts often use an Igbo word immediately followed by the English translation or vice versa. Later emendations to the manuscript excise Igbo words not considered integral to the meaning of the text. Igbo words serve a particular purpose and are not utilized merely as authentication for what constitutes an African text. For example a sentence from chapter nine of the manuscript reads, “Edogwu [sic] returned to his compound to resume work on the ozo door he was carving.” The first published edition reads, “When Obika walked away with his friend, Edogo returned to the shade of the ogbu tree in front of his compound to resume work on the door he was carving.” The obvious is not restated: a carved door is an ozo door, which later texts explain. The addition of the description of Edogo’s locale, “the shade of the ogbu tree,” specifies the kind of tree. In the same chapter, the manuscript reads “But the little ant—agbusi—was dropped into it and it stayed alive and so the fault was not with Amoge’s milk.” The first published edition reads, “But the little ant which was dropped into it stayed alive and so the fault was not with the milk.” The extraneous addition of the appositive “agbusi” merely renames the noun and would seem odd to an Igbo audience and didactic to any other.

Additions

Achebe also attempts to add allusions to African flora and fauna befitting the text, although not indiscriminately. For example, in the description of Ezeulu’s compound, the manuscript reads (the strike-through text reflects rejected versions in Achebe’s own hand), “If a person came in from the main path along the wide path journeying approached Ezeulu’s compound to the public path he would see Edogwu’s compound was on one’s the left, Obika’s on the right and the like two small suckers on a big cocoyam ears.” The emended version of the
first published edition reads, “As one approached Ezeulu's compound off the main village pathway Edogo's place stood on the left, and Obika's on the right.” The first rendering initially compares the architectural relationship of the smaller homesteads to the main homestead with an image of “small suckers on a big cocoyam,” suggesting a kind of parasitic relationship instead of a spatial description. This analogy is struck through and replaced with “like two ears,” an unresolved ambiguity. The final version omits any forced analogy.

In the same chapter the manuscript description of Edogo’s ailing son reads, “When it was only six months it abruptly stopped sucking breasts.” The first published edition reads, “Then at about the sixth month he had changed overnight. He stopped sucking his mother's breast and his skin took the complexion of withering cocoyam leaves.” The look and feel of the skin of a dehydrated child is much like the altered texture of a withered leaf, a more “organic” analogy since both conditions are caused by a lack of fluid. Specifying an indigenous species of leaf, “cocoyam,” maintains the descriptive integrity of the African experience by grounding the analogy in local flora.

Omissions: implied exoticisms and stereotypes

Another area of concern in modern African literary production was to what degree should realistic detail be included in the narrative. Exotic elements were considered constitutive of African narratives, particularly in contemporaneous white African fiction. The manuscript evinces the tension between realistic detail and the exaggeration of elements of African existence. The manuscript description of Amoge, Edogo’s wife, tending her sick child with diarrhea begins:

She looked around the room but did not seem to find what she looked for. “Oji,
oji, oji!” she called and a black dog ran in from the outside and lapped up the excrement, wagging its tail. The child still cried. “He has finished,” said Edogwu. It made straight for the excrement, lapped it up and sat down with its tail wagging on the floor. Abuebe Amoge moved again to reveal only a drop small, green, drop. Oji took it up with one flick of its tongue and sat down again. His mother picked him up and turned his buttocks to the dog, parting them with her hands. Oji came forward, still wagging its tail and licked it clean and then lay down on the cool floor to lick the sides of its mouth. Then it began to snap its teeth together in a futile attempt to catch a fly.

The first published version reads:

She looked round the room but did not seem to find what she wanted. Then she called: Nwanku! Nwanku! Nwanku! A wiry, black dog rushed in from outside and made straight for the excrement which disappeared with four or five noisy flicks of its tongue. Then it sat down with its tail wagging on the floor. Amoge moved her feet and child once again but this time all that was left behind was a tiny drop. Nwanku did not consider it big enough to justify getting up; it merely stretched its neck and took it up with the corner of the tongue and sat up again to wait. But the child had finished and the dog was soon trying without success to catch a fly between its jaws.

One obvious mutation is the dog’s name from “Oji” to “Nwanku.” One possible meaning for “Oji” in Igbo is “black,” which in a more benign literary environment would probably have been taken as a simple reference to the color of the dog. The published version removes any
inferred association of blackness essentialized as an animal. But it is the omission of the
description of the dog cleaning the child’s body with its tongue that moves the text away from
overt exoticism toward an illustration of the usefulness of a dog in an environment where babies
are not diapered.

Authorial Competence

Dialogue

While a sharp division between the types of substantive changes described above and
substantive changes with regard to stylistics may be too primitive an approach, not all mutations
to the texts carry as much critical baggage as the ones already discussed. For instance,
subsequent versions of texts gradually phase out identifying tags such as, “he stammered,” or
“she cried.” Instead, the dialogue itself evokes the emotional state of the character. In the
author’s manuscript of Arrow of God, whole paragraphs that relate the actions of characters in a
third person point of view are refashioned into dialogue for the first published edition. These
kinds of changes illustrate Achebe’s increased confidence in handling dialogue. The manuscript
reads:

The news that Ezeulu was eating from the pot of a man of Umunneora caused
great anxiety alarm. Somehow Obika’s short travel had already affected his
thinking and he seemed so sure that Nwodika’s son was not like the others at
home. Before long Akuebue who had come earlier to see if any news had come
returned. When he was told about Nwodika’s son giving Ezeulu food, he he
roared out like a wounded leopard and begged them not to tell him such a story
again.
The first published version allows the reader to “overhear” exactly what is said, squarely situating the reader as a participant within the rising action of the narrative:

"Did I hear you well?" asked Akuebue, who had so far said very little. "Did you say that the wife of a man in Umunneora is giving food to Ezeulu?"

"Yes."

"Please do not tell me such a story again. Edogo, get ready now, we are going to Okperi."

"Ezeulu is not a small child," said Anosi, their neighbour. "He cannot be taught those with whom he may eat."

"Do you hear what I say, Edogo? Get ready now; I am going home to get my things."

The mutations in the texts not only reposition the reader to the action, but intensify the description of Akuebue’s character, as the text shifts from mere verbal exclamation to a combined interrogative examination of the evidence and declarative statement of imminent action, as opposed to the passive acceptance of Ezeulu’s current situation by both Edogo and Anosi.

Linguistic accuracy

When composing in literary African English, “an animal whose blood can match the power of his [a writer’s] offering,” Achebe eschewed non-standard English forms as a substitute for African speech by differentiating between literary African English and oral and written “pidgin” forms, a mixture of English and indigenous words with indigenous syntax that had come to be associated with early African literary production. The text freely utilizes dialectical
ranges of pidgin as descriptors for different characters in the narrative, while maintaining a narrative “voice” sanitized of such forms. For example, the manuscript text, “When it was only six months…” might have been rendered in standard western usage, “When the child was only six months old.” The first published edition becomes “Then at about the sixth month, he changed overnight.” The non-standard usage of “it” in reference to a child becomes the standard “he,” but the idiomatic “only six months [old]” becomes “at about the sixth month,” still a standard usage, but less colloquial and more poetic. The pidgin phrase “stopped sucking breasts” becomes a simple declarative statement, “He stopped sucking his mother's breast.” Western usage would most likely have substituted the euphemistic verb “nursing” for the more explicit description, “sucking his mother’s breast.” Like the word “cemetery” in “Dead Men’s Path,” “nursing” implies a non-congruent conceptual world rather than a neutral description of a physical act.

The increasing awareness of how the mutations in the Achebe corpus play a constitutive role in how the text means is a direct result of this project’s goal of limning out the 1950-1965 Achebe corpus and tracking text mutations in that corpus. This project is a robust example of textualist material approach that finds a broad theoretical support in the field of textual studies. The examples included in the above categories of change in the Achebe corpus evince just a small, but representative part of the breadth and significance of changes in the corpus. More detailed studies of all text mutations remain as future research projects.
CHAPTER 4
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CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This project fills a substantial lacuna in Achebe letters with three important areas of textual evidence: a comprehensive, accurate, and chronological bibliography that establishes the Achebe corpus for the years 1950-1975; individual text documents that incorporate all textual evidence for an individual text, tracking all text mutations, both compositional and publication variations; taken together, the first two areas provide extensive evidence of text mutation as a central factor in Achebe composition and publication across all genres. The bibliography allows for a demarcation of the Achebe corpus, a corpus scattered across a complex field of archived manuscript, publications and republications in numerous intercontinental books and periodicals. Collecting all extant texts together for a selected period and determining each text’s position in relation to all others reconstitutes the Achebe corpus.

Adopting a textualist materialist approach for this project gives equal attention to all compositional and publication text mutation. This approach to the Achebe corpus is grounded in the fundamental principal of all textualist studies, establishing the “text” as instituted in the Greg-Bowers-Tanselle approach for variorum editions, not with the aim of creating definitive, authoritative texts (although the text documents provide all the textual evidence needed to make a “best text” editorial choice), but rather for the purpose of creating text documents that demonstrate the synchronic and diachronic text mutations for each text. The structure of the text documents dissociates a presumed link between multiple versions and a progression of authorial
intent or authorial teleology so that the “stages of supposed completion” (Shillingsburg 59) might be appraised in relation to all others. Following Robin Schulze’s appeal to textual critics to search for methods better suited to a conception of authorial intention for authors who engage in “incessant” revision, this project is also based on the Zeller-Reiman-Parrish claim that for any text and its mutations, an author may choose conventions that are appropriate to a specific time, place, and culture. The Achebe corpus is best represented by such an approach; therefore, the text documents are placed within the body of the project and not as appendices. Just as text mutation is central to Achebe’s work, those changes are central to the project.

Traditional textualists, guided by the romantic belief in an autonomous liberal humanist subject, privileged the creative compositional moment as the controlling force or authorial intent of a text. This romantic belief in the unified human subject was applied to African authors through the rhetoric of authenticity. Only a unified African subject could be considered an authentic African and by extension, the original compositional moment of an African author must exhibit a controlling intent or force devoid of European elements in order to be considered an authentically African text. Since the first modern African authors Modern African literary composition emerged in the post-WWII period when New Criticism, structuralism, post-structuralism and much of cultural materialism as applied to literary texts depended upon the idea and utility of a text as “well-wrought urn”. These theorists were able to ignore multiple text versions or the historical compositional history of a text because of the labor of traditional textualists who had already chosen a “best text” from among text versions. African modern literature did not have the luxury of such foundational work. Nevertheless, African authors both benefitted from literary theorists disregard for text mutation, which allowed greater freedom of experimentation, but were also held to an idealized, romantic standard.
Achebe began to write within a literary milieu that held preconceived ideas about what constituted an authentic African mindset (or lack thereof), as well as a critical skepticism of his use of the English language. Furthermore, Achebe wrote his first novel without any historical precedent of its kind in African letters. Weaving an alien structural form (the European novel) with African oral tradition, crafting an English that could carry African modes of thought and speech, and creating a recognizable African worldview and mindset was fraught with pitfalls. Achebe’s goal of creating an African literary English required a careful filtering out of heavily connotative English words and culturally dependent idiomatic phrases and figures of speech in order to make the language a more transparent vehicle for the African experience. These types of text changes characterize Achebe’s narrative fiction (novels and short stories). Text mutations in Achebe’s poetry and critical essays reflect Achebe’s shifting stance in relation to the content of his texts in response to rapidly changing historical events.

Remaining Lacuna in the Project

Despite much effort to find library holdings of the following documents, early Achebe work in Nigerian publications such as *The Eagle, The Bug, Radio Times* [Lagos], *The Service, Insight*, and *Dimension*, a publication of the Franz Fanon Research Centre at the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, have not been located. A thorough search of the Nigerian National Archives, which might have unearthed these publications, was not possible for this project. In addition, including the *African Writers Series* typescript manuscripts for the *Things Fall Apart, Beware, Soul-Brother: poems*, and *Morning Yet On Creation Day*, located in the Archives & Special Collections Library at the School of Oriental & African Studies in London, was not possible for this project. Descriptions of these texts by the curator indicate that the typescript for *Things Fall*
Apart contains editorial notes which might provide clues as to the rationale for early decisions regarding text incidentals, an important aspect of social text theory. The typescript for Morning Yet On Creation Day includes authorial notes providing additional primary authorial authority for authorial preference. Adding these remaining sources would complete the Achebe corpus for this selected time period, unless, of course, other texts for this period later come to light.

Future Research Projects

Socio-historical Approach To Text Mutation

A thorough correlation of all versions of the texts with each text’s social history remains for a future project. Achebe published in the variety of critical essays in newspapers, magazines, and book collections. His creative work appeared in book form in novels, collections of short stories and poetry, and European anthologies of African writing as well as in both European and Nigerian magazines. A comparison of kinds of Nigerian and European publications would illuminate how various editorial decisions, publication formats, and shifting audience and public reception shaped Achebe’s texts. In addition, earlier publications might be compared to later publications, both in Nigeria and abroad. Other areas of social text theory might address the joint Nigerian-German adaptation of Things Fall Apart and No Longer at Ease for the 1972 film Bullfrog in the Sun. Critics (as well as Achebe himself) agree that the film was an artistic failure. This failure was rooted in the same problems with arise with a traditional textualist approach that collapses all text mutations into a “best text,” a similar methodology adopted for the film. The German director tried to collapse three specific historical moments (the mid-1880s, mid-1950s, and the events of the Biafran War) into one film, a reductive move that doomed any effective portrayal of its subject. This ahistorical approach to a complex African history suggests that
collapsing text variations into one text also disables meaning in the text. A graphic novel adaption by Oke Horton of Achebe’s novel *A Man of the People*, was serialized in 150 successive editions of the Nigerian newspaper, *The New Nigerian* from 30 September 1974 through October 1975 has received little attention. Both adaptations fall within the early corpus era and would add additional texture to the critical treatment of these texts.

Important social text material is also included among the Houghton Achebe collection, including 1962-1966 correspondence between Achebe and Cambridge University Press’s agent Christopher Okigbo, who also happened to be Achebe’s good friend and a famous Nigerian poet in his own right, killed during the Biafran War; 1986-1991 correspondence with literary agents at David Bolt Associates; 1988-1993 correspondence with Doubleday Publishing; 1986-1993 correspondence with Heinemann Educational Books Ltd, Heinemann Education, Heinemann International and Heinemann Publishers, Ltd., and Heinemann Educational Books [Nigeria], Ltd (items include communications with Alan Hill, the founder of the *African Writers Series*); and various other correspondence dating between 1959-1993. Additional information is found in royalty statements dated from 1959 through 1993.

**Extending the Achebe Corpus**

After 1975, Achebe’s corpus expands exponentially, one of the most important being his long-anticipated fifth novel, *Anthills of the Savannah* (1987). The rich storehouse of manuscripts housed at Houghton Library, Harvard University, provides a wealth of progressive versions of compositional material. Items 43-59, dated to around 1985, give a rare glimpse into Achebe’s first compositional moments. These items include partial manuscripts and multiple drafts of portions of the novel, including drafts of the “Hymn to the Sun,” a central element of the novel.
In addition, Item 60, entitled “The Witnesses,” a fifty-nine-page typescript with author manuscript alterations revised from the previous items and dated to around 1986, has multiple chapter designations, illustrating the shifting construction of the novel. Items 61-75, author manuscripts with alterations titled “Final handscript,” include chapters 2, 3, and 6 through 18. Item 76, a partial typescript of chapters 4-15, with manuscript alterations, primarily corrections made to items 61-75, includes an additional page of author manuscript included for chapter 12. Items 77-94, a typescript with a few manuscript alterations, was marked “completed 12-7-86” when the items were originally sent to Houghton, indicating that Achebe had finished the novel by that date. Preparing text documents comparing all compositional versions with the publication of Achebe’s most innovative novel would be a major contribution to Achebe criticism.

Additional materials available for study include the early drafts of and revised author manuscript for *The Trouble with Nigeria* (1983), as well as a typescript of the manuscript. A variorum edition of *The Trouble with Nigeria* could illustrate the development of Achebe’s most trenchant critique of Nigeria. Other essays include the 1977 author manuscripts and typescripts for “Work and Play in Tutuola’s Palm-wine Drinkard,” published in 1978 and republished in *Hopes and Impediments* (1988); the author manuscript for Achebe’s Ashby Clare Hall Lecture at Cambridge University on 22 January 1993 entitled “The Education of a British-Protected Child,” a transcription of the manuscript with more author manuscript alterations, as well as additional typescript with author manuscript alterations and an additional manuscript page; the 1988 author manuscript of the preface to *In Pursuit of Publishing* (1988) by Alan Hill; two author manuscripts entitled "A call to Nigerians" and "Anniversary of regrets" dated to 1993; the author manuscript for the foreword to *African Rhapsody: Short Stories of the Contemporary African Experience* (1994); and several undated (although references within the text suggest they were
written in the early 1990s) and unpublished author manuscripts including "My daughters," “M. L. K. and Africa,” and two untitled essays, one on poetry, and the other on being Nigerian.

Another important avenue of research that has roots in the early corpus is Achebe’s 1977 children’s story, *The Flute*. The story first appears as a folktale told by Ugoye, one of Ezeulu’s wives, to her children in the first edition of *Arrow of God*, part of the so-called “anthropological” material excised from the second edition. According to Melissa Watterworth, Curator of Literary, Natural History and Rare Book Collections, a typescript manuscript of Achebe’s short story, apparently an early version of the 1977 published version, was “sent in the 1970s to Francelia Butler, scholar and faculty of children’s literature here at the University of Connecticut.” This typescript, housed at the Thomas J. Dobbs Research Center at the University of Connecticut, differs from its first published version. Tracking changes from the novel to the manuscripts to the final published version would add another dimension to Achebe intra-textual studies.

**Text Mutation in the Extended Corpus: “An Image of Africa”**

Besides additional work on collecting and collating manuscript texts with published versions, just a few examples of the comparison of published texts beyond the 1950-1975 corpus illustrate that both the central element of text mutation in Achebe letters continues as well as the lack of accurate bibliographical information about those mutations. One of Achebe’s most controversial speeches was given at the University of Amherst in February 1975 entitled, “An Image of Africa.” The author’s manuscript for the essay is not among the *Achebe Papers* at Houghton Library, but a comparison of its first publication with subsequent publications illustrates Achebe’s continuing practice of text mutation. First published in *The Chancellor’s*
Lecture Series, 1974-1975 by The University of Massachusetts, this text was emended and shortened for its publication in the Winter 1977 issue of The Massachusetts Review, although these emendations are not noted in the footnote at the bottom of the first page that reads: “This paper was given as a Chancellor’s Lecture at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, February 18, 1975.” Interestingly, its publication in the Spring 1978 issue of Research in African Literatures, special issue on literary criticism states that the version here is, “Reprinted by permission of the following: the University of Massachusetts, from the Chancellor’s Lecture Series; Chinua Achebe; and The Massachusetts Review, Inc., from The Massachusetts Review, © 1977.” The acknowledgement covers all bases, but does not explain that the Research in African Literatures text reverts back to the text of the first published version of the speech, and not The Massachusetts Review version, except in incidentals. Changes include a shortened introductory sentence, a shortened version of his conversation with another faculty member while crossing campus, dropping references to his audience while delivering his speech (moving the text toward an essay vs. a speech), and omitting the additional quote from the novel after the example of the fireman. These kinds of changes suggest Achebe needed to trim some of the essay in order to meet a word count limitation, particularly since they do not essentially change the meaning of the text. Truly substantive changes do not occur until the fourth publication version newly titled, “An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad’s Heart of Darkness,” published in Achebe’s second collection of essays, Hopes and Impediments (1988) and anthologized the same year in Norton’s critical edition of Heart of Darkness. Particular attention is given to Achebe’s essay because it figures so prominently in critical discussions of Conrad’s novel and because it is most frequently anthologized in collections of postcolonial theory. Although critics mention the fact that Achebe emended the 1978 version of the essay, removing the word “bloody” and substituting the word
“thoroughgoing,” they do not mention any of the other mutations of the text that include important rhetorical moves shifting the text away from an artistic moral imperative towards the insistence on acknowledging Conrad’s construction of European humanity in opposition to African inhumanity: in a word, Conrad’s racism.

Achebe's essay about the novel and the primarily negative critical response to his critique has become part of the mainstream perspective on Conrad's work. The earliest response, Frances Singh’s “The Colonialist Bias in Heart of Darkness” published in Conradiana in 1978, was the only critique that partially agreed with Achebe’s assessment of Conrad’s racism. But Hunt Hawkins in “Conrad’s Critique of Imperialism in Heart of Darkness” published in PMLA in 1979, Wilson Harris’ "The Frontier on which Heart of Darkness Stands" in Research in African Literatures published in 1981, and the much cited Cedric Watts’ essay, “‘A Bloody Racist’: About Achebe's View of Conrad" published in Yearbook of English Studies in 1983 all defended Heart of Darkness as an anti-imperialist novel. It is important to note that all of these essays were written prior to its 1988 emended version and the text mutations Achebe makes in this version must be understood in light of particular accusations made about Achebe’s critique of Conrad. While the 1977 version is primarily characterized by omissions, the 1988 version is characterized by additions and substitutions, including an emended title. Its prior publication history is acknowledged in Hopes and Impediments at the bottom of first page of the essay: “This is an emended version of the second Chancellor’s Lecture at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, February 1975; later published in the Massachusetts Review, vol. 18, no. 4, Winter 1977, Amherst.” This acknowledgement does not mention its 1978 publication in Research in African Literatures, although the 1988 text follows the 1978 version and not the 1977 version. The primary changes include softening his original stance that there is no critical distance
between the author Conrad and his main narrator, Marlow: “[Marlow seems to me to enjoy Conrad’s complete confidence (1978)] [Conrad seems to me to approve of Marlow, with only minor reservations (1988)]—a [feeling (1978)] [fact (1988)] reinforced by the [close (1978)] [omitted (1988)] similarities between their two careers.” Secondly, and most famously, he removes the expletive “bloody” and substitutes “thoroughgoing” in the sentence, “The point of my observations should be quite clear by now, namely that Conrad was a [bloody (1978)] [thoroughgoing (1988)] racist,” cooling down the heated rhetoric. He specifically notes Watts’ argument by adding additional information: “They will point out to you that Conrad is, if anything, less charitable to the Europeans in the story than he is to the natives [that the point of the story is to ridicule Europe’s civilizing mission in Africa].” Achebe also replaces the following declarative sentence with a rhetorical question, as though he now realizes what at first appeared to be obvious has incredulously fallen on deaf ears: “[Of course, there is a] [Can nobody see the] preposterous and perverse [kind of] [omitted] arrogance in thus reducing Africa to the role of props for the break-up of one petty European mind [.] [?]”

One of the main concessions Achebe makes is to remove the following paragraphs supporting his main argument that great art and racism cannot occupy the same space, extricating aesthetic considerations from a moral imperative:

I would not call that man an artist, for example, who composes an eloquent instigation to one people to fall upon another and destroy them. No matter how striking his imagery or how beautiful his cadences fall, such a man is no more a great artist than another may be called a priest who reads the mass backwards or a physician who poisons his patients.

All those men in Nazi Germany who lent their talent to the service of
virulent racism whether in science, philosophy or the arts have generally and rightly been condemned for their perversions. The time is long overdue for taking a hard look at the work of creative artists who apply their talents, alas often considerable as in the case of Conrad, to set people against people.

This, I take it, is what Yevtushenko is after when he tells us that a poet cannot be a slave-trader at the same time, and gives the striking example of Arthur Rimbaud who was fortunately honest enough to give up any pretenses to poetry when he opted for slave trading. For poetry surely can only be on the side of man’s deliverance and not his enslavement, for the brotherhood and unity of all mankind and not for the doctrines of Hitler’s master races or Conrad’s “rudimentary souls.”

In place of the above paragraphs, he makes a conciliatory gesture towards Conrad’s artistry without conceding his argument that Conrad is still a racist:

I do not doubt Conrad’s great talents. Even Heart of Darkness has its memorably good passages and moments:

The reaches opened before us and closed behind, as if the forest had stepped leisurely across the water to bar the way for our return.

Its exploration of the minds of the European characters is often penetrating and full of insight. But all that has been more than fully discussed in the last fifty years. His obvious racism has, however, not been addressed. And it is high time it was!

Achebe adds an additional tip of the hat to his sentence, “Irrational love and irrational hate
jostling together in the heart of that [talented,] tormented man.”

Finally, Achebe removes the following penultimate paragraph prior to the concluding one, as it does not advance his argument:

Perhaps a change will come. Perhaps this is the time when it can begin, when the high optimism engendered by the breathtaking achievements of western science and industry is giving way to doubt and even confusion. There is just the possibility that Western man may begin to look seriously at the achievements of other people. I read in the papers the other day a suggestion that what America needs at this time is somehow to bring back the extended family. And I saw in my mind’s eye future African Peace Corps Volunteers coming to help you set up the system.

Unsatisfied with the conclusion, he only retains the emended first sentence, “[Seriously, although] the work [of redressing] which needs to be done may appear too daunting, I believe that it is not one day too soon to begin.” He omits the next two sentences: “And where better than at a University? I am indeed grateful to the Chancellor and to the Chancellor’s Lecture Serious Committee for this opportunity,” and writes a new conclusion, conceding Watts’ point about Conrad’s partial critique, but stands by his accusation of racism:

Conrad saw and condemned the evil of imperial exploitation but was strangely unaware of the racism on which it sharpened its iron tooth. But the victims of racist slander who for centuries have had to live with the inhumanity it makes them heir to have always known better than any casual visitor, even when he comes loaded with the gifts of a Conrad.”

For Achebe, where a person is standing in relation to a text makes all the difference in the
assessment of that text, no matter how well written. Achebe confirms this point in the preface to *Hopes and Impediments* (Heinemann, 1988). He states that this essay leads the collection because its argument is no less trenchant now than it was thirteen years ago when he delivered the speech. In a sense, he continues to rewrite the essay in the preface by adding additional evidence for contemporaneous assessments of the historical moment. In the original speech, he compares Conrad’s description of Africans that lack coherent movement and speech with the “discovery” of Fang art by European critics, a style of sculpture that profoundly influenced cubist and modernist European art forms. In the same way that some Europeans grasped the implications of African art forms, while at the same time others sought to deny the capacity for aesthetic composition to Africans, Achebe now notes W. E. B. Du Bois’ famous statement made in 1903, “The problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the colour line,” only one year after the book publication of Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*. Achebe states:

The chronology is of the utmost importance. Therefore the defence sometimes proffered: that Conrad should not be judged by the standards of later times; that racism had not become an issue in the world when he wrote his famous African novel, will have to clarify whose world it is talking about.”

Besides the lack of full disclosure about previous versions of “An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness,*” in *Hopes and Impediments*, originally published by Heinemann in 1988, and subsequently by Anchor Books in 1989, the text mutations in this version of the essay are acknowledged. But the 1989 Anchor version includes confusing information about other previously published essays included in the collection. While the acknowledgement page does not imply that any of the texts are reprints: “The author and publisher would like to thank the following for permission to use material in this book,” yet no
mention is made of any text mutations since their previous publication. For example, the following note appears at the bottom of the first page of the Anchor version of the essay “Named for Victoria, Queen of England”: “First published in New Letters, vol. 40, Kansas City, October 1973; subsequently in Morning Yet On Creation Day, Doubleday Anchor Books, 1975.” This bibliographic information is somewhat misleading, however, since it appears to imply that this 1989 Anchor version of the text is the same as the 1975 Anchor version of the text. That is not the case; in fact, the 1989 Anchor version follows the 1975 Heinemann version and does not include the emendations made to the 1975 Anchor version. This same attribution is made of “Colonialist Criticism” and “Language and the Destiny of Man,” but the same holds true: the 1989 Anchor versions of these texts follows the 1975 Heinemann text and not the 1975 Anchor version. Admittedly, the incidental text mutations for these three essays hardly warrant a mention, but illustrate the difficulty in tracking a text’s genealogy without ready access to all previously published versions.

Text Mutation in the Extended Corpus: Achebe Poetry

Achebe’s poetry will serve as the final example Achebe’s ongoing practice of text mutation and the omission of full bibliographic information for all previous versions. As noted earlier, Achebe’s poetry was first collected in Beware, Soul-Brother and Other Poems (Nwankwo-Ifejike, 1971) which was revised and enlarged as Beware, Soul Brother: poems (Heinemann, 1972). The collection was published the following year by Anchor-Doubleday under the title, Christmas in Biafra and other Poems, with some additional emendations. Some of these poems as well as later poems were collected in the 1998 Anchor-Doubleday publication titled Another Africa. The most recent collection of poems titled Collected Poems (2004), also
published by Anchor Books, includes all the poems previously published in *Christmas in Biafra and other Poems*, as well as the same sequence of those poems and their grouping under subject headings. What is not noted is that the emended versions of several of the poems for the *Another Africa* version are carried over into the *Collected Poems* version. In addition, seven new poems are interwoven into the existing framework. Three of these poems, “Agostinho Neto,” “Flying” and “Pine Tree in Spring (for Leon Damas)” were previously published in the Winter 1990 issue of *Callaloo*, republished in 1996 in the literary journal *AGNI* housed at Boston University, and again in *Another Africa* (1998), prior to their inclusion in *Collect Poems* in 2004. Only their previous publication in *AGNI* is acknowledged in *Collected Poems*, although the 1990 version of “Agostinho Neto” is emended for the 1996 *AGNI* version and emended again for the 2004 version. “Flying,” also first published in 1990 in *Callaloo*, is emended in for the 1996 *AGNI* version and emended again in the 2004 version. Other previously published poems included in the 1990 *Callaloo* issue include “Knowing Robs Us,” emended for the 1998 *Another Africa* version and emended again for the 2004 version; “The Old Chief and the Census,” re-titled and emended as “The Nigerian Chief and the Census” in *Another Africa* and re-titled again as “The Nigerian Census” in the 2004 version; and “A Mother in a Refugee Camp,” previously titled, “Refugee Mother and Child,” now emended for the 1990 edition, and emended again for *Another Africa*. Perhaps the most interesting metamorphosis characterizes the poem, “Benin Road,” first published in the literary journal *Okike* in 1972 and collected in the 1972 Heinemann *Beware Soul-Brother: poems* and in *Christmas in Biafra and other Poems* (1973). The text was heavily emended and given a new title, “Butterfly” in the 1990 *Callaloo* version, slightly emended in the 1998 *Another Africa* version (also titled “Butterfly”), and then emended again under the former title “Benin Road” for the 2004 *Collected Poems*. None of these emendations is mentioned in the
Acknowledgements in *Collected Poems*, leaving the impression that the 2004 version of “Benin Road” is the same as the 1973 version and effectively erasing the stages of mutation prior to its form in the *Collected Poems*.

**Conclusion**

These examples from Achebe’s post-1975 corpus illustrate that the same dynamics evident in the early Achebe corpus continue to the present and underscore the importance of a comprehensive chronological bibliography for the entire Achebe corpus as a foundation for a textualist-materialist approach to Achebe’s literary production. Given the central place Achebe holds in African letters as a foundational figure of modern African writing, it is essential that the architecture of his compositional process be understood as a constant remodeling, or refashioning of the text in response to ever-new contexts. Creating text documents draws attention to that complex architectural project, reminding us that *any* Achebe text is an edited text. A critical appreciation of Achebe’s shifting choices, the “architectural elements” he utilized within the highly disputed space of African literary construction, must constitute part of the critical platform whereby any evaluative conclusions can be made for how Achebe has gained such a central place in African letters as “father of modern African literature.”

It bears repeating that even when Achebe himself collected poems, essays, or short stories together as representative texts, these texts were still not definitive, but are instead further defining moments, opportunities to create new versions within a new structural arrangement for these texts. The current project is a similar collection, itself a particular “version” of Achebe letters. The creation of variorum texts is itself a type of interpretation; these editions never existed in composition or print in this form. Scholarly editions such as the text documents invite
a kind of reading no other textual form comes close to suggesting. Therefore, while projects of this kind, which preserve and present historical documentation of published texts, may appear as a kind of conservation, even a conservative approach in literary studies, when in fact they may be the most progressive innovations of new texts and new contexts.
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