Brian Southam

Mansfield Park – *What did Jane Austen Really Write? The Texts of 1814 and 1816*

Essay published in Re-drawing Austen: Picturesque Travels in Austenland

Questions of textual transmission and textual authority have not hitherto arisen with Austen partly because the published texts are relatively problem-free and partly because the evidence is so thin. Apart from a single fragment, the two so-called 'cancelled' chapters of *Persuasion*[1], an earlier version of the novel's ending, nothing of the manuscripts of the six novels has survived. However, the publication of the Penguin and Norton editions of *Mansfield Park* directs our attention to an area of uncertainty between the published texts and what Austen actually wrote. *Mansfield Park* has an important place in this enquiry as one of the only two novels – the other is *Sense and Sensibility* – revised and corrected by Austen for a second edition; and it is in their differing choice of copy-text that Kathryn Sutherland and Claudia Johnson have raised this issue and, alongside it, and equally important, the question of textual authority as between the first edition, published by Thomas Egerton in 1814, and the second edition, published by John Murray in 1816.[2]

In choosing the second edition of 1816, Johnson has followed established practice, that is to say the practice established by R. W. Chapman, Austen's first real editor, who created the Oxford University Press edition of 1923. Chapman's decision to use 1816 was made on the principle that the last edition published in an author's lifetime can be treated as the authoritative edition, as long as there is evidence of the author's involvement in its preparation; and in the case of *Mansfield Park* such evidence does exist. It comes in a letter Austen sent to her publisher, John Murray, in 11 December 1815. Murray had lent her some books and she now returns them, together with a copy of the first edition carrying her corrections and revisions, with this comment: 'I return also, *Mansfield Park*, as ready for a 2d Edit: I beleive, as I can make it.–'[3] In Chapman's view, the matter was decided anyway by what he regarded as the markedly inferior state of the first edition. According to his Introductory Note, dated 1923, 'Of all the editions of the novels, the first edition of *Mansfield Park* is by far the worst printed. It is very ill punctuated, and there are a good many verbal errors. The second edition, which has been followed in all reprints, is very much better – with the proviso, Chapman adds, that he has occasionally "preferred the reading of the first".[4] This decision, however, was not without loss since he thought that the spelling of 1814 was 'more likely to reflect the author's practice'; and he added the proviso that on occasion he had 'preferred the reading' of 1814.

Chapman's choice of the second edition over the first, so firmly expressed, was not questioned at the time, nor subsequently; nor did it arise, other than as a matter of confirmation, in his Clark Lectures at Cambridge in 1948, published in the same year as *Jane Austen: Facts*

and Problems, where he remarked on the 'careful changes' made to the second editions of *Sense and Sensibility* and *Mansfield Park*. So it is no surprise to find that the editions of later scholars and critics are based on Chapman's Oxford text, with little or no change, notably those edited by Mary Lascelles, Dent Everyman (1963); Tony Tanner, Penguin English Library (1966); and James Kinsley, Oxford English Novels (1970).

In the Norton edition, however, Johnson, takes a different route from all previous editors, not only in side-stepping the Oxford text, but in returning directly to the text of 1816 and challenging Chapman, opening what amounts to a critical dialogue with his editorial decisions. Whilst paying tribute to his 'good judgement and good example' in editorial matters and pointing out that 'at its best' his practice is 'so measured and careful', Johnson nonetheless finds his decisions 'sometimes capricious'. Her aim has been 'to produce a conservative edition', remaining faithful to the 1816 text 'more regularly than Chapman does', avoiding the introduction of 'new variants in punctuation' (one aspect of Chapman's editing) and 'taking a different stand on several cruxes'. In the Textual Notes she sets out the detail of her disagreement with Chapman on specific points: on several occasions, for example, where Chapman emends the text, she has seen no call for intervention. In addition, as Johnson explains, she has tried 'to make editorial intervention explicit', something that Chapman does not always do, 'and to allow those inconsistencies that cannot be adjudicated on the basis of known information about the text to stand'(Norton,p. 323) – a measure of negative capability that other editors would do well to try for. So it can be said that the Norton text is the most faithful we have to the second edition of 1816. Equally important is the fact that Johnson presents the rationale for choosing 1816 as her copy-text. This explanation is given at length, and in detail, and her consideration of the issues that stand behind this choice is clear and extremely thorough.

Turning now to the Penguin edition. The policy regarding the text is set out by Claire Lamont, the Textual Adviser to the Penguin edition of all six novels: the texts 'have been edited afresh' and are based on the first editions. This is a bold decision and makes the Penguin *Mansfield Park* the first edition ever to take the original edition of 1814 as copy-text, and Sutherland presents the case for making this choice. Her claim is that since Chapman's day editorial theory has changed and that nowadays 'editorial preference has shifted towards the earliest articulated form of a work'. As there is no manuscript of *Mansfield Park*, 'the earliest articulated form' is the first edition of 1814. Sutherland finds further support in the 'high valuation' placed in the Romantic period upon 'primary utterances' (p. xlii); and I quote from a letter which Professor Sutherland has kindly allowed me to use, in which she enlarges on the particular meaning of this term: '"Primary" implies both original and chief; and I do think a case can be made for suggesting that the earliest printed version (despite errors it may and will contain) represents a union of form and content, expression and intention (whatever we decide to call it) that is special and which will be strained by subsequent revision even if those revisions render local detail more accurate'.[5]

Returning to what Sutherland says in the Penguin edition, in the 1814 text, Sutherland finds 'a freshness and freedom […] which is lost in the regularizations and "corrections", begun in' 1816 'and continued by Chapman' (p. xliii). Specifically, these are changes made to the punctuation, spelling and grammar – changes in this last category include corrections of the indicative 'was' to the subjunctive 'were'. According to Sutherland, some of the punctuation changes have a pronounced effect on the style or manner of 1814, its 'rhythmical punctuation', 'apparently looser and less logical than modern punctuation', employed 'to mark emphasis or balance which often runs counter to grammatical sense' (p. 416). Overall, the effect of these

changes in 1816 is to remove 'characteristics of the author's writing style which a modern reader would wish to recover' (p. xliii).

Sutherland also claims that the text of 1814 'contains some significantly better readings than' 1816 - 'better' in the sense that the text is 'stripped of the "improvements" of subsequent editions', including 1816. And in 'making a claim for the textual authority' of 1814, Sutherland draws our attention, in particular, to 'those substantive textual variants' in 1816 'which have been traditionally regarded as the improvements of Austen's sailor brothers' (p. xliii). This refers to the passage These come in Volume Three, Chapter seven, where Mr Price describes the departure of William's ship, the 'Thrush', when it leaves the inner harbour at Portsmouth on its way out to the fleet anchorage at Spithead. In 1814, Austen got things wrong. She made mistakes in the nautical terminology and in the geography of the harbour setting. Someone knowledgeable, as Sutherland suggests, almost certainly one of the sailor brothers, Francis or Charles, both of whom were very familiar with Portsmouth, must have warned her about these mistakes; and in 1816 we find the passage revised and corrected. Sutherland follows her copy-text, preserving the uncorrected reading of 1814, with the corrections of 1816 recorded in the Notes. Sutherland explains her decision, at this point, as 'a preference […] for Austen's "uncorrected" personal authority' (p. 410) – a principle maintained throughout the Penguin text. By this, we are to understand that so-called 'improvements' to 1814 fall into a suspect category, most of all the 'improvements' that came from outside, notwithstanding that they were entered by the author herself; and that they remain subordinate to the original uncorrected text, even when the original text is factually wrong. This fully accords with Sutherland's earlier explanation of 'primary utterances.

This example highlights the absolute difference in Johnson's position. Her argument is that the area of correction around the 'Thrush' is only one example of Austen's abiding concern with 'authenticity of details'; and she refers to the other well-known examples of Austen's scrupulous confirming of facts during the writing of *Mansfield Park*. In the case of the 'Thrush', 'The last thing Austen wanted was to be faulted for failing to render nautical terms precisely when the wielding of this specialized speech was the whole point' (Norton, p. xix). (I would add that the user of these 'nautical terms', Mr Price, is himself a naval man. A Lieutenant in the Marines, a townsman of Portsmouth and a habitué of the dockyard and waterfront, he is the last person we would expect to misuse nautical language or to make a mistake exists in about the visibility of vessels leaving the harbour).

Differing as they do in their copy-texts, the Penguin and the Norton editions nonetheless share a common identity as scholarly texts of the first order. What is equally important, both are critiques, direct or implied, upon the authority of Chapman's Oxford edition. In 'Speaking Commas/Reading commas: Punctuating Mansfield Park', an article first published in 1999,[6] Sutherland scrutinizes the problematic nature of this authority and examines the background of social and cultural forces which played a part in its formation. As the title suggests, Sutherland's central argument is that 'punctuation holds the key to *Mansfield Park*',[7] and she discusses in detail what she identifies as Chapman's corrective attitude towards Jane Austen as a *woman* author, especially in matters of punctuation and 'faulty grammar or infelicitous phraseology' which Chapman was prompt 'to regularize and adjust' with '"expert interventions".[8] The argument is striking. It throws a highly critical light on the male style of patriarchal editing to which Chapman subjected Austen's feminine text, a not untypical manifestation of scholarly and critical attitudes in the mid-twentieth century. However, the fascination of Sutherland's analysis should not distract our attention from the question at issue: not the priority of 1814 over Chapman's edition, with all its now-evident shortcomings, but the matters at stake between

the divergent editorial principles expressed in the choice of copy-text for the Penguin and Norton editions.

Some of these matters could be resolved if only we had a copy of the manuscript, that is to say the fair copy that went to the publisher Thomas Egerton at the end of 1813 or early in 1814 and which Egerton, in turn, passed on to the different printers; or the copy Austen retained; or even the author's corrected proofs. And for 1816, the copy of 1814, revised and corrected by Austen, from which the second edition was set. Any one link in this chain of evidence would go a long way to clearing up the disputed readings and uncertainties that face us in both editions. But to the best of our knowledge nothing of this material has survived, either for *Mansfield Park* or for any of the novels, save the cancelled chapters of *Persuasion*. Nor can we expect anything more to turn up, given Chapman's determined pursuit, over many years, of Austen materials of all kinds that might still be in the possession of the family or elsewhere. There must be some significance to the fact that while all the *un*published manuscript material - including the three volumes of juvenilia, *Lady Susan*, *The Watsons* and *Sanditon* – has come down to us intact, no manuscript of anything published in Austen's lifetime has survived. Cassandra was a jealous guardian of her sister's private life and, after Jane's death, just as she censored her sister's letters with scissors and bonfire, so too she may have destroyed the manuscripts of the novels as belonging to that same private realm.

Outside the family, the most likely location would be the official Archive of the publishers Murray. Known as the John Murray Archive, it is remarkably complete and well kept. It was Murray who brought out the first editions of *Emma*, *Northanger Abbey* and *Persuasion*, as well as the second edition of *Mansfield Park*. But all that the Archive now contains in Austen's hand is two letters written to Murray about *Emma*: one dated of 11 December 1815, already referred to earlier ; and two letters regarding *Emma*: one dated 23 November 1815, a letter of complaint saying that she is 'so very much disappointed & vexed by the delays of the Printers' and wondering if there is any 'hope of' the proofs 'being quickened'; the second, dated 11 December , referred to earlier, the letter covering the corrected copy of 1814 from which 1816 was set.[9] Other than these two precious relics, the Archive holds account books recording payments to Austen, to the printers and paper merchants for the four novels, and the ledger for pre-publication orders from the wholesale firms. As nothing more has been found, we can only conclude that the marked-up text of 1814 and the fair copies of the three later manuscripts remained with the printers, as was usual, and in the course of time went out with their rubbish.

So for any further progress we have to make do with those indirect resources in which some guidance can be elicited. Firstly, there is our knowledge of printing and publishing practice in the early nineteenth century. This enables us to reconstruct the path of a manuscript from the time it left an author's hands until its eventual appearance in print; and, within this sequence, we can identify the stages at which the manuscript was liable to alteration. Copy-editing, as we know it today, was non-existent. Normally, the publisher was only concerned to agree with the printer (or printers, as in the case of Austen, when different printers were employed for the different volumes) that the novels would be printed to the standard novel size (duodecimo, (c.185 x 110mm) and in the standard three-volume form (with two volumes each for *Northanger Abbey* and *Persuasion*, ,which were published together, as a four-volume set, probably because they were somewhat shorter than the earlier novels). Publisher and printer would also agree on the type-face and type size, the paper to be used and any other basic matters of production and design. But it was most unlikely that the publisher would make any changes to the text. These would be made in the printing house. At this time, it was working practice for compositors to correct the spelling and punctuation of an author's manuscript, including the

indication of speech, normalizing these features according to "the rule of the house". But from printing-house to printing-house the "rule" changed. For the compositors this was a real problem and in 1805 their London Society was driven to address a formal letter of complaint to their employers, the Master Printers, including these very points:

> Scarcely any two persons agree in their modes of punctuation, - and most houses in town have their peculiar method, not only in this, but in spelling, dividing [hyphenating or otherwise dividing compound words], &c. &c. all which becomes a heavy burden on those who have to support it […][10]

In the light of this we have no assurance that a given passage of printed text reproduces the punctuation and spelling of the original manuscript. Nor did authors expect that it would. As Johnson points out, this has implications for the close reading of Austen: that these 'matters from which we squeeze a lot of nuance' may owe more to the compositors 'than has been acknowledged' (p. xix). This warning takes on a special resonance with *Mansfield Park*, The three volumes of the first edition were set by two different printers and the second edition by three.[11] With so many fingers in the pie, how much of the punctuation and spelling is Austen's and how much is down to the compositors and correctors ? – a question that attaches itself as much to 1814 as to 1816.

Our second indirect resource is Austen's correspondence, although pitifully little has come down to us, a mere 160 letters out of a minimum of at least 3000. References to the writing of the novels and to her dealings with printers and publishers are, understandably, very few. But they do give us some indication of the quantity and form in which the proofs were received by Jane Austen. They come in sheets, probably 96 pages at a time. The letters also tell us how she found mistakes in the typesetting; how the printers queried what she called her own "peculiar style of spelling";[12] and, perhaps the most value – when her brother Henry, her London man-of-business, was unwell and heading for bankruptcy in mid- March 1816 – evidence of her own brisk and equally business-like attitude towards publishers and printers, suggesting that on details that really mattered to her she was capable of taking a firm stand.[13]

Finally, and most useful of all, are the surviving literary manuscripts.[14] All these display Austen's personal idiosyncrasies and mannerisms of punctuation, capitalization and spelling. By comparing these features with the printed texts of the novels, we can go some way towards reconstructing the kinds of changes that were made by the compositors. In such an exercise, the cancelled chapter 11 of volume two of *Persuasion* is of particular value, since this became chapter 12 of the printed text, virtually unchanged in sense and wording, but considerably changed in capitalization, punctuation and spelling. We see, for example, that Austen's abbreviations and ampersands were expanded, that her spelling was normalized, and that her prolific use of initial capitals, by now regarded as old-fashioned, was trimmed to modern taste. The compositors also did away with the dash she habitually put after full stops (thus. –) at the end of sentences. All these features are illustrated in this passage, the last page of the *Persuasion* manuscript, which became the final paragraph of the published novel:

> Mrs Smith's enjoyments were not spoiled by this improvement of Income, with some improvement of health, & the acquisition of such friends to be often with, for her chearfulness & mental Activity did not fail her & while those prime supplies of Good remained, she might have bid defiance even to greater accessions of worldly Prosperity. She might have been absolutely rich & perfectly healthy, & yet be happy.– Her spring of Felicity was in the glow of her Spirits – as her friend Anne's was in the warmth of her Heart.– Anne was Tenderness itself;– and she had the full worth of it in Capt. Wentworth's affection. His Profession was all that could ever make her friends wish that Tenderness less; the dread of a future War, all that could dim her Sunshine.– She gloried in being a Sailor's wife, but she must pay the tax of quick alarm, for

belonging to that Profession which is – if possible – more distinguished in it's Domestic Virtues, than in it's National Importance.–

Finis
July 18. –1816.[15]

Apart from the normalization carried out by the compositors, this manuscript version differs from the printed text in two further details: 'Activity', line 3, becomes 'alacrity', meaning" liveliness", "those", in line 4, becomes 'these'. These changes could have been made by Austen herself in the course of revising this draft further in making the fair copy meant for the publisher. Our uncertainty about this is deepened by the circumstance that as *Persuasion* was published six months after her death it is almost certain that the correction of the proofs was handled by her brother Henry – the businessman of the family, to whom Austen entrusted her publishing affairs.

In the ordinary way, the printer would have received a fair copy of the *Persuasion* manuscript, and we have no reason to suppose that the text would have differed essentially from what is in front of us here. The compositors were used to deciphering writing far less legible than the well-formed and regular copperplate Austen employed in making fair copies of her work – visible for example in the manuscripts of the juvenilia and *Lady Susan*. So while the wording would have been reproduced faithfully, the other elements, including, as we can see in these few lines, the punctuation and spelling, would be subject to all the routine normalizing changes regarded as necessary to transferring the written form to the printed page. And when we take into account that two different printers were involved in the *Mansfield Park* 1814 text and three in the 1816, the complications, vagaries even, of textual transmission are obvious enough. Not only did house rules differ from printer to printer, so did the individual compositors within each house differ in their application of the rules. They introduced their own variations – indeed their own levels of carelessness. It comes as no surprise, therefore, to find a wide range of inconsistencies not simply between the two editions, but also independently amongst the tree volumes of each edition – inconsistencies of hyphenation, apostrophes inserted or omitted or differently placed, variant spellings of the same work, compounds separated, hyphenated or unhyphenated, or run together, and so on. These are inconsistencies amounting to errors even though "correctors", sometimes known as "readers, were employed. Working with the proofs, their job was to spot these and any other mistakes, such as broken letters or letters reversed or omitted or printed askew, page numbers missing, catchwords missing, rules of differing lengths and shapes, and so on. Some of these blemishes got through in 1814, some in 1816, and some in both editions.

That such inconsistencies and printing errors did get through, suggests that the proof-reading stages were unduly hurried or skimped. This should not have happened if the standard procedures had been followed. According to Caleb Stower, a Master Printer of this period, authors first received the proof-sheets to correct alongside the original copy from which the proofs were set; they then received a set of revised proof-sheets together with the first proofs, in order "to see that all the errata are properly corrected"; and throughout this process authors were urged to return their proofs "as quickly as possible".[16] Whatever went wrong, the incidence of error both in 1814 and 1816 tells us that Austen did not regard her manuscripts as sacrosanct, to the very last detail, to be rendered to perfection. In short, she was certainly not an author of the Shelley stamp, some of whose poetry went to the 'printer with strict instructions to "follow copy", that is to print it *verbatim, literatim*, and point for point, and to leave revision to the author'.[17] Austen allowed some latitude to the vagaries of the printing house; and across

the Christmas and New Year period 1815-16 she seems not to have been eagle-eyed when it came to the reading of her proofs. This may reflect her impatience to see the revised *Mansfield Park* published – its production occupied only just over ten weeks, from mid-December to mid-February. There were other distractions during this time. Into December, she was pressing Murray to finish the printing of *Emma*, with the added complication of its dedication to the Prince Regent; and in the New Year, there was anxiety around Henry's failing health and failing business. This may explain the tentativeness of her wording to Murray when she sent him the corrected copy of 1814 'as ready for a 2d Edit: I beeie, as I can make it'.[18] Does this carry an apologetic note for her inability at this time to attend to the to attend to the correction of the 1814 text as thoroughly as she would have liked?.

So Johnson's crucial question remains to be answered – How much weight should we attach to the fine detail of Austen's punctuation and spelling, or, rather, to the punctuation and spelling that faces us on the printed page? I am sure, for example, that both Chapman and Sutherland are right to judge that 'tease', spelt 'teize' in 1814, a slightly archaic form, was Austen's own spelling, rather than the up-to-date 'tease' of 1816.[19] This finds support in the manuscript of *Lady Susan* (a fair copy made c1805) where there are two examples of 'teizing' spelt in the old-fashioned way.[20] Sutherland is also right to draw attention to what she calls 'a rash' of initial capitals that occurs in 1814, in chapters 11, 12 and 13 of volume one (Penguin, p. 418). So it is very likely that at this point the compositor was following the manuscript of *Mansfield Park* to the very letter, whereas the compositor in 1816 chose to modernise the style by dropping these capitals. They had long been regarded as 'antiquated' (this according to Stower, in the standard printers' handbook of the time),[21] a hangover from the past, to be tidied up according to modern practice.

Another 'rash' in 1814 is a 'rash' of italics in chapter 18, the final chapter of volume one. However, in this case, the 1816 compositors left the italics of 1814 unchanged. This is puzzling. According to Stower the 'frequent use' of italics 'is useless, and generally absurd" and they were resisted by compositors as being anaesthetic and old fashioned.[22] And, worst of all, they were time-consuming, since the compositor had to pick the italic typeface from another case, an action which slowed down his rate of setting - a serious drawback, as compositors were paid by piecework and italics hit their earnings. So it is particularly significant to find, in addition to the italics retained from 1814, four words which were printed roman in 1814 and were then re-set in italics in 1816.[23] This runs quite counter to contemporary printing practice and authority. That they are not compositors' mistakes is evident. In each case, the word in question is made to bear a particularizing and dramatic emphasis, an indicative tone of voice and shade of meaning. These are not printing-house alterations but alterations that the author alone would make, indicating them to the printer by underlining the word to be italicized and writing 'Ital.' in the margin.

Although, to take up Sutherland's point, these italicizings are unquestionably second thoughts on Austen's part, and not 'primary utterances', at the same time, they are second thoughts that Austen intended as improvements and which effectively sharpen the text. As far we can judge, they meet Sutherland's requirement in carrying the author's 'personal authority' (Penguin, p. 410) and there is nothing to suggest that that the changes were made at anyone else's prompting. Nonetheless, in obedience to the Penguin editorial principle, these revisions are placed in the list of Textual Variants.

I have made no attempt to arbitrate between the claims and procedures of the two editors. The evidence they present is detailed and needs to be studied in detail and *in situ*. But if I can attempt to summarize the issue, it seems to boil down to this. Sutherland judges that 1814 has a particular value in its proximity to Austen's original manuscript and to have suffered less from the intervention of the compositors; and not at all from the second kind of intervention, that of outside correction or advice as exemplified in the changes made to the 'Thrush' passage. And she finds a strong and intrinsic value to the textual priority of 1814 in its character as 'primary utterance'.

Johnson does not refer, either directly or indirectly, to the concepts of intervention or 'primary utterance'; nor, indeed, does she make any reference at all to the Penguin edition. What she does attach weight to is the hand of the compositors in normalizing the original spelling and punctuation of a manuscript or, of a marked-up text, in conformity with the printer's house rules and as a matter of working practice. By 1816, this normalization, in all its consequences, would have come as no surprise to Austen since it was a fact of publication that she had already encountered in the printing of the five editions of her previous novels - counting in the first and second editions of *Sense and Sensibility* (1811, 1813), the two editions of *Pride and Prejudice*, (both 1813), and the first edition of *Mansfield Park*. Whether the changes Austen made for the second edition were, on her own initiative, or were put to her, palpably as suggestions from outside, both categories are regarded by Johnson as having equal standing, since Austen herself put them into effect as corrections or improvements to the original text.

In the Introduction to the Penguin edition, Sutherland refers to *Mansfield Park* as Austen's 'most designed […] novel' (Penguin, p. vii). If we take this idea into the textual discussion, it frames this question for us – Are Austen's corrections and improvements to 1814, as we find them in 1816, intrinsic to that design, as Johnson maintains, or are they, in Sutherland's terms, interventions extraneous to the first edition, add-ons, as it were, straining the 'union of form and content' that belongs to 1814's identity as a 'primary utterance'? How we answer this question, and what weight we accord to the arguments of the two editors, are for readers to decide for themselves. Nevertheless, if one thing emerges clearly from both the Penguin and Norton editions, it is that the choice of copy-text and the whole procedure of textual criticism which leads up to this choice, are not to be put to one side as specialist concerns, remote from the business of literary history, criticism and interpretation. Textual approaches have their rightful and necessary place alongside other routes of enquiry. Those readers who are yet to be convinced of this will find it worthwhile to read what Sutherland and Johnson have to say on these matters as they relate to *Mansfield Park*. Their conclusions are different, but en route we given an insight upon connections between textual study and the understanding of individual works of literature, their authors and the processes - material and historical - which join them.

Our attention is drawn, for example, to an unmistakable irony of circumstance: that a novel recounting the defeat of Austen's supremely patriarchal figure, Sir Thomas Bertram, at the hands of the meekest and mildest of her heroines, should itself be exposed to the patriarchal manipulation of its printers – those many hands involved in its typographical, (as distinct from its authorial), composition.

Finally, as to the choice of copy-text, there is the approach recommended by Philip Gaskell: that an 'editor should base his decisions, not on rules, but on his bibliographical and

critical judgement of the circumstances of each case'.[24] This seems to me practical and pragmatic, too in the case of *Mansfield Park*.

Afterword

A further possibility, which neither Sutherland nor Johnson discuss, since it lies outside their brief, is that alterations may have been made to the texts of *Mansfield Park* before they went to the printers, while they were still in the hands of the publishers. In the case of 1814, I think this highly unlikely since Egerton did not employ an editor, nor is it on record that he offered any comment or advice on the three Austen novels he brought out. Murray, on the other hand, did employ a trusted and expert editor, the famously interventionist William Gifford, the founding Editor of the *Quarterly Review*; and in a forthcoming essay I hope to show the likelihood that his hand, alongside that of the compositors, also played its part in muddying the textual waters around the second edition of *Mansfield Park*.

Notes

[1] *The Manuscript Chapters of* Persuasion, ed. R. W. Chapman, Oxford, Oxford University Press 1926.

[2] *Mansfield Park* (1814) Penguin Classics (1996), ed. Kathryn Sutherland, and *Mansfield Park* (1816) Norton Critical Edition (1998), ed. Claudia Johnson.

[3] 11 December 1815, *Jane Austen's Letters*, ed. Deirdre Le Faye, Oxford, Oxford University Press 1995, p. 305.

[4] *Mansfield Park*, ed. R. W. Chapman, Oxford, Oxford University Press 1923, pp. xi-xii.

[5] Letter KS to BCS, 6 June 2003.

[6] *Text* (1999), xi. pp. 101-22; reprinted in *Ma®king the Text: The Presentation of Meaning on the Literary Page*, ed. Joe Bray, Miriam Handley, Anne C. Henry, Aldershot, Ashgate 2000, pp. 217-34.

[7] Text, cit., p. 105.

[8] Text, cit., p. 111.

[9] *Letters*, Nos. 126, 130. The archive once held three more letters from Austen to John Murray, Nos. 124, 131(C), 139.

[10] Letter dated 9 February 1805, in *The London Compositor: Documents Relating to Wages, Working Conditions and Customs of the London Printing Trade 1785-1900*, ed. Ellic Howe, London 1947, p. 86. Four-and-a-half years later, in September 1809, the Compositors' Committee raised the question again of the responsibility that fell to the individual craftsman: "the Compositor has generally to point what he composes, and often to correct the orthography", linking this issue with a "request for an advance of wages" (pp. 141-42).

[11] 1814: volumes one and three were set by Sidney, volume two by Roworth. 1816: volume one was set by Moyes, volume two by Roworth, volume three by Davison. Of these printers, all of them London Master Printers, Roworth was the most experienced with Austen texts, having already set all six volumes of the first and second editions of Sense and Sensibility and volume one of the first and second editions of *Pride and Prejudice*. Sidney had set volumes two and three of the first and second editions of *Pride and Prejudice*. However, previous experience with Austen manuscripts seems not to have improved the quality of setting, however, probably because new compositors were involved.

[12] *Jane Austen's Letters*, cit., p. 300.

[13] This aspect is well covered in Jan Fergus, *Jane Austen: A Literary Life*, Basingstoke, Macmillan 1991, ch. 5.

[14] Especially *Lady Susan* (composed c. 1793-94, transcribed c. 1805); the two abandoned novels: *The Watsons* (dating from about 1805) and *Sanditon* (begun in January 1817); and the cancelled chapters of *Persuasion* (dated July 1816).

[15] *The Manuscript Chapters of* Persuasion, cit., pp. 38-39, emended from the manuscript, British Library (Egerton Ms. 3038).

[16] Caleb Stower, *The Printer's Price-Book*, London 1814, Pp. 8, 11.

[17] D. H. Reiman, *Romantic Texts and Contexts*, Columbia, University of Missouri Press 1987, p. 37, quoting H. B. Forman, *The Shelley Library*.

[18] *Jane Austen's Letters*, cit., p. 305. What exactly Austen meant by these words is suggestively questioned by Johnson (Norton, p. xvili).

[19] 1923, p. xii; Penguin, p. xliii.

[20] *Lady Susan*, ed. R. W. Chapman, Oxford, Oxford University Press 1925, pp. 64, 124.

[21] Caleb Stower, *The Printer's Grammar*, London, 1787, 2nd edn 1808, p. 60. Stower was a working Master Printer, and his book, in effect a manual, is addressed to those learning the trade. He was the author of several such works, one of these, addressed to authors, on *Typographical Marks, Employed in Correcting Proofs* (2nd edn 1806).

[22] Stower, *The Printer's Grammar*, cit., p. 39.

[23] Penguin, see "List to Textual Variants": "If *they* were at home" p. 209; "It *was* long" p. 374; "she had certainly been *more* attached to him" p. 379; "In *her* usefulness" p. 389.

[24] Philip Gaskel, *From Writer to Reader: Studies in Editorial Method*, Oxford, Clarendon 1999 [1978], p. 6. Sutherland refers to this work, see Penguin, note 1, p. 417.