Brian Southam

The Manuscript Works after Fifty Years and into the Future

Article published in the Jane Austen Society Report for 2009

> 'our comprehension of dead writers must pierce a mist of ever-thickening gloom.' R.W.Chapman, *The Portrait of a Scholar and Other Essays written in Macedonia 1916-1918* (1920), p. 64.

It was just over fifty years ago ─ to be exact, in 1954 ─ that the Oxford University Press completed its edition of Jane Austen with the publication of volume six, *Minor Works*. This *diminuendo* title concealed its real importance, for what the great Austen editor, R.W. Chapman, gave to the world was the first complete edition of Jane Austen's surviving literary manuscripts.[1]

Over the previous thirty years, between the 1920's and 1951, Oxford had published the individual manuscripts, all of them edited by Chapman.[2] In that sense, at least, the *Minor Works* volume of 1954 contained nothing new. What it did provide, however, was the first comprehensive overview of the surviving literary material; and in this respect it opened a fresh and revealing perspective. It presented all the known manuscripts in a single chronological sequence that extended over the entire length of Jane Austen's writing career, a period of thirty years. She was scrupulous in preserving her childhood writing, pieces dating from about 1787, when she was 11 or 12; and to the end of her life she was equally scrupulous in keeping the manuscripts of her unfinished works and the smaller items written over the course of thirty years to entertain the family. From 1817, the year of her death, we have the opening chapters to *Sanditon*, what would have been the beginning of her seventh novel; and, a few months later, her very last work of all, written on her death-bed, verses on the Winchester horse races, a poem remarkably accomplished, vigorous, and edged with a fine sardonic humour.[3] The only substantial manuscript Chapman omitted from *Minor Works* was the original ending to *Persuasion*, the two 'cancelled' chapters which he had edited and published on its own in 1926, a text which Oxford eventually added to the *Persuasion* volume in 1963.[4]

So *Minor Works* delivered a considerable body of work, representing every period of Jane Austen's writing career, a corpus which is in some ways ancillary to the six great novels, in some ways wholly independent of them. Quite apart from their intrinsic literary and historical importance, two of the manuscripts focus our attention upon the writer at work. This is not the case with the three notebooks ─ *Volume the First*, *Second* and *Third* ─ in which Austen gathered her childhood pieces. These, together with *Lady Susan*, are fair copies made some years after their original composition and carry only minor changes and corrections, plus a few revisions and updatings entered later; whereas the two unfinished novels, *The Watsons* and *Sanditon*, are

© 2009 Brian Southam. All rights reserved. Please visit www.brian-southam.com for more information.

works-in-progress which carry the evidence needed to reconstruct their process of composition. In 1923, Virginia Woolf declared 'that of all great writers' Jane Austen 'is the most difficult to catch in the act of greatness'.[5] However, in these two manuscripts we can trace the successive stages of first drafting and immediate correction, followed by later revision. Before us, on the manuscript pages, are the insertions, cancellations, alterations and changes of hand that these different stages entail ─ a process of reworking and refinement that takes us at least some of the way towards glimpsing that elusive 'act'. One can regret that these textual changes are not recorded in the *Minor Works* volume. But Chapman judged this to be an acceptable omission as the changes were already recorded in his individual volumes, and in his Preface to *Minor Works* he refers 'the student' to these editions.[6]

Altogether, then, the *Minor Works* volume created the opportunity for a reappraisal of the literary manuscripts. Deliberately or otherwise, it was an opportunity Chapman left wide open. A shrewd and perceptive critic, he was also unduly modest and chose to confine himself to an editorial role that can properly be described as discreet. Having established accurate texts and set them before the reader, thereafter Chapman opted to do little more than trace the source of literary quotations and obvious allusions. Of the explanatory historical notes that are nowadays standard to scholarly editions, there are very few. Chapman's judgement on the matter was forthright. In his Preface to *Minor Works* he announced that 'These immature or fragmentary fictions call for hardly any comment'.[7]

To our ears, this remark may sound dismissive. Put in context, however, it loses some of its edge. Firstly, we should remember that the *Minor Works* volume was a very late addition to Oxford's existing edition of the six novels, which dated from 1923. An important feature of the Oxford edition ─ and greatly prized by Chapman ─ was the group of Appendices treating social, cultural and literary matters of Jane Austen's period; and Chapman could assume that anyone reading the *Minor Works* volume would be familiar with these earlier volumes and would be referring to them. Moreover, in Chapman's view the editor's prime responsibility lay not in assisting the reader with detailed explanatory notes and lengthy introductions but in carrying out his duty to the author in preserving the integrity of the text. This resolve, 'a pious duty' he called it ─ ''To restore, and maintain in its integrity the text of our great writers' ─ he carried with him from the rigours of active service in the Great War.[8] We should remember, too, that alongside his pioneering work in Austen studies Chapman was also a Johnsonian scholar. He was well aware of Johnson's contempt for notes as 'necessary evils' that (in Johnson's words) refrigerate the mind.[9] On these principles, Chapman kept the editorial apparatus to the *Minor Works* volume to an absolute minimum. Taken together, the notes and introductions to the individual manuscripts amount to no more than an essential ten pages or so, plus a further ten pages of Indexes to the Characters, Real Persons, Places, Authors and Books.

As to the texts, Chapman left them unmediated, for readers to engage with as manuscripts. He made no attempt to provide trouble-free reading versions. Jane Austen's idiosyncrasies of spelling, capitalisation, paragraphing and so on, he left unchanged. Regarding punctuation, he had declared his view bluntly back in 1923: that 'to modernize is ─ in however small a degree ─ to falsify'.[10] He respected the status of *The Watsons* and *Sanditon* as works–in–progress, unfinished and unfinalised. He explained that he was providing texts that were faithful to 'what seems to have been' Jane Austen's 'final intention', having taken account of the manuscript corrections and revisions.[11]

For the sake of the record, however, some qualification is needed here. Although Chapman was a good reader of the manuscripts, anyone who studies his texts of *The Watsons*

and *Sanditon* alongside the actual manuscripts will find several hundred discrepancies: where, for example, Jane Austen's habitual use of the ampersand sign '&' has been rendered as 'and'; and *vice versa*, where Jane Austen's 'and' has been given as an ampersand; where Jane Austen's unconventional placing of apostrophes has been regularised; where points regularly included by Jane Austen in 'Mr.' and 'Mrs.' are omitted; where there are variations in hyphenation; where initial capitals and lower case forms have been varied; and where her distinctive mark of punctuation at the end of sentences, a dash, either in front of, or behind the full stop, has been reduced to a full stop alone. Of course, these changes can be regarded as trivial. They pass by most readers unnoticed and they cause the no inconvenience whatsoever. They do not involve the mistranscription of words and they have only a marginal bearing on the meaning or literary aspect of these works. Nonetheless, for anyone concerned with this material in its manuscript state, that is to say in the precise and distinctive form in which Jane Austen left these works, they are significant changes.

Similar issues arise in Chapman's text of *Lady Susan*. This survives as a fair copy made by Jane Austen some years after the original, possibly for circulation amongst the family or for reading aloud in the family circle. For the most part, Jane Austen laid out the text as it would appear in print, with careful attention to paragraphing and the separation of speech, so that in sections of dialogue each speaker commences on a new line. However, in Chapman's text of 1923, which the *Minor Works* text follows verbatim, there are passages where Jane Austen's system of paragraphing and speech demarcation disappears, the text is run together, and we face solid and undivided areas of print.[12]

We have no idea how all this came about, who was responsible for these changes or at what stage they were introduced. Was it simply a matter of Chapman's carelessness? This seems far-fetched, since Chapman, a classicist by training and a publisher by profession, was a man whose habit of mind was exacting over matters of detail, textual minutiae most of all. Was it ignorance or indifference or downright fatigue on the part of the typist working from Chapman's handwritten transcript of the manuscript? Even for his colleagues, his hand was notoriously difficult to decipher. Or was it carelessness on the part of the printer? And how was it that these discrepancies were overlooked in the proofs, by Chapman or whomsoever? Although we have no firm answer to these questions, one explanation could lie in the fact that at the very time Chapman was establishing his reputation as the world's leading authority on Austen he was also running the Oxford University Press, of which he had been Secretary to the Delegates ─ equivalent to our modern CEO ─ since 1920.

*

It could be said that in the stark minimalism of the *Minor Works* volume Chapman left an open invitation to textual critics, biographers, literary and cultural historians and to anyone else who wanted to explore this body of work. It was an invitation soon accepted, and over the next fifty years and into the present day the *Minor Works* volume has served as the foundation for selections, critical studies and a multitude of articles.[13] This activity has culminated in the two final volumes in the Cambridge edition of Jane Austen: in 2006, the *Juvenilia*, a piece of exemplary editing by Peter Sabor; and, published at the end of 2008, the *Later Manuscripts* volume, edited by Janet Todd and Linda Bree. As against the economy of Chapman's *Minor Works*, just under five hundred pages in length, the two volumes of the Cambridge edition

deliver virtually the same body of manuscript material in over fourteen hundred pages. This striking difference is largely accounted for by the extent of the Cambridge editorial apparatus, essentially a detailed historical and critical surround delivered in the form of introductions, explanatory notes and appendices. The texts are newly collated from the manuscripts; and *Later Manuscripts* include transcriptions of *The Watsons* and *Sanditon* rendering the manuscripts line-by-line and page-by-page. On the face of it, these transcriptions could be regarded as even more helpful than facsimiles, since the editors have the opportunity to elucidate words and lines so heavily worked over as to be virtually indecipherable.[14] Having said that, we should also enter a note of caution, since no set of readings, including those from Cambridge, are to be regarded as definitive; alternative readings, equally plausible, are possible for some of the cancelled material.

The one highly debatable feature of *Later Manuscripts* is the editorial decision to present the primary texts of the two unfinished works —*The Watsons* and *Sanditon* — not as Austen left them but in 'reading' versions (as the editors call them). They explain that these reading texts are 'discreetly edited to reflect basic publishing conventions of the early nineteenth century', 'conventions' based upon the evidence of 'Austen's own published works'.[15] Thus these Cambridge texts of *The Watsons* and *Sanditon* are editorial constructs, contrivances, what we might describe as hypothetical texts projected for an imagined existence. The problem thus created becomes immediately clear: editing on this basis is an as-for-publication editing wholly incompatible with the essential nature of these two fragments as manuscript works-in-progress. These are manuscripts in a transitional state, *en route* to completion and eventual publication but still far from that finished state. We have no firm basis for judging what further changes Jane Austen might have made on returning to these opening sections once the stories were brought to a conclusion. So an editorial treatment that confers an impress of finality is misjudged. For a 'scholarly' edition, as this is described by Cambridge, the editors would have been better advised to have taken a conservative line, as Chapman did, only giving what could be construed as Jane Austen's 'final intention' at that point in time, taking into account the manuscript corrections and revisions, and retaining the distinctive features of Jane Austen's style in spelling, capitalisation, punctuation and paragraphing. Alternatively, a substantial note on the text was needed, sifting these issues thoroughly, referring to what previous editors have done, and weighing the pros and cons of their own policy. Just such a discussion, which passes unmentioned in *Later Manuscripts*, was conducted thirty years ago by John Davie in the Oxford World's Classics edition of *Northanger Abbey, Lady Susan, The Watsons, Sanditon* (1980). Amongst other approaches, Davie considers the very treatment favoured by Cambridge — 'normalizing the text along lines which the editor presumes would have been followed in publication'— only to reject it: 'to normalize the "Minor Works" to this extent involves guesswork and runs the risk of departing from Jane Austen's intentions in some points of substance'.[16]

In the General Editor's Preface to the Cambridge edition (which appears at the head of the *Juvenilia* and *Later Manuscripts* volume as it does in the individual novels), Janet Todd refers to 'the author's own chosen style' — and sadly it is precisely Jane Austen's 'chosen style' which lies buried beneath the Cambridge reading texts of *The Watsons* and *Sanditon*.[17] Chapman's decision was in the opposite direction, with the consequence that *Minor Works* presents these texts for what they are, unmistakably works-in-progress, unmistakably direct transcripts of Jane Austen's written word, unmistakably her 'chosen style'. If Cambridge's aim was to demonstrate the transformation of the holograph texts into a supposed printed and published form, that could have been accomplished in the space of a few specimen pages

illustrating this final state. But commercial winds blow, even in University Presses, and someone may have led the editors to suppose that these easy-to-read versions would enlarge the market for their volume.

Against this major reservation on the textual side, we have to welcome the scope of the Cambridge editorial apparatus. On the score of sheer information, it establishes a new point of departure, enlarging the reader's understanding of the material world of Regency England and the habits, customs and fashions of its gentlemanly and rising middle classes. This is a context that extends from the highly literary elements of *Lady Susan* to the monetary, economic and medical issues raised in *Sanditon*: the earlier work born out of the social and literary culture of the late eighteenth-century; *Sanditon*, a distinctly post-war novel, dramatising the energies of the late Regency, a work whose driving forces are the capitalist dynamics of speculation, investment and consumerism, and in which Jane Austen's familiar comedy of hypochondria reaches new heights of comic extravagance.

Alongside the Cambridge edition, a further important resource is the new Oxford edition of the manuscript works prepared by Professor Kathryn Sutherland. This presents facsimiles of all the known literary manuscripts, amounting to approximately eleven hundred manuscript pages and largely overcomes the problem of studying material which is physically frail and not available for sustained access. The edition is available in both digital and print versions, with the electronic version fully searchable, opening the way to a more intense study of Austen's working practices than has been possible hitherto. Three further points about the Sutherland edition: the facsimiles are accompanied by transcriptions; there is explanatory annotation; and an essay treats the genesis and composition of the manuscript works and their relationship to the six novels. Overall, this edition builds upon the important discussion of the manuscripts in Kathryn Sutherland's recent study, *Jane Austens's Textual Lives*.

*

Looking to the future, there are a number of specific questions which these new editions will help us to resolve or, at least, to clarify. One of these concerns the date of composition for *Lady Susan*, a highly-accomplished work of deceptively precocious maturity. On this question the manuscript itself offers little help, since this is not the original but a transcription, probably a reading copy, made by Jane Austen some years later. The most generally accepted view is that *Lady Susan* follows on directly from the last of the juvenilia, giving us composition around 1793-94. Q.D.Leavis decided 'on internal evidence' that the novella 'was founded on the years 1795 to 1797, and was certainly written before the end of 1797. Ellen Moody, who has made a close study of the internal chronologies of the novels, suggests 1804-05, a dating based on the supposition that Jane Austen referred to almanacs in constructing the internal time sequences of her narratives. Alongside some deprecatory remarks, Chapman comments that Jane Austen 'handles' the 'story…very unlike a novice' and without any further explanation places *Lady Susan circa* 1805; while Marilyn Butler, associating *Lady Susan* with one of Maria Edgeworth's 'Tales of Fashionable Life', a proposes a date post-1809.[18] The Sutherland edition, providing the means for detailed verbal and stylistic analysis, should help us to fix on the most likely of these.

Another specific question arises from the literary-historical aspect of *Sanditon*: did Jane Austen conceive of *Sanditon* as a 'resort' novel? Looking back to the eighteenth-century, we find that 'resort' has two slightly different applications. The earliest resorts were the traditional inland spas or watering places, headed by Bath, Cheltenham, Harrogate and, mentioned in *Sanditon*, Tunbridge Wells. Visitors came to drink from the springs and bathe in the waters. Over time, the medical or curative aspect became less important and visitors were increasingly drawn by the pleasure of good company and the Assembly Rooms, just as we see in *Northanger Abbey*. However, in the opening decades of the nineteenth century, Bath began to lose something of its social *cachet*, its public entertainments were spurned by good society, and those with social pretensions, such as Sir Walter Elliot and the Dowager Viscountess Dalrymple and her daughter Miss Carteret in *Persuasion*, turned inwards to the select pleasure of exclusive private parties with chosen guests.

The second type of resort, the seaside resort, emerged in the mid-eighteenth century when the medicinal value of sea-water and sea air became recognised. Headed by Brighton, Weymouth and Lyme Regis on the south and south-west coast, these resorts flourished under royal patronage; socially, they were soon to eclipse the inland watering places. Over the next forty or fifty years, their growing popularity created opportunities for commercial investment. Local landowners along the coast were quick to spot the opportunity for profit. Sometimes joined by bankers and other outside investors, they set about the modernisation and development of long-established fishing villages, exactly as Jane Austen describes the transformation taking place at Sanditon.

To my knowledge, however, no-one has yet identified the resort novel, in particular the seaside resort novel, as composing a distinct sub-genre; and it follows from this that no attempt has been made to trace its history, which certainly extends over half a century, beginning with the brief account of Scarborough in Smollett's *Expedition of Humphry Clinker* (1771) and continuing, towards the end of this period, with Thomas Skinner Surr's *The Magic of Wealth* (1815). A popular work, in part it recounts the investment made by a rich tradesman turned banker, a Mr Flim-Flam,[19] in the erection of his namesake resort, Flimflampton ─ reminiscent of a real speculator, Mr Hotham, who had turned the Sussex fishing village of Bognor into fashionable Hothampton in the 1790's ─ and there are some grounds for believing that *The Magic of Wealth* was in Jane Austen's mind when, two years later, she set about the creation of her own Sussex resort.[20]

Literary historians and critics have written a great deal about the direct relationship between *Northanger Abbey* and the Radcliffe school of Gothic fiction. In the same way, a good history of the resort novel would help us to determine whether or not Jane Austen intended *Sanditon* to be read as a work in the resort tradition. It would also help us to judge the extent to which *Sanditon* was to be driven by satirical and romantic impulses, and whether, like *Mansfield Park*, *Emma* and *The Magic of Wealth*, it was to be read as a condition-of-England novel.

*

Finally, I want to turn to two larger areas awaiting re-examination. The first of these, dating from the 1940's, is 'A Critical Theory of Jane Austen's Writings' by Q.D.Leavis. Even

after sixty years this remains one of the most challenging and radical discussions of the manuscript works and their relationship to the six novels and, more widely, to Jane Austen's procedure in the writing of the novels and the economy of her creative process.[21]

According to Mrs Leavis, in writing the six novels Jane Austen drew upon a wide range of sources: principally, her reading, the events of her own life and the lives of her family and friends, and on material recycled from the juvenilia and, in particular, from *Lady Susan* and *The Watsons*. As a general proposition, this claim should awaken no surprise; many writers admit to working along these or similar lines. For a speculative construct, however, the 'Critical Theory' moves with an altogether unexpected degree of certainty and its starting point is formulated with remarkable confidence. Mrs Leavis contends that in Austen we have 'a uniquely documented case of the origin and development of artistic expression' and that 'an enquiry into the nature of her genius and the process by which it developed can go very far indeed on sure ground'.[22] Mrs Leavis claims it to be a necessary enquiry, since without such a detailed examination of Austen's procedures of composition, 'no criticism of her novels can be just or even safe.'[23] Mrs Leavis maintains that the novels are 'palimpsests though whose surface portions of earlier versions, or of other and earlier compositions quite unrelated, constantly protrude'; and she describes the composition of the novels in a graphic image, envisaging them as 'geological structures, the earliest layer going back' to the earliest of the juvenilia, 'with subsequent accretions from her reading, her personal life and those lives most closely connected with hers, all recast…under the pressure of deep disturbances in her own emotional life'.[24] This forceful and accretive process Mrs Leavis traces in detail, accounting for the way in which *Mansfield Park*, centrally Mary Crawford, was developed out of *Lady Susan*, which, in turn, according to the 'Critical Theory', was in part based on Austen's observation in the 1790's of the flirtatious behaviour of a cousin, Eliza de Feuillide, towards her brothers James and Henry.[25] More briefly, Mrs Leavis traces the process by which *Emma* was evolved out of *The Watsons*.[26] Futhermore, she conjectures that, as for the other five novels, there was also a 'prototype' *Persuasion* ─ now lost ─ which she places pre-1806.[27]

Mrs Leavis was not alone in suggesting such processes of recycling. Speculations of this kind go as far back as the 1870's.[28] And although Chapman was scornful, describing the 'Critical Theory' as an 'ingenious and elaborate construction', he too allowed that '*The Watsons* may be regarded as sketch for *Emma*'.[29] More recently, Margaret Anne Doody claims to have identified prototypes and preliminary sketches in Jane Austen's early writing.[30] Other critics have made use of the 'Critical Theory', sometimes embracing it with enthusiasm;[31] and the recycling process has been traced in further directions. Joseph Wisenfarth, for example, terms *The Watsons* as a fertile 'pre-text', an ample source of characters and scenes that Austen drew upon in the late stages of revising *Sense and Sensibility* and *Pride and Prejudice* and also in the writing of *Emma* and *Persuasion*.[32] Quarrying deeper, Jane Fergus has suggested that '*The Watsons* may have developed from Austen's earliest attempt at a novel, "Catharine, or the Bower"'.[33] And excavating deeper still, Olivia Murphy finds 'echoes' of 'Jack and Alice', one of the very earliest of the juvenilia, as late as in *Persuasion*, a linkage across thirty years.[34] Widening the perspective, Kathryn Sutherland guardedly speculates that 'if it is the case that in revising *Pride and Prejudice* Austen absorbed and enlivened aspects of the subject-matter of *The Watsons*, it is even more apparent that in general colouring and in its depiction of physical and emotional constraint ─ of sheer frustration ─ the fragment is far closer to *Mansfield Park* and *Emma*'.[35]

Over fifty years ago, Marvin Mudrick, himself something of an iconoclast, commented that the 'Critical Theory' constituted 'the most iconoclastic, the most confidently documented,

and the most comprehensive effort to describe Jane Austen's method and development'.[36] Yet the 'Theory' is not the last word. To this day, further knowledge and productive speculation continue to extend our consideration of the literary manuscripts; and with the arrival of the Cambridge and Sutherland editions, there is a strong case for re-examining the full range of fact and theory ─ recalling that Mrs Leavis's declared starting point (admirable, it has to be said) was to disabuse the literary world of any illusions about the 'miraculous' nature of Austen's art and to translate the textual 'facts' revealed by Chapman 'into the language of literary criticism'.[37]

A second broad area calling for revaluation is the feminist reading of Austen. This radical approach dates from the 1970's and was powerfully argued in 1979 by Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar in *The Madwoman in the Attic*. The authors chose not to treat the juvenilia as either raw material or apprentice work, in which Jane Austen was seen to be honing her skills as a novelist. Instead, they ask for these early compositions to be recognised as works of individuality, with their own distinctive exuberance and energy, and populated by their own breed of assertive heroines, women who behave 'with indecorous abandon' in a world of the 'zany picaresque' whose orthodoxies are theft, adultery and drunkenness, madness and the murder of mothers and fathers.[38] Writing diagnostically, Gilbert and Gubar find in 'Love and Freindship' 'the first hint' of Austen's 'alienation from her culture, especially as that culture described and circumscribed women'.[39] It is worth noting, as Peter Sabor comments, that when Gilbert and Gubar 'went on to edit the *Norton Anthology of Literature by Women*' published in 1985, they chose to represent Austen by 'Love and Freindship' on its own.[40]

Later critics, notably Claudia Johnson, Margaret Drabble, Margaret Anne Doody and Richard Jenkyns, have also pointed to the self-awareness and individuality of the young author. 'The fruit of unparalleled self-assurance', Johnson describes 'her earliest literary productions…With very little ado, Austen proclaims the dignity of her genre as well as the authority of her command over it…'. 'In some of the shorter fragments' Drabble finds 'hints of another Jane Austen, a fiercer, wilder, more outspoken, more ruthless writer, with a dark vision of human motivation…and a breathless, almost manic energy'.[41] Doody likewise: in the juvenilia is 'another Austen, a comic writer of harder tone and more fearless satire'; 'Her early writing is rough, violent, sexy, joky. It sparkles with knowingness'. And, yet again, Jenkyns, of the juvenilia: '…they reveal a boisterous, hoydenish, sometimes surreal imagination; they are immensely high-spirited, anarchic, occasionally violent in a cartoonish way, and often hilariously funny'; and he compares Austen early pieces with the work of Sterne, Lear, Ionesco and Monty Python.[42]

The publication of these works in the Cambridge edition and the resources of the Sutherland edition, open a fresh opportunity for studying this 'other', uninhibited Jane Austen; and not only in isolation, but also alongside the juvenilia of other writers, an association explored in the work of Christine Alexander and other contributors to *The Child Writer from Austen to Woolf*.[43]

*

Virginia Woolf accounted Jane Austen 'as inscrutable in her small way as Shakespeare in his vast one'; and, more recently, Emily Auerbach, in discussing Woolf's view of Austen,

has described her as ‘an elusive, slippery, enigmatic figure’.[44] Nonetheless, while we acknowledge and respect these values, scholarship marches on, not least in studying the paratextual life of the manuscripts and their crucial interface with print culture, areas which seem likely to dominate Austen studies over the next decade.

Chapman had the misfortune to be serving on the Balkan front in 1917 when ─ in the quotation which heads this essay ─ he wrote of the ‘ever-thickening gloom’ he visualised as enshrouding our recognition of literature. In the trials of war his mood of resigned pessimism is understandable. But on his return to peacetime Oxford, to the world of publishing and scholarship, and most of all to the intellectual companionship of his wife, Katharine Metcalfe, a fellow-Austenian, his earlier Austen energies and enthusiasms were restored and that ‘ever-thickening gloom’ dispersed ─ just as to-day his spirits would be lifted by the prospect, now newly-opened, for the continuation of the work begun long ago in concert with his wife.[45]

Acknowledgements

Christine Alexander; Dr Martin Maw, Archivist, Oxford University Press; Juliet McMaster; Kathryn Sutherland; Jocelyn Harris

---

Bibliography

Austen, Jane. *The Works of Jane Austen, Volume VI, Minor Works*. Ed. R.W.Chapman. London: Oxford University Press, 1954; 2nd ed, revised Brian Southam, 1969. This volume remains available through OUP, New York.

----------------*Jane Austen's 'Sir Charles Grandison'*. Ed. Brian Southam. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.

----------------The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen. *Juvenilia*. Ed. Peter Sabor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

----------------The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen. *Later Manuscripts*. Eds. Janet Todd and Linda Bree. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Chapman, R.W. *The Portrait of a Scholar and Other Essays written in Macedonia 1916-1918*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920.

-----------------*Jane Austen: Facts and Problems*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948.

Gilbert, Sandra and Gubar, Susan. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. New Haven:Yale University Press, 1979; 2nd ed, 2000.

Leavis, Q.D. ‘A Critical Theory of Jane Austen's Writings’. *Scrutiny*, vol. 10 (1941), pp. 61-90, 114-42; (1942), pp. 272-94; vol. 12 (1944), pp.104-19; reprinted in *A Selection from Scrutiny*. Ed. F.R.Leavis (Cambridge: CUP, 1968), vol. 2, pp. 1-80; and in *Collected Essays, 1, The Englishness of the English Novel*. Ed. G.Singh (Cambridge: CUP, 1983), pp. 61-146.

Sutherland, Kathryn. *Jane Austen's Textual Lives: From Aeschylus to Bollywood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Notes

References to the novels are to R.W. Chapman's Oxford edition (1923 onwards). The re-issues of 1965-66 onwards contain additional changes by Mary Lascelles based upon her own observations and notes she found in Chapman's papers.

[1] To be exact, virtually complete. The texts of eight further poems were discovered or recovered in the following decades; and the manuscript of Jane Austen's dramatisation of Richardson's Sir Charles Grandison ─ long held within the family and supposed the work of James Austen's elder daughter, Anna Lefroy ─ only came to light and the attribution to Jane Austen made in the late 1970's (Jane Austen's 'Sir Charles Grandison', ed. Brian Southam, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.

[2] Lady Susan (1925), Fragment of a Novel (Sanditon) (1925), Two Chapters of Persuasion (1926), Plan of a Novel (1926), The Watsons (1927), Volume the First (1933), Volume the Third (1951): all these volume published Oxford: Clarendon Press; also Volume the Second, ed. Brian Southam (1963). As Sutherland (2005) notes, as far back as 1912, the Clarendon Press 'was considering… a complete edition of Jane Austen's works, including the manuscript writings and the letters. All that seemed to be holding it back, before war intervened, were copyright issues, the new Act of 1911 having extended protection to fifty years, thus putting the manuscript writings in Bentley's 1871 edition [J.E.Austen-Leigh, A Memoir of Jane Austen, second edition] out of reach until 1921' (p. 26, n. 42). In the event, Chapman also found himself delayed or frustrated by the reluctance or refusal on the part of members of the Austen family to let him see or edit manuscript materials in their possession.

[3] 'Venta', Minor Works (1969), pp. 451-52.

[4] Between 1923 and 1963, the Persuasion volume contained 'The Cancelled Chapter (Chap. X.) of "Persuasion"' reprinted, with 'some corrections' made from the manuscript in 1954, from the second edition of the Memoir, 1871 (Persuasion, p. 253, fifth impression, 1954).

[5] Virginia Woolf, 'Jane Austen at Sixty', Nation & Athenaeum, 15 December 1923.

[6] Minor Works, p. vi.

[7] Ibid., p. v.

[8] R.W.Chapman (1920), 'To restore, and maintain in its integrity the text of our great writers is a pious duty' (p. 79).

[9] Samuel Johnson, Preface to Shakespeare (1765): 'Notes are often necessary, but they are necessary evils'; 'The mind is refrigerated by interruption…'. (Paras, 156-57).

[10] Emma, p. 516.

[11] Minor Works (1954), pp. 314, 363.

[12] Examples of these discrepancies can be found in Lady Susan, Letters 23-24: 1925 text, pp. 101-13; Minor Works, pp. 234-39.

[13] To mention the most notable: a collection of critical and historical articles in Jane Austen's Beginnings: The Juvenilia and Lady Susan (1989), ed. J. David Grey (Anne Arbor, UMI Research Press); the twelve Austen titles published by the Juvenilia Press; Margaret Anne Doody's World's Classics edition of Catharine and other Writings (1993); Claudia Johnson's World's Classics edition of Northanger Abbey, Lady Susan, The Watsons, Sanditon (2003); and Margaret Drabble's Penguin edition of Lady Susan, The Watsons, Sanditon (1974). Drabble's Introduction and Notes and her treatment of the text display all the inward grasp and understanding of a fellow-novelist; and although this is an edition aimed primarily at non-academic readers, still in print thirty years later, it holds much of value for the student of Jane Austen.

[14] There is an existing facsimile of Sanditon, ed. Brian Southam (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975). The first transcription: Arthur M. Axelrad, Jane Austen Caught in the Act of Greatness: A Diplomatic Transcription and Analysis of the the Two Manuscript Chapters of Persuasion and the Manuscript of Sanditon (Bloomington: AuthorHouse, 2003).

[15] Later Manuscripts, p. xvi.

[16] 'Note on the Text', Oxford World's Classics edition of Northanger Abbey, Lady Susan, The Watsons, Sanditon (1980, 2003), p. xxxvi.

[17] Later Manuscripts, p. xii.

[18] Brian Southam, Jane Austen's Literary Manuscripts (Oxford:OUP, 1964; sec.edn. London: Athlone, 2001), p. 45; R.W.Chapman, Jane Austen: Facts and Problems (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948), pp. 49, 52, Minor Works (1954), pp. vii, 243; Q.D.Leavis, in Collected Essays, 1, The Englishness of the English Novel, ed. G.Singh (Cambridge: CUP, 1983), p. 88; Ellen Moody, www. Google: 'A Calendar, Letters in and Sources for Lady

Susan'; Marilyn Butler, review: David Nokes, Jane Austen: A Life, Claire Tomalin, Jane Austen: A Life in London Review of Books (5 March 1998); and see subsequent letters from Brian Southam (LRB, 2 April 1998) and Trevor Fawcett (LRB, 4 June 1998).

[19] According to the Oxford English Dictionary, a 'flim-flam' was 'A piece of nonsense' or 'trick' or an 'attempt at deception'. The term was used by Fielding in Tom Jones (1749), 'I tell thee 'tis all flimflam' (XVIII. xii).

[20] The Cambridge edition devotes several hundred words to a discussion of Surr's novel and its possible connection with Sanditon; but it fails to mention that this suggestion was first raised over forty years ago (see Brian Southam, 'A Source for Sanditon?' in the Jane Austen Society Report for the year 1970 (1971), p. 30; and enlarged upon in Southam, 'Sanditon: the Seventh Novel' in ed. Juliet McMaster, Jane Austen's Achievement (London: Macmillan, 1976), pp. 17-23.

[21] It is worth observing that 'Volume the Third' was published only in 1951 and that there is no evidence that Mrs Leavis was acquainted with its contents.

[22] Leavis (1968), vol. 2, p. 1.

[23] Ibid., p. 23.

[24] Ibid., p. 4.

[25] Ibid., pp. 23-65.

[26] Ibid., pp. 14-20.

[27] Ibid., p. 3.

[28] See, for example, Anne Thackeray, 'Jane Austen', Cornhill Magazine (1871), vol. 34, pp. 158-74; extracts commented on in Southam (1987), pp. 24, 164-70.

[29] R.W.Chapman, Jane Austen: A Critical Bibliography (Oxford: Clarendon, 1953, sec. edn. 1955), p. 52. Chapman also commented: 'I am also unable to accept the identification of Mary Crawford with J.A.'s cousin and sister-in-law Eliza, on which the argument largely hinges' (pp. 52-53); Chapman (1968), p. 51. Subsequently, Chapman made it clear that he had been unaware of Mrs Leavis's 'Critical Theory' (letter to the Times Literary Supplement, 20 November 1948, p. 653).

[30] Jane Austen, Catharine and other Writings, eds. Margaret Anne Doody and Douglas Murray (Oxford: OUP, 1993), p. xxiv.

[31] Southam, Jane Austen's Literary Manuscripts, p. 141, notes 5, 6.

[32] Wisenfarth, 'The Watsons as Pretext', Persuasions (1986), vol. 8, p. 109.

[33] Jan Fergus, Jane Austen: A Literary Life (London: Macmillan, 1983), p. 115.

[34] Olivia Murphy, 'From Pammydiddle to Persuasion: Jane Austen Rewriting Eighteenth-Century Literature', Eighteenth-Century Life, vol.32, no. 2, Spring 2008), p.33.

[35] Sutherland (2005), p. 141.

[36] Marvin Mudrick, Jane Austen: Irony as Defense and Discovery (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952), p. 260.

[37] Leavis (1968), vol. 2, p.1.

[38] Gilbert and Gubar (1974, 2000), p. 114.

[39] Ibid., p.117.

[40] Introduction, Juvenilia, p. lv.

[41] Claudia Johnson, Jane Austen: Women, Politics, and the Novel (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), p. 28; Drabble, Foreword, Grey (1989), pp. xiii, xiv.

[42] Doody, 'Jane Austen, That Disconcerting "Child"', in edd. Christine Alexander and Juliet McMaster, The Child Writer from Austen to Woolf (Cambridge: CUP, 2005), p. 103; Doody, 'The Short Fiction' in The Cambridge Companion to Jane Austen, edd. Edward Copeland and Juliet McMaster (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), p. 98; Richard Jenkyns, A Fine Brush on Ivory: An Appreciation of Jane Austen (Oxford: OUP, 2004), p. 31.

[43] See Alexander and McMaster, note 42.

[44] Virginia Woolf, 'Jane Austen at Sixty', Nation & Athenaeum, 15 December 1923, reprinted in Essays of Virginia Woolf, ed. Andrew McNeillie (London: Hogarth, 1988), vol. 2, p. 275; Emily Auerbach, 'The Geese vs. the "Niminy Piminy Spinster": Virginia Woolf Defends Jane Austen', Persuasions On-Line (Winter 2008), vol. 1, no. 1.

[45] Katharine Metcalfe's edition of Pride and Prejudice, planned with Chapman and published by the Clarendon Press in 1912, was the prototype of Chapman's Oxford Edition of the novels, although her contribution is nowhere acknowledged and her name is not mentioned (see Brian Southam, Jane Austen: The Critical Heritage Volume 2 1870-1940 (London: Routledge,1987), pp. 79-80, 148-149 and Sutherland (2005), pp. 36-44.