Mansfield Park

Jane Austen

Edited by Claudia L. Johnson

A NORTON CRITICAL EDITION

A NORTON CRITICAL EDITION

Jane Austen

MANSFIELD PARK

AUTHORITATIVE TEXT

CONTEXTS

CRITICISM

Edited by

CLAUDIA L. JOHNSON

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

W • W • NORTON & COMPANY • *New York* • *London*

This title is printed on permanent paper containing 30 percent post-consumer waste recycled fiber.

Printed in the United States of America
First Edition

The text of this book is composed in Electra with the display set in Bernhard Modern.
Composition by PennSet, Inc.
Manufacturing by Courier Companies.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Austen, Jane, 1775–1817.
Mansfield Park : authoritative text, contexts, criticism / Jane Austen ; edited by Claudia L. Johnson.
p. cm. — (A Norton critical edition)
Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-393-96791-3 (pbk.)

1. England—Social life and customs—19th century—Fiction. 2. Young women—England—Fiction. 3. Austen, Jane, 1775–1817. Mansfield Park. I. Johnson, Claudia L. II. Title.
PR4034.M3 1997
823'.7—dc21 96-49462

W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10110
www.wwnorton.com
W. W. Norton & Company Ltd., 10 Coptic Street, London WC1A 1PU

3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

W. W. NORTON & COMPANY, INC.
Also Publishes

THE NORTON ANTHOLOGY OF AFRICAN AMERICAN LITERATURE
edited by Henry Louis Gates Jr. and Nellie Y. McKay et al.

THE NORTON ANTHOLOGY OF AMERICAN LITERATURE
edited by Nina Baym et al.

THE NORTON ANTHOLOGY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE
edited by M. H. Abrams and Stephen Greenblatt et al.

THE NORTON ANTHOLOGY OF LITERATURE BY WOMEN
edited by Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar

THE NORTON ANTHOLOGY OF MODERN AND CONTEMPORARY POETRY
edited by Jahan Ramazani, Richard Ellmann, and Robert O'Clair

THE NORTON ANTHOLOGY OF POETRY
edited by Margaret Ferguson, Mary Jo Salter, and Jon Stallworthy

THE NORTON ANTHOLOGY OF SHORT FICTION
edited by R. V. Cassill and Richard Bausch

THE NORTON ANTHOLOGY OF THEORY AND CRITICISM
edited by Vincent B. Leitch et al.

THE NORTON ANTHOLOGY OF WORLD LITERATURE
edited by Sarah Lawall et al.

THE NORTON FACSIMILE OF THE FIRST FOLIO OF SHAKESPEARE
prepared by Charlton Hinman

THE NORTON INTRODUCTION TO LITERATURE
edited by Jerome Beaty, Alison Booth, J. Paul Hunter, and Kelly J. Mays

THE NORTON INTRODUCTION TO THE SHORT NOVEL
edited by Jerome Beaty

THE NORTON READER
edited by Linda H. Peterson and John C. Brereton

THE NORTON SAMPLER
edited by Thomas Cooley

THE NORTON SHAKESPEARE, BASED ON THE OXFORD EDITION
edited by Stephen Greenblatt et al.

ENGLISH RENAISSANCE DRAMA
edited by David Bevington, Lars Engle, Katharine Eisaman Maus, and Eric Rasmussen

For a complete list of Norton Critical Editions, visit
www.wwnorton.com/college/english/nce

Acknowledgments

From the start, Jane Austen's work has had an uncanny power to create communities out of diverse persons, and it seems that an entire community of scholars, students, librarians, editors, and general readers has helped me in the preparation of this Norton Critical Edition. I would like first to thank the staffs of the Rare and Manuscript Collections of the Carl A. Kroch Library at Cornell University and of Rare Books and Special Collections at Princeton University for making their rich holdings in first editions and background material available to me. Margaret M. Sherry of Firestone Library was particularly helpful through every stage of this project. In addition, more colleagues and students than I can possibly mention here have advised me on matters ranging from the selection of background material to the choice of passages requiring explanatory footnotes; among these Nina Auerbach, Carol Kay, A. W. Litz, Anne K. Mellor, B. C. Southam, Patricia M. Spacks, Joseph Wiesenfarth, and Susan Wolfson offered advice for which I am especially grateful. I would also like to thank Patricia Latkin of Jane Austen Books in Chicago for helping me track down information about green goose, among other things; Henry Churchyard for the resources available on his Jane Austen website; and Mark Turner for running computerized word combination searches, which helped in several textual decisions.

I reserve my deepest thanks for Carol Bemis, Editor of the Norton Critical Editions, for her patience and encouragement; for Jan Fergus, whose knowledge of Austen's texts is matchless and whose assistance has been generous; and most of all for Sarah M. Anderson, whose formidable command of textual scholarship in all its rigors has saved me from many a blunder, and whose unstinting support has made everything possible.

Introduction

Jane Austen and *Mansfield Park*

Mansfield Park is an ambitious and difficult novel, the first composed and published exclusively in Jane Austen's adulthood. She was proud of it. Inclined to consider *Pride and Prejudice*, which she had just published, "rather too light & bright & sparkling," Austen wrote a novel with all the "shade" her earlier comic masterpiece lacked.[1] Of course, she knew full well that *Mansfield Park* was different from her previous work—"not half so entertaining," as she put it—but she was confident it would "sell well" and contribute to the modest but growing commercial success of her previous novels, a success which, as she confided to her brother Frank, "only made [her] long for more."[2] She had reason to suppose herself right. Within six months of its publication by Thomas Egerton in May 1813, Austen wrote her niece, "You will be glad to hear that the first Edit: of M.P. is all sold."[3] Naturally Austen supposed that Egerton would agree to a second edition. But Egerton declined. With the assistance of her brother Henry, Austen negotiated with John Murray, who published the second edition in February 1816 on commission.[4]

It is painful to consider the failure of this enterprise, which Austen entered into with such confidence. There are no contemporary reviews of *Mansfield Park*. The second edition of *Mansfield Park* hardly sold at all, and Austen had to pay Murray for its publication costs out of the profits she made from her next novel, *Emma*. And yet Austen still followed the fortunes of *Mansfield Park* closely. She carefully recorded even the silliest opinions about the novel voiced by her neighbors or relations. And when Murray sent her Sir Walter Scott's positive (anonymous) review of *Emma* in the prestigious *Quarterly Review*, she had nothing to say, except to protest "the total omission of Mansfield Park," adding with some asperity, "I cannot but be sorry that so clever a Man

1. *Jane Austen's Letters*, ed. Deirdre Le Faye (Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 1995), 3rd ed., 203. The letter is dated February 4, 1813. Hereafter, I will indicate letters from this edition by date rather than page number.
2. *Letters*, July 3–6, 1813.
3. *Letters*, November 18–20, 1814.
4. David Gilson, *A Bibliography of Jane Austen* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982) 59.

as the Reviewer of *Emma*, should consider it as unworthy of being noticed."[5]

In our own time, *Mansfield Park* has hardly been neglected. Instead, it is avidly read and has the distinction of being Austen's most controversial novel. This is largely because its apparent skepticism about wit, high spirits, and desire appears to announce an abrupt about-face from her previous work. Austen imagined that the overweening Emma Woodhouse would be the heroine no one would like much but herself, but posterity has found it far harder to like Fanny Price, with all her self-doubt and modesty. For some Fanny Price is a prig *extraordinaire*, and the novel the very acme of sanctimoniousness. "What became of Jane Austen?"[6] is the famous question Kingsley Amis asked when he turned in bewilderment from the sparkling *Pride and Prejudice* to the dour *Mansfield Park*, appalled to find that the author who "set out bravely to correct conventional notions of the desirable and virtuous" in other novels became in *this* novel "their slave." Many readers have agreed that something went wrong with Austen in *Mansfield Park*, and have sought the cause. Did Austen undergo a conversion to Evangelicalism, and thus on the grounds of religious principle dramatize the triumph of priggishness over playfulness, duty over desire? Or, elaborating this answer more psychologically, did she suffer some inner compulsion to revenge herself upon her own imagination, to scourge her wit, to punish the saucy Elizabeth Bennet by recasting her as that shallow, worldling-siren, Mary Crawford? Did she suffer some other sort of "crisis" which, with its attendant fatigue, made her yearn for stasis, submerging personality in principle, and foregoing energy for repose?[7]

Over and against these readers have been those who feel that *Mansfield Park* does not stand out as the oddball of Austen's canon, but is indeed her most central work insofar as it posits stability, authority, custom, sobriety, and staunch morality as values cultivated in the country houses of the Tory gentry. For such readers, Fanny and Edmund are attractive, sensible, and sympathetic despite their passing flaws; the rootless Crawfords are patently unfeeling, amoral, and materialistic; and the novel as a whole rigorously moral in meting out its rewards to the deserving and its punishments to the undeserving.

Of course, there are many intermediary positions as well, for *Mansfield Park* is a profoundly experimental novel, challenging to read in part because it refuses to let us repose our full confidence in *any* single character or mode: it is skeptical not only about witty heroines, after all, but also about ponderous paternal figures, who turn out to be mer-

5. *Letters*, April 1, 1816.
6. Kingsley Amis, "What Became of Jane Austen?" was originally published in *Spectator*, October 4, 1957, 339–40. I quote from the version printed in William Heath, ed., *Discussion of Jane Austen* (Boston: Heath and Company, 1961) 99–101.
7. For one of the most enduring discussion of this kind, see Lionel Trilling's essay on *Mansfield Park*, reprinted below, pp. 423–34.

cenary rather than judicious; about sober clergymen, who turn out to be benighted and self-deceiving rather than steady; about modest good girls, who are painfully inhibited and more than a little naive; and finally even about the values of the country estate itself, which, notably unlike its counterpart Pemberley in *Pride and Prejudice,* is here tainted by its association with the slave trade and Sir Thomas's "business" in Antigua.

Critical fortunes change. Squarely taking on such issues as class, gender, sexuality, religion, education, theatricality, and colonialism, *Mansfield Park* now appears to occupy a more critical place in Austen's canon and in literary and cultural history generally than that perennial favorite *Pride and Prejudice.* The present edition is designed to further this trend.

Mansfield Park is noticeably more allusive than Austen's other novels. In addition to the complete text of Elizabeth Inchbald's *Lovers' Vows,* I have provided other contextualizing material about education, female modesty, religion, theatricals, clerical responsibility, and landscape improvement, along with selections from William Cowper's poetry and contemporary remarks on that other, seldom-discussed play in the novel, *Henry VIII.* In addition, I have provided background material on the slave trade and its abolition, which is currently an urgent subject of critical interest—some debates in the House of Commons, of which Sir Thomas is a member, which represent the opinions of West Indian planters and Liverpool interests; and some selections from Thomas Clarkson, an author beloved of Austen, on the abolition of the slave trade.

Because these selections are comparatively generous, I have scaled back on nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century background material with a somewhat better conscience, declining to represent material from Austen's letters, on the grounds that relevant portions are cited in the Criticism section. It has been harder to pare down selections from modern criticism, as the interests of space required. The essays included here represent important, often competing, critical trends—such as feminism, historicism, poststructuralism, cultural studies, and the literary marketplace—and together they suggest how and why the controversy over this rich and complex novel is not likely to end soon. There has been much splendid scholarly work on this novel that I have not been able to include, and I have listed such work in the selected bibliography.

A Note on Money in Austen's Novels

Few subjects fascinate students reading Austen for the first time more than money, and for good reason: Austen's characters themselves are both extremely interested in their neighbors' annual incomes and extremely well-informed about them. Their houses, grounds, and gardens, their trips to London, their carriages, their servants, their governesses, their pianos, and the fruit on their tables are signs of wealth and status.

During Austen's time, one's wealth is typically described as a yearly disposable income, a figure in turn calculated by multiplying the principal of one's inheritance by 5 percent (the interest earned by investing in 5 percent government funds). But determining the actual value of money during Austen's time is a greater challenge. In recent years, those of us accustomed to currency based on dollars rather than pounds sterling have been advised to multiply each pound sterling by anywhere from 33, 60, or 200 times in order to determine dollar equivalences for the United States in the late twentieth century, formulas that would put Mr. Rushworth's yearly disposable income of £12,000 at around $396,000, $720,000 or $2,900,000 a year.[8] Of course, scholars and economists are also quick to add that such formulas are misleading. First, the economy during Austen's time was still principally landed and agrarian, which means among many other things that the basic cost of consumer items is not comparable to their cost today, in an urban and industrial economy. Cloth, for example, which was not mass manufactured, was very expensive, and food generally cheaper. Second, wealth itself was distributed among a much smaller number of people than is the case today. When G. E. Mingay says that only four hundred families among the landed gentry during Austen's time had annual incomes within the range of £5,000 and £50,000, with the average among these at £10,000 (Darcy's annual income in *Pride and Prejudice*), we get some idea of the fabulousness of Rushworth's £12,000 a year in *Mansfield Park*, and some insight into Sir Thomas's motives for wanting his daughter Maria to proceed with her marriage to Rushworth, even though he knows she does not love him.[9]

If the stupendous wealth of Rushworth is the upper limit in Austen's novels, at the lower end is what her characters call a "competence," which Edward Copeland has aptly defined as "the bottom line of gentility, increasing and decreasing with the pretensions of its possessor to

8. James Heldman recommends a ratio of $33.13/£1 for 1988 equivalences in "How Wealthy Is Mr. Darcy—Really," *Persuasions*, 12 (1990): 38–49; Margaret A. Doody recommends a $60/£1 ratio for 1990 in Appendix IV (on Finance) to her edition of Frances Burney's *The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties* (Oxford: Oxford World Classics, 1991); a novel originally published in 1814, the same year as *Mansfield Park*; Julia Prewitt Brown recommends a $200/£1 ratio for 1985 in *A Reader's Guide to the Nineteenth-Century English Novel* (New York, Macmillan, 1985) 7–8.

9. *English Landed Society in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Routledge, & Kegan Paul, 1963) 26. Mingay's tables for the variability of annual incomes among genteel ranks can be summarized as follows: gentlemen between £300–£1,000; squires between £1,000–£3,000; wealthy gentry between £3,000–£5,000; and great landlords, between £5,000–£10,000. As Eric Hobsbawm points out, in 1800 "less than 14 percent of British families had an income of more than £50 per year, and of these only one-quarter earned more than £200 a year." See *The Age of Revolution, 1789–1848* (New York: New American Library, 1989) 36.

rank and status."[1] In *Mansfield Park*, Edmund's living at Thornton Lacey is £700 a year, and this figure, twice as much as what was minimally necessary for a bachelor, is the bottom range of a competence for a married couple. At the end of *Sense and Sensibility*, the sensible Elinor Dashwood attains her dream of a competence when she and Edward Ferrars marry on a combined annual income of £850. Mr. and Mrs. Norris had an income of about £1000, which makes Mrs. Norris's stinginess more irrational. Commanding an extremely ample fortune of £4,000 a year himself, Henry Crawford calls Edmund's income "a fine thing for a younger brother" partly because he assumes that Edmund will reside at Mansfield Park and that his living will be pocket money. The worldly Mary Crawford, with a taste for London life, is alarmed by Edmund's unambitious contentment with a competence. Five percent interest on her fortune of £20,000 would bring in £1,000 a year, and this money was more than a competence; indeed, it was sufficient even to cover some of the elegancies of genteel life, such as a carriage. Twice that much would be considered wealth for the minor gentry. More opulent luxuries such as a house in London required a yearly income of £5000 or more.[2]

Lower down on the social scale are the Prices in Portsmouth. Assuming that Mrs. Price took the same lump sum of £7000 to her unfortunate marriage that Lady Bertram brought to hers, she would bring £350 to her family annually, a figure that would be supplemented by the £45 a year Mr. Price brings in as a half-pay officer. Though hardly penurious, a yearly income of £395 is not enough to maintain the gentility Fanny has been used to at Mansfield Park, even if the Prices *can* afford two (bad) servants. Austen herself lived with her mother, sister, and one servant on around £460 a year, and when Mr. and Mrs. John Dashwood in *Sense and Sensibility* consign their stepmother and half-sisters to a similar income (£500 a year), Austen describes their rationalizations with bristling irony: "[W]hat on earth can four women want for more than that?—They will live so cheap! Their housekeeping will be nothing at all; they will keep no company, and can have no expences of any kind! Only conceive how comfortable they will be!"[3]

Things get lower still for Austen's characters, though not in *Mansfield Park*. Left a total of £1000 apiece at their great-uncle's death, the Dashwood sisters each contribute £50 a year to their maintenance at Barton Cottage, and even smaller income (calculated by the precise Mr. Collins on a 4 rather than 5 percent basis) awaits the Bennet sisters of *Pride and Prejudice* after their father's death. Mrs. Smith in *Persuasion* cannot afford a servant, which probably puts her income at £50. As a governess,

1. Edward Copeland's *Women Writing About Money* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995) 23. Throughout this discussion, I am extremely indebted to this splendidly informative work.
2. Copeland 15–32.
3. *The Novels of Jane Austen*, 3rd ed., ed. R. W. Chapman, vol. I, *Sense and Sensibility* (London: Oxford UP, 1933; rpt. 1982) 12; quoted in Copeland, p. 31.

Jane Fairfax in *Emma*, like Jane Eyre after her, could look forward to a salary of £30 a year. A common laborer would make around £25. In *Mansfield Park* Tom Bertram scoffs at Edmund's concern that the expenses from staging *Lovers' Vows* at home will amount to £20.

A Note on Austen and the Text of *Mansfield Park*

There is no extant autograph manuscript of *Mansfield Park*. The first edition (hereafter called *A*) was published in May 1814 by Thomas Egerton, who had also published Austen's earlier novels. The second edition (hereafter called *B*) was published by John Murray in February 1816. *B* is rightly considered authoritative not only because it contains fewer errors, but also because it incorporates Austen's corrections upon and additions to A. This edition, like all modern editions, is based on *B*. With only two, close printed versions to collate and no autograph to consult, the text of *Mansfield Park* is relatively unproblematic.

Comparing A and *B* gives us the chance to ponder Austen's relation to her own texts in distinctive ways. On December 11, 1815, she returned what was probably a corrected copy of A to Murray, saying "I return also, Mansfield Park, as ready for a 2d Edit: I beleive [sic], as I can make it.—"[4] The import of this remark is far from clear, and it is worth thinking about what she meant.[5] Is she saying, with mock self-deprecation, that her powers are not sufficient to make the novel completely ready for the second edition? Or, is she stating that she does not have the time or the leeway to do so? A collation of A and *B* shows that—with the exception of two paragraphs about William's ship in volume III—Austen's revisions are sparing, one is tempted even to say forbearing, and for an author celebrated for stylistic precision, this seems striking. Yet every bit as striking is the fact that the compositors of *B*, in resetting the text, go out of their way to follow A despite different house policies about punctuation and spelling, in the vast majority of cases printing the same words on each line, the same number of lines on each page, and, when the line endings do get out of sync, resuming as soon as possible. The reason for this is not hard to determine: using a relatively clean printed text as a guide ensures the greater speed and accuracy of the resetting. With this in mind, we may wonder—this is only speculation—if Austen (who was paying for publication costs) revised only sparingly because Murray advised her that

4. *Letters*, December 11, 1815. Chapman is also of the opinion that Austen was referring to a corrected copy of A. See *The Novels of Jane Austen*, 3rd ed., ed. R. W. Chapman (London: Oxford UP, 1934; rpt. 1966) xii.

5. There is no certain evidence that Austen read proof for B. It would be unusual not to do so. Austen gives a lively report about receiving and correcting page proof—or, "Sheets," as she called them—for Murray's edition of *Emma*. On November 24, 1815, she announces that the printer's boys bring the sheets and carry away the corrected ones. But the letters from early 1816—and there are not a lot of them—never mention "sheets" for *Mansfield Park*.

extensive corrections would increase the time and cost of publication, somewhat as editors today ask authors in the later stages of production to avoid all but essential changes.

This matter is important for readers of Austen because it invites us to ask how she, nothing if not a splendidly self-conscious author, regarded her work once it was a printed artifact. Did she expect a printed page to look like a manuscript page? Austen's extant fair copies, for example, frequently run conversations together in a single, long paragraph. Did she expect typesetters to indent for each new speaker? Similarly, Austen's extant manuscripts rarely indent for paragraphs. Was she conserving paper, assuming that a printed version of her handwritten page would indent in appropriate places? And what about the punctuation of stops? In the manuscripts Austen generally uses a period followed by a long dash (.—) for an endstop. Did she expect printers to delete the dashes, or did these kinds of dashes signify in some particular way? The printed texts are inconsistent, presumably omitting dashes most of the time, but retaining them in some contexts (e.g., in Lady Bertram's congratulations to Fanny on her marriage proposal, in some letters, and in some internal monologue). Did Austen care about spelling and punctuation?

Austen noted the appearance of typesetter's mistakes in Egerton's *Pride and Prejudice*—calling them "Typical errors"—and observed that she found one "blunder" in Volume III, "where two speeches are made into one."[6] We also know that she thought adding a " 'said he' or a 'said she' would sometimes make the dialogue more immediately clear." But such concern had its limits. Her quip " 'I do not write for such dull Elves / As have not a great deal of Ingenuity themselves' "—so often cited with respect to the weighty matters of interpretative practice, and in particular to irony—actually pertains to "Typical errors" alone.[7]

A contains many small errors. Due in part to the fact that its volumes were set by two different printers, its practice is inconsistent with regard to the spelling of many words (e.g., *chuse/choose*), to the capitalization of nouns and titles (e.g., *Father/father*; *Lady/lady*), to the separation of compounds (*Anybody/any body*), to the hyphenation of compounds (e.g., *head-ache/headache*); to the use of an apostrophe in some past tenses (e.g., *dress'd*; *blush'd*), among many other kinds of instances. But even after making allowances for such differences not merely among but also within the volumes of *A*, and after granting that punctuation and spelling were less regularized than today (despite the efforts of printers' manuals to recommend uniformity), *A* contains many distinctive errors. Among these are: (a) outright mistakes, as provable by context, and as corrected in *B* (e.g., *of* for *or*; *then* for *than*; *too* for *two*);

6. *Letters*, January 29, 1813, and February 4, 1813.
7. *Letters*, January 29, 1813.

(b) omitted or misplaced plural possessive apostrophes (e.g., *Lovers Vows* and/or *Lover's Vows* instead of *Lovers' Vows* throughout *A1*; *year's* for *years'*); (c) mis-set, inverted, dropped, or doubled letters (e.g., *themselvess, Crauford, prfiot, b en*; and (d) omitted spaces between words (e.g., *Ifeel, evenin*).

More troublesome, because impinging on matters Austen *did* care about, is the punctuation of dialogue. Sometimes A misplaces open- and close-quotation marks, which blurs dialogue and description, making it hard to register when speech stops and resumes. On one occasion, when Lady Bertram and Mrs. Norris discuss where Fanny will stay after Mr. Norris has died, A omits indenting for any of the speeches. This "error," if it is an error (it is "corrected" in B), probably results not from departing from Austen's faircopy, but from following it closely.

We have no record that Austen complained about these mistakes. But even more telling is the fact that even though most printers' errors are corrected in *B*—caught by Austen and/or by Murray's correctors—some carry over: e.g., the misnumbering of chapter fourteen in volume III, printed as *XVI* instead of *XIV*; the printing of *Miss* instead of *Mrs.*; the omission of spaces and apostrophes for plural possessives; and the misplacement of quotation marks in dialogue.

These mistakes are small, rarely hard even for dull elves to catch. It is precisely on this account that their carry-over from A to *B* obliges us to wonder what making *Mansfield Park* "as ready for a 2d Edit" as she could entailed for Austen. Possibly she wasn't a keen proofreader. But it is likelier that Austen did not consider punctuation her affair.[8] In any case, if it is true that Austen's corrected copy of A let stand such "Typical" errors as the mis-setting of quotation marks, then we must reconsider R. W. Chapman's notion that the "very slightness" of Austen's changes from *A* to *B* shows "some 'particularity' of revision" on her part.[9] "Particular" changes may be the advertent or inadvertent work of compositors. I would be wary of regarding any change in punctuation from *A* to *B* as "too good for the printer" and therefore probably Austen's, as Chapman sometimes does.[1] Even larger changes—such as A's "It is to be called Lovers Vows" as opposed to *B*'s "It is to be Lovers' Vows"—should be eyed warily before we conclude that they show us Austen's hand at work.

8. Austen does report receiving a "modest" marginal query from the typesetter of *Emma* concerning her spelling of *arra-root* for *arrow-root*, and to my ear at least she sounds pleasantly surprised by the query. See *Letters*, November 26, 1815. Concerning punctuation, printers' manuals advised authors "to leave the pointing entirely to the printers, as from their constant practice they must have acquired a uniform mode of punctuation." See C. Stower *The Printer's Grammar; or, Introduction to the Art of Printing* (London, 1808) 80. On the corrector's role in ensuring uniform punctuation, see, Stower 213.
9. Chapman, xii.
1. See, for example, his note to page 421, line 22.

None of this questions the authority of *B*. It is meant rather to underscore the compositors' role not simply in the transmission but also in the very formation of our sense of Austen's artistry. We delight in reading Austen closely. And yet compositors' parts in paragraphing and punctuating, maybe even in some wording—matters from which we squeeze a lot of nuance—are greater than has been acknowledged. If Austen was a minute artist, a cameoist working on a "little bit (two Inches wide) of Ivory" with a fine "Brush,"[2] then she had a very definite sense of when her work was done. Once her work was printed, she does not appear to have worried over each brush stroke. Austen seems to have regarded matters "Typical" as to some extent distinguishable from and outside of her domain. What Woolf so eloquently described as "the rhythm and shapeliness and severity"[3] of Austen's sentences inheres more in the spoken word rather than in the printed page.

What Austen manifestly *did* care about was the authenticity of details. From her letters we know that as she was composing *Mansfield Park*, she inquired about local details—(e.g., was there a Government House at Gibraltar? what is the time frame for the ordination process? do hedgerows grow in Northamptonshire? could she use the name of ships in commission?)[4] Furthermore, between the publication of the first and second editions of *Mansfield Park*, she evidently consulted with her sailor brothers about Mr. Price's description of his son's ship as it left the inner harbor of Portsmouth to moor at Spithead. This section, unlike the "polite" converse she generally reports, is dense with jargon; and Austen's goal here is to represent not only Mr. Price's enthusiasm for the *Thrush* and his pride in his son, now a lieutenant, but also his obliviousness to Fanny. 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. Accordingly, for example, she changes *point* to *platform*, because Mr. Price could not have seen the *Thrush* from the Point; *alert*, a technical term about readiness inappropriate to the context, to *sharp*; *things* (evidently too nontechnical) to *mess*; *under weigh* (which implies being anchored) with *moorings*, since the water in Portsmouth harbor is too shallow for anchors. And the proud William rejoins with a new sentence—"*It's the best birth at Spithead*"—locating the Thrush more specifically, relative to the *sheer hulk*. The revised paragraphs, fully reproduced below (pp. 257–58), take up a total of two additional lines.

In this text, I follow the authority of B, noting where A differs significantly even when the error is fairly gross. I do not list variants in

2. *Letters*, December 16–17, 1816.
3. *The Common Reader*, first series (New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1953) 139.
4. See *Letters*, January 24, 1813, January 29, 1813, and July 3–6, 1813.

punctuation and spelling unless they impinge upon the sense. *A*'s practices in this regard are frequently inconsistent even within a volume printed by the same house. *A*'s apparent carelessness, which results in errors such as quotation marks that are not closed, militates against its choice as the basis for an edition. *B* usually corrects errors at this level and demonstrates a higher level of self-consistency. Nevertheless, practices concerning punctuation, spelling, capitalization (*Pug, pug*), and the use of apostrophes to mark possessives (e.g., *yours/your's*) are in some flux during this period, and like Chapman but more consistently, I let such irregularity stand as long as it does not affect the comprehension of the text. In a relatively few instances, the reading of *A* is to be preferred to *B*, and such cases are always listed in the Textual Notes (below, pp. 322–25). Except in the case of egregious typographical errors and misplaced or missing quotation marks, which are corrected silently, when neither *A* nor *B* offers a correct reading, I have emended and noted the passage, mentioning Chapman's discussion of the matter if he and I differ in our interpretations.

Because Austen's contemporary readers apparently tolerated a wider range of inconsistency than readers would today, and because the precise extent to which Austen supervised the production of this text must remain a matter of conjecture, I have attempted to produce a conservative edition, different from Chapman's in small but pervasive ways. To be sure, Chapman's *Works of Jane Austen* was a monumental achievement: never before had anyone attempted to arrive at an "authoritative" text of Austen's novels by collating the editions published in her lifetime, checking them against available information in her letters, and reviewing and noting usages contemporary to her. Never before had any of the texts of any British novelist been treated with the care customarily reserved for classical authors and poets. I share the debt of generations of Austenian scholars to Chapman's texts and notes. His good judgment and good example have made many of my own editorial decisions immeasurably easier.

That said, it is also true that Chapman's practice, at its best so measured and careful, is sometimes capricious: sometimes he prefers the punctuation, spelling, or even substantives of A without justification or note; sometimes he emends *A* and *B* when they agree to good sense; sometimes he tidies punctuation and grammar, producing an amalgam of A and *B*. True, his emendations are not radical. But minute changes add up. Because one can easily assume that accidentals were the work of compositors in the first place, it is all too tempting to correct them in the belief that one knows what Austen was thinking. Convinced that—what with four different typesetters at work in A and *B*—there are already too many hands in *Mansfield Park*, I have tried not to smuggle in my own, to follow *B* more regularly than Chapman does, and to avoid introducing new variants in punctuation.[5] The resulting text is rawer and less lapidary than Chapman's—taking a different stand on several cruxes.

CLAUDIA L. JOHNSON

5. There are two compositors for A: Sidney for vols. I and III and Roworth for vol. II. *B* employs three compositors: Moyes for vol. I, Roworth for vol. 2, and Davison for vol. III. It will be noted that Roworth also set the second volume for A.

Contents