Hawthorne's text has been preserved in almost every form possible for a nineteenth-century American author except that no substantive edition was printed without authorial concurrence. An authoritative manuscript lies behind all initial publication, therefore, regardless of the treatment given this document by editorial hand or printing-house styling. The modern textual critic can come as close as possible to the ultimate source of authority whenever such a manuscript is preserved, as in The
Marble Faun, for instance; he is further removed when the manuscript is lost and the first-edition printed document (derived from it) must constitute the authority, as in The Scarlet Letter; he is furthest removed of all when, as in some of the tales and sketches first published in magazines and gift books, an editor has intervened and (as commonly) the manuscript is not extant to give us the evidence we need to establish the nature and extent of the unauthoritative tinkering, or even indeed the fact of its existence.

In general, only the one document nearest to authority is of primary concern for the establishment of Hawthorne's text. Once a work was set in type, Hawthorne seldom revised it during the course of its textual transmission, and then only in small details, more associated with correcting its obvious errors than improving its form or style by second thoughts. The manuscripts themselves, however, attest to a slow and careful process of revision during composition. The printer's-copy manuscripts of The House of the Seven Gables, The Blithedale Romance, and The Marble Faun manifestly represent authorial fair copies of earlier versions. Original composition could not account for the large number of currente calamo repair of eyeskips and small omissions, sometimes only an instant after the slip, sometimes later. A common characteristic of these manuscripts is the inscription of the first few letters of a word and then its alteration to another. True, a change of intention during the act of composition does not preclude many of these, but the habit is so persistent as to lead to the view that some, at least, represent revisions made during the act of copying.

However, the usual correction of error in these manuscripts concerns skips that seem to be due to memorial lapse, or to memorial anticipation, during the process of writing out fair copy. Typical, for instance, is the anticipatory error in The Blithedale Romance (Centenary, 12.24-25), which in its cor-
rected form reads, "we professed ourselves almost loth to bid the rude blusterer good-bye." In the manuscript Hawthorne first wrote, "... bid the good" before he stopped and, wiping out the still wet letters, superimposed "rud" over "good", and added its "e" before continuing with "blusterer good-bye." The context makes it clear that the tempest could not have been "good" in the original; instead, Hawthorne had anticipated the "good" of "good-bye" as he sped along transcribing another manuscript. Similarly, at 16.18 in the words "there are four of us here, already", Hawthorne first wrote "there are four of h" before he stopped, wiped out the anticipatory "h", and copied "us" before going on to "here".

Evidence of this nature, frequent in all three manuscripts, is cumulatively very strong; but, fortunately, certainty has replaced conjecture for The Blithedale Romance, at least, with the recent purchase by the Ohio State University Libraries of a leaf that is definitely part of an earlier manuscript of the book, one probably that is the direct source of the complete final manuscript preserved in the Pierpont Morgan Library. In the forty lines of the text on the recto of this early leaf, ten minor alterations were made during or after inscription. Yet in the corresponding text of the later Morgan manuscript, twenty-three differences between the two exist in corrected or revisory readings, nineteen of these being substantive, that is, concerned with words.

Typical are the changes in the Morgan sentence (46.20-23) "Rumors might fill the social atmosphere, or might once have filled it, there, which would travel but slowly, against the wind, towards our north-eastern metropolis, and perhaps melt into thin air before reaching it" from the version in the Ohio State leaf, "Rumors might exist, or might once have existed, there, which ... and perhaps melt into thin air before they reached it." Likewise, "The spheres of our companions" was, earlier, "The spheres of other persons"; the freedom of Zenobia's de-
portment which, in Morgan, "might commend itself as the utmost perfection of manner, in a youthful widow" (47.4-5) had earlier been written as "might seem the consummate perfection of manner, in . . . ";¹ Coverdale's speculation that Zenobia had been married is followed in Morgan by, "irresistibly that thought drove out all other conclusions, as often as my mind reverted to the subject" (47.19-21), but in the leaf it had read " . . . as I dwelt upon the subject"; or Zenobia in Morgan protests to Coverdale about his surveillance of her, "I have been exposed to a great deal of eye-shot in the few years of my mixing in the world" (47.25-27), whereas in the earlier version it is " . . . since I have mingled with the world". Moreover, the whole sentence leading up to her protest is a later addition: "Zenobia was conscious of my observation, though not, I presume, of the point to which it led me" (47.22-23).

Whether this leaf was itself a copy of an earlier version is not to be determined from the small amount of available evidence. None of the changes made during its inscription need have resulted from eyeskip or memorial lapse. Although some alterations represent the same sort of revision during writing found in the Morgan manuscript, which we know is a copy, the possibility is ever present that Hawthorne might expand and revise during the process of original composition in the manner that he did while copying out his fair manuscripts. On the other hand, if this leaf be at all representative of the earlier manuscript, it was in as acceptable shape to hand to the printer as was the copy made from it, if cleanness were the only criterion. Thus unless the leaf was actually atypical and Hawthorne felt required to copy out fair a manuscript not legible enough throughout to serve the printer, we are led to the conjecture that the act of copying stimulated him to fresh creativeness (as it does many writers) and hence that he deliberately transcribed the earlier manuscript the more readily
to induce in himself the flow leading to really creative revision
and thus achieved the final literary form of the work.²

To a student of Hawthorne's text, the chief value of this
single leaf, so remarkably preserved, is the evidence it provides
for the very considerable difference in style and details between
the earlier and later versions of *The Blithedale Romance*. When
important variation like this occurs, Hawthorne must have
formed the new phrasing in his mind after reading what he
had before him but before setting pen to paper for the copy.
However, to this major revision must be added still another,
that more minor variety found in the leaf and also in the
Morgan manuscript, which revised material already copied in
whole, or in part, in the very act of transcription. The intent
of both kinds of revision seems to be the same. It is a notable
fact that in his second and third thoughts Hawthorne almost
always expands, and seldom condenses. The added detail, then,
occupied his mind, on the testimony of the manuscripts, and
not the problem of recasting for sharper (in the sense of more
concise) expression, although it is true that one-for-one substi­
tutions of words may appear that offer greater precision. The
main point is, Hawthorne did not boil down his work in
revision, but instead amplified it.

On the evidence of the Ohio State leaf of *The Blithedale
Romance*, the major part of the expansion was accomplished
between the earlier version and the fair copy for the printer.
Under these conditions, the vast amount of Hawthorne's re­
vision of his works will forever remain hidden. Yet even
while he was in process of inscribing the fair copy, or was
reviewing it, self-contained additions do take place. Whole
sentences may be added, as that prefacing Zenobia's narrative
of "The Silvery Veil": "From beginning to end it was un­
deniable nonsense, but not necessarily the worse for that"  
(108.1-2); or, as Coverdale leads Foster and Hollingsworth to
the pool, the interlineation, "A nameless presentiment had again drawn me thither, after leaving Eliot's pulpit" (231.17-18). The longest insertion during inscription is the three paragraphs of conversation between Zenobia, Hollingsworth, and Coverdale represented by Centenary 68.6-20 in the chapter "A Modern Arcadia."

More common are such additions as in *The House of the Seven Gables*, 29.23-24, where "It appeared to be his doom to spend eternity" is deleted, and followed by "From the look of unutterable woe upon his face, it appeared to be his doom to spend eternity". A constant drumfire of such expansive second thoughts appear in the revisions within the final manuscripts. In *The Blithedale Romance*, for instance, "Her writings", while being copied, became "Her poor little stories and tracts" (44.2-3). Many additions are interlined above carets, just possibly a sign that they were made at some later time. Typical is the added description of Zenobia's jewels "like lamps that burn before some fair temple" (191.32), or the specification added to Coverdale's account of voices and laughter that they were proceeding from the interior of the wood" (209.9). That, among the masqueraders, Moll Pitcher held a "broomstick in hand" (210.5), and Silas Foster "leaned against a tree" (210.8) we know only from additions.

The substitutions, usually of individual words, show Hawthorne striving for precision of language and of idiom, as well as exactness of physical description. A "city-residence" becomes a "town-residence" while being inscribed (40.6); Hollingsworth's proposed building is distinguished not as "the material type, in which his philanthropic dream had embodied itself" but as the one in which it "strove to embody itself" (56.17); Priscilla claps her hands as is the "custom", not the "habit", of young girls (60.19); the colonists' working clothes were an
“epitome”, not a “presentment”, of defunct fashions (64-3); cold skepticism “smothers”, not “murders”, our spiritual aspirations (101.34); in brooding over recollections we “subtilize”, not “convert”, them into something akin to imaginary stuff (105.1); the Veiled Lady has “sybilline”, not “oracular”, responses (111.9); Moodie is an “elderly”, and not an “old”, man (5.4); Hollingsworth is “three or four” years older than Coverdale, not “two or three” (7.25); Foster remarks, with superior idiom, that Zenobia’s shoe “never was made on a Yankee last” (231.27), not “never made in Yankee land”; and so on.

Something may be told, occasionally, either about the particular difficulty Hawthorne had in writing certain passages, or else that there may be more invention and less copying, when there is a marked rise in the number of alterations, as throughout Zenobia’s narrative, “The Silvery Veil.”

In The House of the Seven Gables, Hepzibah had almost invariably been denominated the “Old Maid” in the narrative; but at some later time, Hawthorne went back over the whole manuscript and substituted a variety of paraphrases, like “elderly maiden”, “maiden lady”, “elderly person”, “recluse”, “old Hepzibah”, “old gentlewoman”, “mistress of the house”, or simple “Hepzibah”. In The Marble Faun, Kenyon was originally named “Grayson” for about half the manuscript.

The notable care expended on revision in the manuscripts is wanting in the history of the transmission of the printed text once it had been set in type. Despite the fact that Griswold, of International Magazine, made ten verbal alterations in printing “The Snow Image,” Hawthorne did not change a one of these back to his original when he collected the tales; and in the collected editions, he even let stand in “The Wedding Knell” the editor Goodrich’s sentimentalized “embrace” for his own “touch” in the remarkable query to the decrepit couple who
after forty years are about to be married, "But why had she returned to him, when their cold hearts shrank from each other's touch?"

No changes were ever ordered by Hawthorne in the plates of *The House of the Seven Gables* or *The Blithedale Romance*; and he followed Fields's advice to leave the text of *The Scarlet Letter* alone in an exact reprint when a second edition was called for. In a letter to E. P. Whipple, of May 2, 1852, accompanying the just finished manuscript of *The Blithedale Romance* sent for his criticism, Hawthorne warned, "should you spy ever so many defects, I cannot promise to amend them; the metal hardens very soon after I pour it out of my melting-pot into the mould." Whether the late addition of the final chapter to this romance preceded the dispatch of the manuscript to Whipple, or resulted from his criticism, is undemonstrable. However, the paragraph added in proof almost at the end of this chapter suggests continuing care. Nonetheless, by and large it would seem that Hawthorne divested himself of responsibility for his text, like most authors, once a book had been published.

A small exception may just possibly be found in *The Marble Faun*, first published in England in 1860 under the title *Transformation*, although the case is doubtful. In what appears to be the third American printing, fourteen changes were made in the plates, all but one of which bring the respective readings into conformity with the joint readings of the manuscript and English edition. Several of these correct real errors in substantives, like "art" for the error "heart", and "dead" for "dread"; a few correct obvious misprints like "Etrucean" and "dirtly". But others alter small matters of punctuation that would be odd even for the author to notice. Thus, wanting evidence in letters or other such material, we cannot tell whether it was Hawthorne who sent this list to Ticknor in order to correct errors he had observed in the American edition. The time element is probably
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too short, and perhaps the conjecture is best that the American publishers were responsible for these alterations on the authority of the English text or of a late stage of its proofs. If so, the substitution of “on” for “for” in I.225.22 (first-edition reference) of the Boston 1860 edition is inexplicable since it is found nowhere else.

The first American printing of The Marble Faun is full of problems not yet solved. Despite the presumption that it was set from English sheets, as planned, certain errors in the Boston typesetting can have derived only from misreading of the manuscript itself, such as “kind” (English “kindly”) at II.56.16 when the “ly” of the manuscript has been so worked over as to resemble a deletion. The errors “would” at II.29.5, II.31.25, and II.260.29 derive from Hawthorne’s handwriting in which “co” is easily misread as “wo”. Again, when in II.250.20 the American edition misprints “lost”, in the English, as “last”, the manuscript “o” has been traced over in a way that might have caused confusion. At II.61.25, American “sorrier” repeats the manuscript, whereas the English print has “sadder”; at II.201.3 the same situation holds for American edition and manuscript “avails” (as a noun) versus the English edition “proceeds”. These latter two readings must either be sophistications by the English publisher overlooked (or accepted) by Hawthorne, or proof-corrections in the English edition.

It is interesting and very likely significant that all of the variants occur in Volume II of the American edition, a fact that seems to indicate a difference in printer’s copy between the two Boston volumes. (The alternative would be proof read back against the manuscript, a hypothesis one would scarcely wish to entertain.) This oddity requires, and will receive, further investigation. So far as is known, the manuscript never left England, and it is difficult to see why it should have been sent to Ticknor in America and then returned to England. One excellent possibility remains, that Volume I was set from cor-
rected English proof-sheets but Volume II, because of a recorded delay in getting sheets to America, from uncorrected English proofs. If so, the Boston 1860 errors would have been faithful reproductions of corresponding errors in the earliest English proofs that Hawthorne detected and altered. If uncorrected common errors can be found in the English and American editions, like “with foot” (London II.9.7; Boston I.198.9) in Volume I for manuscript “with her foot” (protested by Hawthorne to his English publishers on March 7, 1860, but left unchanged), then the case can be demonstrated.

The importance of rigorous bibliographical examination of copies is illustrated by the 1860 printings of The Marble Faun in the Boston edition. In what seems to be the fourth impression, the first American printing to contain the revised conclusion, sixteen further changes were made in the plates. Five of these are misprint errors created by an unproofread resetting and replating of a page (I.98); the others concern spelling and punctuation. Since most of these latter go contrary to the forms of the manuscript and to Hawthorne's generally observed characteristics, it is clear that this round of plate-alteration was made by the publisher and is without authority.

However, if the third printing, with its authoritative plate-changes, had not been firmly distinguished by collation on the Hinman Machine from the first and second impressions, an editor collating the fourth printing with the added conclusion back against an earlier one might by chance have picked a first or second impression. If so, he would have observed all of the third- and fourth-impression variants mixed in together without differentiation, and their quite opposing indications of authority would have proved puzzling in the extreme. Only when extensive machine collation isolates the first and the second impressions from the third—all without the conclusion—
can the unique variants either of the third or of the fourth printings be properly assessed for what they are and their textual authority determined.\textsuperscript{8}

Hawthorne's manuscripts differ from the books printed from them in certain verbal readings (substantives), and extensively indeed in the system of punctuation, capitalization, word-division, and spelling (i.e. the accidentals). A conservative estimate would put these latter differences at about two thousand in \textit{The Blithedale Romance} and at not less than three thousand in \textit{The House of the Seven Gables}. The obvious question arises to what extent, if at all, was Hawthorne responsible for these numerous variants in the accidentals between manuscript and print.

That he was not responsible for several large classes seems demonstrable. The general forms of the accidentals are similar in \textit{Seven Gables} and in \textit{Blithedale}, set in the same shop within a year of each other and partly by the same two compositors. For instance, both prints regularly use syntactical commas plus dashes in a sentence like the following, quoted from its first-edition form in \textit{Blithedale}: "Nobody else in the world, I am bold to affirm,—nobody, at least, in our bleak little world of New England,—had dreamed of Paradise that day, except as the pole suggests the tropic" (9.22-10.2). Yet, in neither manuscript do commas ever supplement dashes in such a construction. One would scarcely wish to argue that Hawthorne made hundreds and hundreds of such proof-corrections in the \textit{Seven Gables} sheets and then ignored the new system and reverted to his former ways in the manuscript of \textit{Blithedale}.

But Hawthorne does supplement parentheses with commas, as in the following from the same manuscript: "The snow-fall, too, looked inexpressibly dreary, (I had almost called it dingy,) coming down through an atmosphere of city-smoke . . ."
The prints of both romances reverse the usage in the manner of the first edition here: "inexpressibly dreary (I had almost called it dingy), coming down. . . ."

House style, of course, has been imposed rigorously on both prints. In word-division, for example, it is impossible to believe that Hawthorne forsook his invariable forms like "tomorrow" and altered them in proof to uncharacteristic "to-morrow". In spelling one would hesitate to argue that he revised in proof his invariable "Oh" to first-edition "O", "Aye" to "Ay", or "fauter" to "falter". Or in capitalization that, as in 103.25-26, he would find cause to reduce to lower-case from manuscript capitals such semi-personifications as "Unpardonable Sin" and "Devil".

That Hawthorne "approved" of the form his manuscripts took in print can scarcely be maintained; but, like other authors, he was helpless to prevent the imposition of house style on his work. Hence if one wants what Hawthorne wrote presented in the way that he wrote it (not the way the printer thought it should be), the manuscript must serve as the copy-text for a definitive edition, and not the first edition. In so doing, an editor preserves Hawthorne's intentions to the maximum. That this preservation is not an academic matter can be illustrated by many small differences in meaning that develop between manuscript and print owing to the compositor's lack of understanding of the nuances of what he is setting. A typical example is *Blithedale* manuscript "they perpetrated so hideous a clamor, that methought it might have reached, at least a little way, into the eternal sphere." This represents a different sense from the compositor's version in the first edition, "that methought it might have reached, at least, a little way into the eternal sphere" wherein "at least" modifies "reach" instead of "a little way" as in the manuscript (202.7-9).

However, the case for the retention of the author's instead
of the printer's forms of the accidentals does not rest only on such evident distortions of meaning, serious as is their cumulative effect. Instead, an author's accidentals are a part of his total style by which he conveys meaning. I quote with pleasure from a letter to me by Professor William Charvat after he had compared the manuscript and the first-edition punctuation of *The House of the Seven Gables*:

It comes to me now, for the first time, that Hawthorne's style is essentially parenthetical, and that this characteristic reflects the basically essayistic, generalizing, and speculative quality of his fiction. His parentheses give him latitude and flexibility that this quality requires. He modulates the degree of isolation of a unit by selecting (usually) just the right pair of separators: parentheses, or dashes, or commas. I don't think he did this selecting consciously, and probably the restoration of his own punctuation after the compositors mangled it, looked like too much drudgery. Certainly, the compositors show very little sensitivity about his modulations.

To this most perceptive statement only two small exceptions can be taken. The rather frequent alterations of commas to dashes about parenthetical statements during the inscription of the manuscripts might seem to indicate some degree of consciousness on Hawthorne's part about the effects of his modulation. Second, he could scarcely interfere in proof with the all-pervasive house-styling. He would have bankrupted himself in extra charges for alteration, and his publishers might well have been so annoyed as to order his corrections to be ignored.

When, as in *Fanshawe* or *The Scarlet Letter*, the first edition must be the authority in the absence of a preserved manuscript, the house-styled accidentals in considerable part must be thought of as authoritative, in the sense that they are characteristic of the only documentary authority there is for this particular work. Hence, when the print is consistent, as with the supplementary
syntactical commas in parenthetical dash constructions in *The Scarlet Letter*, the knowledge that the lost manuscript would not have agreed cannot permit editorial emendation that would remove them. A student of Hawthorne manuscripts could in many respects restyle various of such first editions to enforce agreement with what it is clear must have been the different manuscript usage. But no consistency is possible in a process like this, for only a bare majority, perhaps, of the features of the accidentals are susceptible of alteration with such certainty. Thus all internally consistent features of a first-edition copy-text must be retained in default of the evidence of its lost manuscript.

The case is altered, however, when the first-edition copy-text is not in itself consistent, either because of compositorial slips or because of variable usages on the part of the different compositors who set the book. Although in *The Scarlet Letter* different compositors rigidly followed house style in what words were to be set with final -or and what with final -our, for instance, *Fanshawe* is by no means consistent in this and in dozens of other matters affecting the accidentals and their forms. By matching the different compositorial habits in dealing with nine selected variables, a critic can discover that five different compositors set *Fanshawe*, and with tolerable accuracy for a considerable part he can determine the exact pages that they set. Once the book is divided in this manner, we can readily see that each workman followed in a different way what we may suppose to have been the consistent characteristics of the manuscript. Some of the five, perhaps even four of them, will agree in one respect in dealing with some Hawthorne usage after their own style, whereas only one may reproduce what the manuscript form almost certainly was. Or the proportion may be reversed, in bewildering variety.

It suffices that only a pedant would be able to defend the proposition that every such variable in *Fanshawe* has other than
technical authority. As a result, an editor can have a field day noting every difference in treatment of the accidentals, relating it to the five compositors, and then choosing the form that represents Hawthorne’s known characteristic. By matching “authorities” in this manner, an editor can indeed go a tolerable way (in a manner impossible for the more uniform Scarlet Letter) toward reconstructing a number of surely authentic features of the lost manuscript of Fanshawe without ever forsaking the documentary authority contained in the typesetting of some one or more compositors of the first edition. The edited text, in this manner, can in truth be more authoritative in its details than the first edition, but never without reference to some authoritative reading within that edition.

When manuscripts are preserved, only a small amount of such cleaning-up is called for. Instead, the central problem of authority comes to rest on the reconstruction of the proofreading. That is, when variation appears between manuscript and print, it can have only two sources: it can come from the unauthoritative compositor, or it can come from Hawthorne authoritatively altering the typesetting in proof to another reading. The problem is to distinguish the two.

In the thousands of accidentals variants, a textual critic can quite definitely decide for some categories that the compositorial house style is so opposed to Hawthorne’s own normal characteristics that no hypothesis can hold that in the print these could have come from Hawthorne’s proof-correction. On the other hand, a very large number of the changes in the accidentals between manuscript and print are so relatively indifferent as to be incapable of adjudication. In such cases, the odds favor retaining the manuscript reading. Even if Hawthorne indeed had changed a few of these and the editor is unwittingly rejecting his final preference, the number of such occurrences will be very small compared to the large number of composi-
editorial variants that he can avoid foisting on Hawthorne if he will cling, generally, to manuscript authority. Ordinarily, the critical methods that may succeed with many verbal variants have no chance of success in dealing with accidentals.

However, two categories of accidentals might seem to offer some hope for a distinction. These are the alteration of parenthetical commas to dashes, and the splitting apart of a long sentence, its parts joined by a semicolon, into two separate sentences. The reason that these might be significant is that they represent distinct trends within the manuscript revisions themselves; and it would be only reasonable to conjecture that this tendency could carry over into the proof stage.

Analysis of the first, the frequent change of manuscript parenthetical commas to dashes in the print, yields only negative results. When one selects a group of such examples at random and then examines the typography of the lines in question, it frequently becomes evident that the line with the dashes is so loosely set that no compositor would have spaced it so wide if the considerably narrower commas had first been set and the dashes added only in proof. When lines with dashes are correctly justified, no argument can be made that the dashes are proof-alterations, since these would often have upset the normal spacing and caused a noticeable crowding. Hence, though no critic can deny the possibility that some few of these changes might have been made in proof by the author, it is possible to demonstrate that many could not possibly have been proof-corrections. In these circumstances, no criteria obtain consistently to identify authoritative changes, and any attempt to select examples from the first edition to emend the manuscript readings must be abandoned.

Unfortunately, no greater success attends an effort to establish as Hawthorne proof-alterations the breaking-up of lengthy
semicolons, as happens during the inscription of the manuscript. Since only eleven examples occur between manuscript and first edition, this number is not out of line with probability and could well represent changes in proof. But discouraging evidence accumulates. For instance, in the work of all four major compositors, many more examples occur of short manuscript sentences made into long sentences by semicolons than the reverse. Frequently the compositors seemed to have joined these sentences because they objected to the common Hawthorne practice of starting a sentence with a conjunction. It would seem, then, to be significant that, contrary to compositorial preference, not one of the possible Hawthorne proof-changes in splitting up sentences starts with a conjunction.

More to the point, the stints of the compositors are marked in the manuscript; and thus one can easily discover that of the eleven examples seven appear in pages set by one compositor, Fox, two in the work of Munn, and only one apiece in Henderson's and Emery's stints. This imbalance points very suspiciously toward the hypothesis that the changes are printer's styling, particularly Fox's. However, there is always an outside possibility that chance has operated and that bibliographical reasoning has been misled. And a few of the changes, like the two within a few lines of each other at the turn of the page between Fox and Henderson (Centenary 44.3, 44.10), are tempting to attribute to the author. But bibliographical reasoning has not been misled. Fox and Henderson are among the compositors who, the year before, had set The House of the Seven Gables. Among these various workmen, only Fox splits manuscript sentences in two, this occurring five times in his stint, but nowhere else in the whole book. The repetition of this discrepancy in the typesetting of Fox and Henderson in two manuscripts
cannot be ignored. If Hawthorne did indeed change a sentence or two in proof in this manner, no evidence to identify any such alteration can be adduced.

Since these two categories of accidentals furnished the best test of the possibility that some of Hawthorne's changes of punctuation or other accidentals in proof (if any) might be ascertained, the case appears to be hopeless without special evidence. Hence any editorial emendations in these respects from the first edition must be made sparingly, and then chiefly to correct slips in the manuscript. It is unlikely that very many will be authoritative.

The question of the substantives, or wording, is of more immediate critical importance, and certainly these verbals represent a field where criticism can properly operate in decisions concerning authority. A typical book is The Blithedale Romance, in which one may count a total of forty-nine substantive variants between manuscript and print, omitting the correct setting of the various dittographic errors in the manuscript. Normal expectation would divide these into authorial proof-alterations and compositorial variants not noticed by the author. The question is, which is which.

The view that Hawthorne was a careless and comparatively uninterested proofreader rests on his willingness to proofread non-creative work, like his biography of Pierce, without the copy; or his disinclination to bother with proofreading himself the collections of his tales and sketches that had already appeared earlier in print. The latter, especially, supports the view (indicated in some references in letters) that Hawthorne distrusted the ability of the printer to read his handwriting and wanted to see proof, not at all for the opportunity it offered to improve his work, but only to assure himself that his manuscript words had been correctly transferred to print. But this attitude implies some scrupulousness and accompanying care. The
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record ordinarily is very good indeed that his proofreading overlooked only a small number of printer's corruptions in his romances.

What the errors were that he found and corrected, we shall never know in the absence of any preserved proof-sheets, for these readings in the print would have been altered to agree with the manuscript. Some variants may be those of the professional proofreader who would normally have read over and marked proof before it was sent to the author. An exasperated remark in a letter to Mansfield of February 10, 1850, concerns The Scarlet Letter and "a certain proofreader whom I am, just now, afflicted with" (MS, Berg Collection, New York Public Library). Such corrections Hawthorne could agree with or excise; but we have no means of knowing whether this publisher's reader may not have returned sometimes for a final reading after the author had finished and at that time made changes that could not have been seen by the author. Possibly this happened with a reading or two in The Blithedale Romance (see below). The only authorial variants, of course, that we have the opportunity of recognizing are those that are revisory in their nature and thus depart from a satisfactory manuscript reading.

Of the forty-nine substantive variants in The Blithedale Romance, the Centenary editors believe that at least twenty-eight represent Hawthorne's literary revisions in the proof-sheets; ten represent his correction in proof of unsatisfactory manuscript readings, although some of these may already have been changed by the compositor; and eleven represent printer's errors that he overlooked and that an editor must reject.

The editorial process by which these are separated into their categories is largely a critical one. Widely variant readings, like first-edition "recognize her as his" for manuscript "consider her his" (74.32), present no particular difficulty in assigning to the
author, just like "influence" for manuscript "agency" (7.30), "creditable" for "to his credit" (30.2), or "autumn to autumn" for "season to season" (211.33). On the contrary, any editor acquainted with Hawthorne's vocabulary would reject as a vulgarization the first edition's "inspired" for manuscript "inspired" (180.4); and, on the face of it, "winter" for manuscript "wintry" (85.11) is corrupt, for the month is April and the cold weather has three times elsewhere been referred to as "wintry".

As illustrating the real scrupulousness of Hawthorne's occasional changes, the example of first-edition "roof" versus manuscript "roofs" (148.34) is salutary. Coverdale is looking out of his hotel window at the back of a range of houses which, we are told, is connected by a single roof. The backs, or offices, of these houses have "roofs" along which a cat wanders. A buttonwood tree aspires to overtop what in the manuscript is the "roofs" but in print is the "roof" of the residences. The singular must be right, since the plural has been used only for the ground-floor offices. Moreover, in the Notebook entry from which this description is copied almost verbatim, the singular is used for the same circumstance. A small point, indeed, but indicative of Hawthorne's care.

The prime textual difficulty comes in the indifferent variants not susceptible of critical assessment, and in their nature most readily associated with compositors' memorial lapses: readings like first-edition "I am" for manuscript "I'm" (232.13), or "hanging up by" for "hanging by" (144.18). In such cases, when insufficient grounds exist for a sound critical judgment, the evidence suggests, in the romances, that more authentic Hawthorne proof-corrections exist in the first edition than printer's errors that were overlooked. Hence the odds favor the working hypothesis that any variant between print and manu-
script not identifiable almost certainly as a printer's error is more likely than not to represent a proof-alteration.

In some very small part, unexpected confirmation of this view comes from the first English edition of *The Blithedale Romance*. We know that Chapman and Hall published this edition more than a week before the American, and that their text was set up using as copy the proofs of the American typesetting rushed across the Atlantic in batches. We know that Fields, then in England, had ordered these proof-sheets to be sent as the plates were returned from the stereotyper.

The interesting question then arises whether, in these circumstances, the English typesetting preserves any readings that at a later state of proof-correction were altered in the American sheets before printing and publication. The evidence is fragmentary, but in a few examples no doubt can exist that when the English first edition agrees with the manuscript against the American first edition, the reading of the American print must represent such a proof-alteration. The most prominent example is the agreement at 74.32 in “consider her his” as against the first-edition “recognize her as his”, a variant in the print that one would not wish to assign to compositor or to publisher's reader. Another, although the variant itself is largely indifferent, is the agreement in “I'm” versus the first-edition “I am”.

On the other hand, the fact that the English edition follows the majority of what appear to be the authoritative Hawthorne proof-alterations in the American sheets (thirty-six of the thirty-eight substantive variants selected as authoritative, in fact, without consideration of the more difficult punctuation agreements) appears to confirm the hypothesis that normally Fields' instructions were followed and that the copy sent to England consisted of proofs pulled from stereotype plates made from the typesetting in its finally corrected form. It is certain, for instance, that
the passage a few lines before the conclusion (247.26-32) added in proof could not have been sent abroad from the original state of the proof-sheet for gathering 18.

If one takes into account the evidence for other proof-changes in the sheets containing the suspected readings, only two possibilities suggest themselves. With the possible exception of one or two sheets, the proofs in question sent abroad could not have been in their original uncorrected state. Hence the readings in the American sheets that alter the forms in which the English edition agrees with the manuscript must represent either (1) alterations made in the stereotype plates before printing, or (2) alterations ordered at a later stage than the original proofs either by Hawthorne or a publisher's reader but before stereotyping.

Careful examination on the Hinman Machine of the suspected readings in later printings of the American edition where alteration of the plates would be likely to expose itself in spread or battered letters and in somewhat out-of-line typesetting fails to produce any evidence that the plates were altered. Hence the second hypothesis appears to be the one that must be held. In this connection, it is simpler to assume that the printers sometimes found it difficult without undue delay to follow Fields's instructions about sending proofs from plated type pages, and on at least some occasions caught the mail with packets of proof from corrected but unplated type pages. Then, before plating, final instructions were received that resulted in the subsequent alterations revealed in the English edition. Certainly the sheets containing these variants appear to support this hypothesis by tending to run in sequences: sheets 5, 6, 7, then sheet 10 alone, and finally sheets 16 and 17.

The occasional usefulness of English editions to a study of the generally more authoritative American print is well illus-
trated by this example, and so, in reverse, the usefulness of the Boston 1860 typesetting to the generally more authoritative English edition of *The Marble Faun*.

Excisions in a manuscript without substitution often present a problem to a textual critic, but not to an editor of Hawthorne. Since his whole revisory bent was towards amplification instead of condensation, very few such excisions appear other than of casual words here and there. An interesting example occurs in *The Blithedale Romance* when Coverdale induces Hollingsworth to explain to Silas Foster their dread that Zenobia has committed suicide. In the manuscript Hawthorne first wrote, on folio 187:

> "And so you think she's drowned herself!" he cried, with his eyes half out of his head, from mere surprise. "What on earth should the young woman do that for? Why, she has more means than she can use or waste, and lacks nothing to make her comfortable, but a husband—and that she could have, any day! There's some mistake about this I tell you!"

> "Come," said I, shuddering. "Let us go and ascertain the truth."

Perhaps because he wanted to reduce the number of times that he utilized Foster's crude reactions for shock effect, Hawthorne at some point deleted the passage "with his eyes . . . " to " . . . I tell you" so that Coverdale's answer "Come," followed immediately on Foster's original exclamation. But, then, he decided to restore the passage, and on the verso of folio 188, with some rearrangement, he wrote the following:

> I turned away my face.

> "What on earth should the young woman do that for?" exclaimed Silas, his eyes half out of his head with mere surprise. "Why, she has more means . . . some mistake about this, I tell you!" (230.31-231.2)
In *The Blithedale Romance*, however, there are three other passages that were deleted but not restored. Two of these were excisions only of a sentence or a clause (10.23-24; 17.15-16), but the third consisted of twenty-one lines in the manuscript (175.5-27). It is interesting to observe that one of these concerns sexuality, and two liquor. The one truncates a mental image Coverdale has of Zenobia in the garb of Eden, following a joking exchange between the two on his arrival at Blithedale. The other allows Coverdale to regret that in forsaking his snug town quarters to drive to Blithedale in a wintry storm, he had left behind a bottle or two of champagne and a "residuum of claret in a box"; but then Hawthorne removes the mention of strong liquor by deleting the phrase "and somewhat of proof in the concavity of a big demijohn".

The long excision, on the other hand, contains a satiric if not bitter attack on temperance workers who attempt to take away strong drink from the poor without an idea that liquor must be replaced with something else of good if the effort is to succeed. The general tone is indicated by such a quotation as, "The temperance-men may preach till doom's day; and still this cold and barren world will look warmer, kindlier, mellower, through the medium of a toper's glass; nor can they, with all their efforts, really spill his draught upon the floor, until some hitherto unthought-of discovery shall supply him with a true element of joy."

These three passages stand out as unique excisions presumably made for other than literary purposes. Although the faint possibility exists that E. P. Whipple suggested them when he read over the manuscript before it was sent to the printer, the natural candidate is Sophia Peabody Hawthorne, who was the closest at hand and certainly the most influential. Before her marriage, she had urged on Bronson Alcott censorship of the published version of notes made on "unpleasant subjects." Haw-
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Hawthorne's American Notebooks exhibit her deletions of his references to smoking, drinking, and "low company," as well as her firm attitude toward his occasional levity about drunkenness. Especially, the forthright satire on temperance men could not have pleased her.

It seems likely that Hawthorne withdrew the three passages in deference to the sensibilities of his wife. If so, it may not be the first evidence that an author's text has been affected by the influence of the marital bed, perhaps, but it will do in default of a better.
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