What is Authorial Philology?

A stark departure from traditional philology, What is Authorial Philology? is the first comprehensive treatment of authorial philology as a discipline in its own right. It provides readers with an excellent introduction to the theory and practice of editing 'authorial texts' alongside an exploration of authorial philology in its cultural and conceptual architecture. The originality and distinction of this work lies in its clear systematization of a discipline whose autonomous status has only recently been recognised.

This pioneering volume offers both a methodical set of instructions on how to read critical editions, and a wide range of practical examples, expanding upon the conceptual and methodological apparatus laid out in the first two chapters. By presenting a thorough account of the historical and theoretical framework through which authorial philology developed, Paola Italia, Giulia Raboni and their co-authors successfully reconceptualize the authorial text as an ever-changing organism, subject to alteration and modification.

What is Authorial Philology? will be of great didactic value to students and researchers alike, providing readers with a fuller understanding of the rationale behind different editing practices, and addressing both traditional and newer methods such as the use of the digital medium and its implications. Spanning the whole Italian tradition from Petrarch to Carlo Emilio Gadda, and with examples from key works of European literature, this ground-breaking volume provokes us to consider important questions concerning a text's dynamism, the extent to which an author is 'agentive', and, most crucially, about the very nature of what we read.

As with all Open Book publications, this entire book is available to read for free on the publisher's website. Printed and digital editions, together with supplementary digital material, can also be found at www.openbookpublishers.com.
Jane Austen’s fiction manuscripts represent one of the earliest surviving conspicuous dossiers of materials for a British novelist, covering a large time span in Austen’s life, roughly from 1787, when she was eleven, to 1817. Since all these manuscripts, be they drafts or fair copies, testify to works that were never published (and in the case of *Persuasion* to an alternative, unpublished, ending), it is widely believed that the author routinely destroyed the manuscripts of her published novels once they were printed, as was common practice in the period. Austen’s manuscripts underwent two major dispersals, one in 1845 when at the death of the author’s sister they were dispersed among surviving family members, and another in the 1920s when they began to enter auction houses to be divided among multiple British public and private collections.

These manuscripts have been the object of a digital edition directed by Professor Kathryn Sutherland, *Jane Austen’s Fiction Manuscripts* (https://janeausten.ac.uk/), designed to reunite, order and preserve the materials. The website edits all the manuscripts respecting the author’s use down to her graphic usage, with only minor normalization as regards punctuation. The reproduction of all the manuscript pages can be seen side-by-side with the corresponding transcription, so that the user can at all times double-check the readings of the edition or recover those graphic elements that inevitably get lost in the transcription. While the edition is strongly diplomatic, the chronological succession of the corrections is included as well. The transcription is indeed faithful to the page, reproducing erasures, interlinear corrections and carets as they are on the page; however, in cases of particularly complex, multi-layered corrections, the user can hover with the cursor on the relevant correction to ‘reveal’ the earlier phases, and many of the corrections are accompanied by footnotes that reconstruct particularly difficult elaborations of the manuscript in a fashion akin to that of authorial philology. Sutherland’s team indeed included individuals with an
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1 Unless otherwise stated, all the information found in this chapter is from the *Jane Austen’s Fiction Manuscripts* website. I would like to thank Kathryn Sutherland for her help with writing this chapter, and Carmela Marranchino for helping with the sample edition.
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Italian/European philological background, and she herself cultivates philological interests, and therefore produced an edition in which material data and interpretation are productively intertwined.

This interpretative element is even more apparent in the printed version of the same edition (Austen 2018), where a number of new textual notes have been added. The printed edition was later incorporated in the *Oxford Scholarly Editions Online* (OSEO) portal. OSEO brings the edition back to the digital realm and overcomes a technical limit of the original *Fiction Manuscripts* website, now ten years old and partially reliant on discontinued Adobe Flash software, with the consequence that parts of it might soon become inaccessible. While this edition is extremely commendable and is from many points of view superior to the original *Fiction Manuscripts*, the passage to a physical edition sacrificed much of the astute interactive presentation of the original project, reverting it to a more ‘classic’ edition, despite preserving the synoptic presentation of the website. The evolution of technology is indeed a problem that one should keep in mind when working on digital editions, as all technical solutions used are bound to become dated. Because of this, one either has to keep their project constantly updated from the technical point of view (which can however be quite difficult and costly), or to also publish a physical edition to ensure its long-term usability at the cost of the benefits of the digital form. However, this should not discourage one from attempting digital editions altogether, especially considering how newer technologies such as HTML5 were conceived with the specific intention of avoiding drastic changes such as the discontinuation of Flash software.

Both the original *Fiction Manuscripts* and the *Scholarly Editions Online* version are nevertheless an excellent example of the multiplicity of perspectives offered by a digital edition. Editions such as this have been defined as ‘paradigmatic’ by Elena Pierazzo, Technical Research Associate of the project (2014: 4–5), with reference to the ‘paradigmatic axis’ of possible views from which the user is able to choose.

For this example, we are examining a draft to which Austen had not given a title, and which was named *The Watsons* by one of its first editors, James Edward Austen-Leigh. The 17,500-words long fragment was written around 1804–1805 in Bath, after *Pride and Prejudice, Sense and Sensibility* and *Northanger Abbey* had already been drafted. *The Watsons* is
a case of *codex unicus*: the only witness of the work is a sequence of forty-four-leaves distributed across twelve small homemade booklets which were split into two parts in 1915 when the first six leaves were sold at a charity sale. The first six leaves are now held in New York (Morgan Library & Museum MS. MA 1034), while the rest is in Oxford (Bodleian Library MS. Eng. e. 3764). Some time after 2005, while still in private ownership, the second booklet of the manuscript (eight pages) went missing, so that the pictures found on the *Fiction Manuscripts* website and on its printed equivalent remain the only witnesses of those pages (Austen 2018: 1).

The manuscript pages are written in a neat hand covering the entirety of the page and leaving little room for large-scale revision other than lines of extra text crammed into narrow interlinear spaces. For more extensive revision (occurring in three parts of the manuscript), probably as part of a single correctional campaign, Austen applied separate ‘patches’ of a different paper which she carefully cut and pinned to the sheets where the correction/addition was intended to be placed.

The text is the beginning of a story, either a novella or, more likely, a longer novel, which was never finished, but whose narrative outline was known to Austen’s sister (Austen 2018: 5–6). The author perhaps anticipated later division into chapters. As it stands, the text is separated in the draft only by lines or by wider spacing. Virginia Woolf considered *The Watsons* a model of Austen’s writing strategy, believing its dry style to be due to her habit of writing the text in a bare, factual fashion, and revising the sentences later to ‘cover them with flesh and atmosphere’, not unlike what Gadda used to do (see section 3.6). According to Sutherland, Woolf’s remark is true, but in *The Watsons*’ case, Austen also did the opposite — when reviewing the text, she used to ‘remove the flesh and on occasion expose the bones’, not unlike what she later did when revising *Sanditon* (Sutherland 2005: 140). It might be that it was the almost cynical tone adopted in the draft that led Austen to interrupt her work on the novel. Other theories have however been proposed. According to her niece, Fanny Caroline, the reason for giving up on *The Watsons* was the sudden death of the writer’s father; Austen-Leigh instead believes that it was due to disgust for the excess of social degeneracy that the continuation of the novel would have depicted; and Sutherland also advances the hypothesis that the cause might
simply have been discouragement for the fact that despite having sent *Northanger Abbey* to the publisher more than a year before, it had not been printed yet (Sutherland 2005: 129–30). However, *The Watsons* was not disowned in its entirety, as materials from it were re-used in later novels (Sutherland 2005: 147).

*The Watsons* has been edited as part of longer literary works twice. Austen’s niece Catherine Hubback indeed based the first five chapters of her novel *The Younger Sister* (1850) on the incomplete novel, while an apocryphal completion, which included the entirety of Austen’s text with reworked punctuation, was written and published in 1928 by Hubback’s granddaughter Edith Brown in association with her husband. The text was instead published by itself in the second edition of James Edward Austen-Leigh’s *Memoir of Jane Austen* (1871: 297–364), and was edited again by the scholar Robert William Chapman in 1927. Both editions however normalized spellings and did not account for the corrections, with only Chapman giving a brief explanation of the characteristics of the manuscript in an appendix (Pierazzo 2016: 14–15).

A good example of how Austen worked in revision is in the evolution of the description of Mr Edwards’s townhouse. Here is how it appears in the *Fiction Manuscripts* website ([https://janeausten.ac.uk/manuscripts/qmwats/b2-3.html](https://janeausten.ac.uk/manuscripts/qmwats/b2-3.html)).

The diplomatic nature of the edition is clear from the example, where one can find even purely graphical characteristics such as the long s (ſ) that was a normal feature of handwriting at the time. An element of interpretation can however be found in the second note, where the editors give an account of the order of the overlapping corrections within the same sentence.

Here we will propose a *specimen* of how the same passage would look in an edition that follows the principles of authorial philology, to produce which we will also use the information found in the footnotes of the 2018 edition, using the latest text as base-text and preserving its graphic particularities even down to grammatical errors (cf. ‘Mr. E.s House’ instead of ‘Mr. E.’s House’). We will follow the representational criteria detailed in sections 2.5 and 2.6, but to make it easier for the reader to identify the many implicated variants found in the passage, I will represent them using a smaller font, as the Colli-Italia-Raboni edition of Manzoni’s *Fermo e Lucia* does (see section 3.4):
4.3 Jane Austen’s The Watsons

[b 2-2] The old Mare trotted heavily on, wanting no direction of the reins to take the right Turning, & making only one Blunder, in proposing to stop at the Millenars [b 2-3] before she drew up towards M’ E. Edward’s door. — M’ E. lived in the best house in the Street, & the best in the place, if M’ Tomlinson the Banker might be indulged in calling his newly erected House at the end of the Town with a shrubbery & sweep in the Country. — M’ E.s House was higher than most of its neighbours with windows on each side the door, the windows guarded by posts & chain the door approached by a flight of stone steps. — “Here we are — said Eliz: — as the Carriage ceased moving — safely arrived; — & by the Market Clock, we have been only five & thirty minutes coming. —which I think is doing pretty well, tho’ it would be nothing for Penelope. — Is not it a nice Town? — The Edwards’ have a noble house you see, & They live quite in stile. The door will be opened by a Man in Livery with a powder’d head, I can tell you.”

The edition that we have attempted here gives an idea of the advantages and disadvantages of editing the text using the methods of authorial philology — the chronological information that can be derived from the manuscript is made explicit at the cost of most information on topography, while a readable text is established without the arbitrariness of the old editions, and without sacrificing the strata of corrections that the manuscript attests. Thanks to the possibilities offered by paradigmatic (digital) editions, the reader could potentially be able to determine the level of interpretation s/he desires to see on his/her screen, from a minimum (photographs), to the genetic edition of the manuscript page, to a philologically-established text with apparatus. In this way, the materiality and spatiality of the page is both preserved and transcended at the same time.
Fig. 10 Jane Austen, *The Watsons*, 1804–1805 (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. e. 3764, b.2-3), https://janeausten.ac.uk/manuscripts/qmwats/b2-3.html