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or What Text Should We Read:  
The Case of an Omitted Paragraph 
in a Forgotten Conrad Book Review

RAY STEVENS
Western Maryland College

MODERN LITERARY CRITICISM often seems a stormy sea of warring interests. Will British feminism conquer French feminism? Will deconstruction go its truncated way, following the Marxist dialectic that appears to have played a part in giving deconstruction its fragmented birth (with apologies to Saussure and Derrida)? Will the criticism that shifts thought from psychoanalytical discussion of the author to reader-response analysis finally bring happiness to those who have forgotten that it was the author who wrote what some critics find their livelihood in trying to forget? Will cultural criticism (1980s variety) replace canon? Will biographical (1930s variety) and historical (1950s variety) criticism find a Carlylean New Birth in a new century? Will new criticism become new once more?

Instead of joining the battle, let us idle for a moment in the calm haven of the textual critic who seeks the details of seemingly superfluous materials, trying to find a standard text that serves as a point of departure so that critical battles can be fought on calmer seas.

Take, for example, a most minute piece of minutiae from the works of Joseph Conrad: an omitted paragraph. Conrad’s friend and editor Richard Curle cut the paragraph in preparing a text for publication in pamphlet form of a book review written hastily by Conrad in 1906. So insignificant did Conrad believe the review to be, in fact, that by 1921, Conrad had forgotten that he had written it, and failed to include it in Notes on Life and Letters, a miscellaneous volume of essays on various topics. An essay such as Conrad’s review of The Man of Property, written...
by the now almost forgotten Nobel Prize-winning John Galsworthy, is at best of minor importance in assessing the direction of modern literary criticism. An exercise in understanding the evolution of even a minor text such as Conrad's review, however, reemphasizes in a critical era inclined to forget such things the importance of the context within which a composition evolves—the factors that go into the development of the text that the reader, whether in 1906, or in 1922, or in 2001, eventually evaluates. However definitive a work of literary criticism might seem to be, there are often lacunae in the bridge from author to text that separate critics even more from the author to the written page, and, in turn, the written page from the reader who responds. Rather than forget the importance of such gaps in our knowledge that may lead to a sounder literary criticism, as some urge, it is imperative that critics understand, to the extent possible, what happens in the composition of the text.

II

The premise of this essay is central to textual criticism in the mainstream from W. W. Gregg through Fredson Bowers to the Modern Language Association's Center for Scholarly Editions: what text should one read, and how does one decide what that text should be? The textual critic argues that to enter critical dialogue about a text there should be critical consensus about what that text is. Because of the inevitable errors, both accidental and substantive, that enter the text (especially before the electronic transmission of text from author's computer to printer's computer eliminated many errors of transmission), and because the careful craftsman knows that even a misplaced semicolon can alter the meanings of closely argued texts, readers need to have the most accurate text possible, even though in critical approaches such as reader-response theory readers seem often to be privileged over text, and certainly over author. Thus, let us illustrate this obvious but sometimes overlooked point by examining the inception, reception, and textual history of "John Galsworthy," a major novelist's minor work of literary criticism.

Today, if one by chance should stumble across "John Galsworthy" in its current text, it would most likely be a cursory reading out of idle curiosity as one seeks material in Conrad's various writings about the sea in Last Essays, the only location where "John Galsworthy" is widely available. The serious student of Conrad and Galsworthy would know of their close friendship, but most critics of the late twentieth century
would be more familiar with the criticism that dismisses the works of Galsworthy in Virginia Woolf's "Modern Criticism" (1919) and "Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown" (1924) and D. H. Lawrence's Scrutinies (1928). Other critics approaching middle age might privilege memories both precise and imprecise of The Forsyte Saga, the first BBC-PBS Masterpiece Theatre production, with the urbane discussions by Alistair Cooke. Still others, having read either the first (The Forsyte Saga), or the second (A Modern Comedy), or third (End of the Chapter) of the trilogies with various interludes, would most likely approach the text of Conrad's essay quite differently from the way the readers of Conrad's review did in 1906 when it appeared within a fortnight of the appearance of The Man of Property, the first novel in the Forsyte series.

Thus, if modern readers want to evaluate the validity of Conrad's review of Galsworthy's novel, they need to do so within the context of 1906 as well as currently. Conrad himself seems to have forgotten that, as the subsequent discussion will demonstrate.

The Initial Quandary for the Textual Critic: Copy-Text

What text should the critic read? On whose authority, and what methods should be used to select the text that ought to become the standard for criticism? Even if critics agree to disagree about the possible meanings of a text, is it not plausible to have a standard text so that critics at least have something common to agree or disagree about? This might seem to belabor the obvious. But the textual critic is very much aware that what is obvious to some is not necessarily obvious to others. Some time ago, for example, a textual critic attended a seminar to discuss, among other things, Virginia Woolf's To the Lighthouse. At a critical point in the text, in pursuit of possible meaning in one of Woolf's extended periodic sentences, he asked a simple question: should a certain semicolon in fact be a period because, he argued, such a simple change could further alter the possible meanings of the passage in question? It had not occurred to most assembled there to raise the question central to the textual critic: Is the text accurate? Is there an accidental error (a minor or typographical slip that has little or no relevance to interpreting the meaning of the text) that the author did not intend; or might there have been a substantive error (one made either by author or editor or typesetter) that might alter the possible meanings of the text? Such questions are central to the work of the
textual critic, even in such contexts as selecting a copy-text that serves as the basis for reconstructing a text that might best serve the critical world.

"John Galsworthy" is one of the least complicated essays, from the point of view of copy-text, among the twenty that I am currently working with in preparing Last Essays for the Cambridge University Press Critical Edition of the Works of Joseph Conrad. No manuscript or typescript pre-publication text exists for the review as it appeared first in the 31 March 1906 Outlook. Later, when Conrad prepared the text for publication twice—in 1921 for a second edition of Notes on Life and Letters, and in 1922 for the pamphlet printed privately by the Canterbury firm of H. J. Goulden—he simply used a typescript copied from the Outlook essay. The review, in fact, would have appeared in Notes on Life and Letters rather than in Last Essays had Conrad not forgotten that he had written it. The Lilly Library at Indiana University owns a copy of the emended 1921 galley proofs prepared for inclusion in a second edition of Notes on Life and Letters; but the essay with emendations was not included, as Conrad had requested, when the Notes on Life and Letters volume of the first of his collected editions was published. Conrad also emended the 1922 page proofs of the Goulden pamphlet, now located at the Colgate University Library. The type for the Last Essays volume, in turn, was set from the pamphlet. The history of the transmission of the text of "John Galsworthy" is, consequently, both linear and simple. But that does not necessarily mean that the text is standard, as will become evident below, because principles of editorial selection are somewhat more complicated.

Last Essays

To illustrate some of the problems facing the textual critic, it might be appropriate to discuss briefly the general problems in editing a collection of essays by Conrad. Who edits, and does it really make any difference? There are twenty pieces in Last Essays, none of which Conrad edited specifically for the volume that was published in March 1926, some twenty-one months after his death, by both the British publisher Dent and the American publisher Doubleday. Richard Curle, the editor of the 1926 Last Essays, made significant alterations to various texts that cannot be said to represent Conrad's final intent, which is one of the rationales for the textual critic's work. Yet Conrad
entrusted Curle with significant freedom in getting essays that he wrote late in life ready for journal publication. For example, Curle made final revisions, with Conrad's approval, on at least two of the Last Essays texts during Conrad's lifetime—“Christmas Day at Sea” and “Travel”; and he assumed some editorial responsibility for “John Galsworthy.” Curle also assisted Conrad and his literary agents J. B. and Eric Pinker in placing some of Conrad's work and, after Conrad's death, saw to the publication in newspaper and periodical form of several essays from previously unpublished typescripts that were written years before Conrad's death. In addition, Curle made some justifiable corrections of fact and other changes to “Legends,” which was left unfinished on Conrad's desk when he died on 3 August 1924.

Even Jerome Kern got into the act of editing one of the texts that appeared in different form in the Last Essays. He had printed privately for Christmas 1925 distribution to his friends the “Admiralty Paper” (“The Unlighted Coast”) from Conrad's manuscript. Kern's text, in fact, marked the first appearance of “The Unlighted Coast” in print.

One other example will suffice. The “Congo Diary” that Curle prepared for serial publication, and in which form it appeared in all of its published states until the 1978 appearance of Zdzislaw Najder's Congo Diary and Other Uncollected Pieces, is incomplete, containing only about half of the original. Most of the excluded material is technical information about Conrad's journey up the Congo River in 1890, contained in “Up-river book,” the second of two composition books written in pencil in Conrad's hand and now located at the Houghton Library at Harvard University. That text includes a series of unusual and often perceptive drawings of land configurations and navigational points, with various jottings on blank pages. Even Najder does not include Conrad's diagrams. In addition, Curle's text has many changes, primarily accidental, but also substantive. Given the fact that Conrad never intended the “Congo Diary” or the accompanying “Up-river book” for publication, these changes are understandable; but they do not represent Conrad's final intent. Thus, there can be no single source of copy-texts for the twenty Last Essays, and critics must approach any edition circumspectly.

The Texts of “John Galsworthy”

It is problematical which of the nine texts collated for this discussion is the proper one to signify Conrad's final intent. I shall argue in fact
that the first text published in 1906, which Conrad apparently did not even see through the press once he sent it away, represents his final intent more than the final version that he examined, some sixteen years later. Texts collated for this study include:

1) the original English magazine publication in the *Outlook* of 31 March 1906, which serves as copy-text

2) the unrevised galley proofs

3) the galley proofs revised by Conrad

4) the galley proofs edited by Richard Curle for the text that was inadvertently omitted from *Notes on Life and Letters* in 1921, at Indiana University's Lilly Library

5) the unrevised page proofs of the 1922 English pamphlet published by H. J. Goulden of Canterbury, at Colgate University's Everett Needham Case Library

6) the first printing of the pamphlet

7) the second printing of the pamphlet

8) the first English (Dent) edition of *Last Essays*

9) the first American (Doubleday) edition of *Last Essays*

Copy-Text

The copy-text of “John Galsworthy” appeared as “The Book of the Week” review in the London periodical *Outlook*, 31 March 1906, entitled “A Middle Class Family.” Presumably that title was given by a member of the editorial staff of *Outlook*, because Conrad does not refer in any of his correspondence to a specific title for the review of Galsworthy’s *The Man of Property*, and both the placement of the essay and the selection of a title within “The Book of the Week” context was clearly the prerogative of the editorial staff. When the text next appeared in 1922, Conrad had changed the title to the much more recognizable “John Galsworthy,” and that has remained constant.

There are no known surviving pre-publication texts of the material submitted to *Outlook* in 1906, only the text that appeared in the periodical itself. No extant records indicate what role, if any, Conrad played in seeing the text through the press once he submitted it to *Outlook*. It seems plausible that there was none, because Conrad sent the material from his vacation home in Montpellier in southern France less than two weeks before it was published. Correspondence with his
literary agent J. B. Pinker contains no reference to page proofs. Consequently, because no pre-publication text of the review that appeared in *Outlook* survives, and because Conrad used a typescript of the *Outlook* essay for subsequent editions, the 1906 periodical publication of "John Galsworthy" serves as copy-text.

James Garvin,7 editor of *Outlook*, had written to Conrad several months before Conrad composed his review, requesting that he contribute opinions "upon the current questions of our time" to the periodical. Conrad declined reluctantly, but kept open the possibility of contributing other articles to *Outlook* in the future.8 Thus, when the time came to write the review of *The Man of Property* that he had promised Galsworthy, Conrad had already arranged for publication with Garvin, and mailed it to him on Tuesday, March 20, informing Galsworthy two days later that he had mailed the essay with the request that it appear about a fortnight after *The Man of Property* was published.9 Galsworthy's novel was published by Heinemann on March 23; the review appeared eight days later.

Conrad had known of Galsworthy's plans to write what was to become the first of the Forsyte novels10 as early as 4 June 1903:

I am excited by the news of the novel you are hatching. It is good news; for you are a man of purpose and know what you want to do. But what is it that you exactly want to do? That is it—for me—the question. The name of the people suggests the moral shape of the thing; yet I would like to know—to know absolutely—to know as much as you know (or think you know) of what is going to happen to the doomed crew of the Forsythes [sic].11

Conrad's interest in the success of his friend of thirteen years was personal, promotional, and professional, as various letters to Galsworthy indicate. First, on 12 February 1905:

I can't refrain from a shout at the news [that Galsworthy had finished *Property*]. How You [sic] must have worked! I only regret that the publication is to be delayed till Xmas season—which is crowded as you know. . . . I wonder if letting it go over the New Year say and Jan 06 will not be good policy. The book to my mind is so considerable that no circumstance of its pub°n [publication] should be disregarded—I fancy I'll have to review it—anonymously. A good place for that review will have to be found.12

Conrad wrote again on 8 May 1905, in response to Galsworthy's comment that he had finished further revisions to *The Man of Property*: "Our Congratulations on the real and true end of your labours. Good luck to the book!"13
Conrad had read portions of Galsworthy's novel at various stages of its development, and reported to Galsworthy on 31 January 1906 that he had completed reading the pre-publication typescript: "The book is in parts marvelously done and in its whole a piece of art—undubitably [sic] a piece of art. I've read it 3 times. My respect for you increased with every reading. I have meditated over these pages not a little. I want to know when it is going to be published."  

Despite Conrad's apparent enthusiasm, his review was less than enthusiastic about The Man of Property as a work of art, and Conrad was uncomfortable and defensive when he tried to explain why. He called the essay "inept and benighted" in the March 22 letter to Galsworthy, continuing: "I am appalled at the bad use I've made of the opportunity; but the thing is done; it is the best thing I was capable of doing." On April 9, he added that he had consciously avoided literary analysis because of limited space in the review, that he wanted to present a "literary tribute not unworthy of you," but that he feared being misinterpreted: "So I simply endeavored to send people to the book by a sort of allusive compte-rendu, a mere 'notice' in fact." As Frederick Karl has commented, Conrad was apparently more interested in "creating market interest in his friend's work" than indulging in literary analysis. 

In addition, Conrad was concerned that his review might be considered a puff by a friend, and he wanted to be thought circumspect and honest by the many literary acquaintances whom he knew would be reading the article. Various biographers have speculated about other motives for writing as he did: jealousy; frustration that Galsworthy seemed so much more successful with much less effort than Conrad; envy at Galsworthy's speed of composition; discontent with the conclusion of The Man of Property and of Bosinney's fortuitous death; belief that the novel could not be probed deeply lest its flaws become too obvious; perhaps even aggravation with Galsworthy's "disconcerting honesty." Conrad's candor and honesty have served him well, however, because eight decades of literary criticism have confirmed his judgment.

Conrad's pace was frenetic when he wrote "John Galsworthy" while on the three-month visit to the Hôtel Riche et Continental in Montpellier. He was fretting about his finances; sending harried letters to his agent J. B. Pinker asking him to arrange payments for various expenditures; and trying to meet deadlines, both his agent's and his own. Conrad wrote to Pinker that he had "been hindered [from sending
additional manuscript pages of *Verloc* (*The Secret Agent*) and the corrected proofs of *Gaspar Ruiz* by the necessity to write at once a review of Galsworthy’s book." In addition, Conrad’s ill-health continued to bother him; his wife Jessie suffered from her usual indispositions; and his son Borys was struggling with scarlet fever.

On March 2 he mailed to Pinker a portion of the corrected proofs of “Gaspar Ruiz” and reported that *Verloc* was expanding rapidly; on March 5 he forwarded the completed text of *The Mirror of the Sea* to Pinker, expressing the hope that proof corrections would be minimal. He was also considering his possible financial reward of 60 percent of the gross receipts from a proposed German stage production of *One Day More*—at least he expressed those sentiments to Pinker on the back of a letter from Frank E. Washburn Freund, the representative of the Anstalt für Aufführungsrecht dramatischer Werke of Berlin. He also lamented to Pinker on March 28 that the three days he had spent writing the review had delayed returning to *Verloc*, and that he hoped to return to the often delayed manuscript of *Chance* soon. He even suggested that Pinker might become Galsworthy’s agent, miscalculating Galsworthy’s later productivity when he commented that his “output will never be very great.”

**Pamphlet Galley Proofs**

The textual history of “John Galsworthy” since 1906 is intriguing because, once Conrad had explained the circumstances of its publication to Galsworthy, he apparently forgot about the essay. He confessed to Galsworthy on 8 June 1921:

You can’t imagine my disgust with myself and my consternation when I discovered that the article I wrote on you... has got left out of the *Life and Letters* vol. What can I do but confess that I had forgotten all about it?... They had to put the texts under my eyes to convince me! When Pinker asked me about you lately, I said: “No, I never wrote anything. Galsworthy wrote an appreciation of my work which I have, but I never wrote about him.” Of course they sent me a typed copy of the article in *The Outlook*—and as soon as I glanced at it, a lot of actual phrases rushed into my memory. My dear, this is not to be explained.... But we are not too late for the Collected Edition, of which Life and Letters will be the 18th vol. I have sent a typed copy to America and another to Heinemann with the intimation that it must go in. For the moment I can do no more.... Yet, truly, I am not very proud of what I wrote. Neither you nor the book get half your due in that article.
This letter helps to explain the otherwise inexplicable comment in an unknown hand on the galley proofs at the Lilly Library: “Note to Printer: This essay on John Galsworthy is to be placed between the article on Anatole France (p 43) and Turgenev (p 61). Make the necessary alteration in the table of contents.”

Curle, who often assisted Conrad with literary matters, aided in editing the page proofs intended for the Notes on Life and Letters volume in the collected edition. In fact, the Lilly proofs record ten emendations by Curle—nine of which are substantive—and only one by Conrad. In the introduction to Last Essays (1926), the editor Curle comments that Conrad had indeed forgotten about the review of The Man of Property. But Curle must also have been forgetful, because he failed to mention his role in editing the proofs of the text that were to have been included in the collected edition.

There is no reason not to believe Conrad’s explanation of his oversight in not including “John Galsworthy” in Notes on Life and Letters. There is likewise no reason to doubt Conrad’s statement that the two typescripts copied, perhaps by his secretary Lillian Hallowes, from Outlook, and sent to Doubleday and Dent, did exist. But those typescripts have been lost. The galley proofs at the Lilly Library are set in line and page size consistent with the text of the first edition of Notes on Life and Letters, not of the pamphlet, and the even-numbered galleys (002, 004, 006, 008) have as the caption at the top of the page “NOTES ON LIFE AND LETTERS.”

Here things get particularly interesting. By a route impossible to reconstruct with certainty, the substantive emendations to the Lilly galley proofs in Curle’s hand—the five substantive changes of the verbal from “shall” to “will”; the change from “this talent” to “his genius”; from “poverty” to “property”; and from “a” to “one”—are incorporated later in the pamphlet and in both the English and American editions of Last Essays. The one substantive change in the Lilly galleys in Conrad’s hand, however—from “all sorts of respects” to “every respect”—is reprinted neither in the pamphlet nor in the English or American editions. Neither textual evidence nor correspondence indicates why this happened, but one can speculate that the Lilly galleys, which were presumably set for a second English edition of Notes on Life and Letters rather than for a second American Doubleday edition, were consulted when the pamphlet was prepared. It seems logical to conclude this because 1) the galleys apparently remained in England until 1931; 2) the typesetting
is consistent with the English Notes on Life and Letters edition; and 3) all of Curle's emendations from the galleys are included in the pamphlet. At least it seems logical to speculate that Curle's emendations from the galleys were included in the text (perhaps yet another typescript?) that went to Goulden. Even if that were the case, however, left unexplained is why Conrad's emendation was not used. Once again speculation leads one to suggest either that Conrad preferred the original to the revised or, less likely, that it was simply overlooked. However moot such speculation might be, Conrad's intent can be determined at the next stage, because he did examine the pamphlet page proofs.

Pamphlet Page Proofs

The pamphlet page proofs for the August 1922 publication by Goulden contain no substantive or accidental emendations of the text. There are, however, three notes to the printer in the Colgate page proofs, perhaps in Conrad's hand, to alter the type format. One of these, on the title page, requests "roman" type rather than italics for the words "Printed for Private Circulation by." The other two are in the text of the essay: one requests "roman" for the italicized word "willed"; the other requests "larger" type for the small capital letters "THE MAN OF PROPERTY." In addition, there are two long diagonal marks calling attention to imprecisely printed words. Finally, the trial proof of the Goulden title page, which was reset before the first printing, has the printer's address deleted, and the date 1922 added in Conrad's hand.

Pamphlet First and Second Printings

Curle records in the introduction to the Dent Last Essays that Conrad corrected his "oversight" of not including the essay in Notes on Life and Letters by "privately printing a few copies." By the time Doubleday published Last Essays, however, Curle had changed his count to "about fifty copies." "Oversight" is perhaps Curle's discreet and circumspect way of avoiding a discussion of the financial implications of publishing most of Conrad's essays in pamphlet form before they were collected in Notes on Life and Letters and Last Essays. While the pamphlets were no doubt published in part to reward his friends, Conrad did not object to making money from collectors of his works. Indeed, the collectors Clement Shorter and T. J. Wise had profited by publishing series of pamphlets of Conrad's essays. By the time "John Galsworthy" was
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printed in 1922, however, Conrad and Curle had taken over seeing the pamphlets through the press. Curle’s “few” or “about fifty” are actually seventy-five copies in two printings. Collation and bibliographical descriptions of the two states of text reveal that, even though the texts of the essay are identical, the two editions differ significantly. For purposes of this essay, one copy of each printing has been collated. The text of the first printing collated here is located at the Williams College Library; the text of the second printing is located at the University of Arizona Library.

Last Essays: Dent and Doubleday Editions

The text of “John Galsworthy” in Last Essays in both the Dent (English) and Doubleday (American) editions are identical with the text of the pamphlets, with one substantive exception. For some reason impossible to trace with certainty, the word “earthy” in all texts that precede Last Essays appears as “earthly” in both the Dent and Doubleday texts. Whether this was a conscious change on Curle’s part or a publisher’s editorial oversight is not important in establishing Conrad’s text, however, because the change, coming as it did after Conrad’s death, obviously has no authority from Conrad.

Emendation

To choose the Outlook text of 1906 is not to assume that it is exactly as Conrad finally read it in 1922. Rather, the choice is consonant with Conrad’s initial intent when the essay was an organic part of his creative and critical process, rather than a hastily considered afterthought in which he turned over most of the editorial and business chores to Curle, whose emendations, rather than Conrad’s, are the ones incorporated in later texts. Thus, the text that I advocate as standard retains two passages that were deleted both from the pamphlet and from Last Essays. The most significant is a paragraph devoted to Irene, the central woman in The Man of Property:

Irene, the wife of Soames Forsyte, is there also; an exquisite creation of Mr. Galsworthy’s art, delicate in her charm, fascinatingly passive and a little mysterious in her weakness of a woman formed for love alone; but still clearly unfortunate in this that she, too, has no property whatever.
Reasons for retaining the reading, despite its exclusion in subsequent texts reviewed by Conrad, are both logical and aesthetic. First, the context of the paragraph is a construction of Conrad's argument in the essay, leading from Irene's and Bosinney's exclusion from the Forsyte family of property, discussed in passages that both precede and follow the passage in question. This includes, of course, Conrad's final paragraph, in which he questions Galsworthy's conclusion to *The Man of Property*: Bosinney, in emotional turmoil over Irene's rape by her husband Soames, is killed tragically in an accident in the London fog. Second, the passage also gives insight into Conrad's aesthetic and sensitive reading of the character of Irene; she and Soames are the two characters who most define the Forsyte generation. Third, when Conrad returned to the text in 1922, his opinion of the character of Irene had altered significantly because of his knowledge of additional volumes in the Forsyte series, where both Soames and Irene have evolved significantly from their characterization at the end of *The Man of Property*.

The logic and aesthetic of the essay in its original intent, therefore, require inclusion of the paragraph on Irene, because not until later volumes does Irene's character become more defined as a person of greater depth than "fascinatingly passive and a little mysterious in her weakness of a woman formed for love alone." This was, after all, Conrad's judgment after his initial three readings of the novel in 1906.

Of course it can be argued that the inclusion of this paragraph does not represent Conrad's final intent. It might with reasonable aplomb also be argued, however, that Conrad's final intent in preparing the pamphlet text was hardly literary, given his cavalier treatment of the essay in its several stages of preparation in 1921 and 1922. First, Conrad had forgotten that he had written it. Second, he told his secretary to prepare a typescript from a copy of the *Outlook* text and send it to his English and American publishers for inclusion in *Notes on Life and Letters*. Third, he delegated authority for final editing of the text in both the Lilly galley proofs and the pamphlet text to Curle. Fourth, he was so unconcerned about the final text that he forgot that it had been set for inclusion in *Notes on Life and Letters*. Fifth, he was so preoccupied with other more pressing literary and personal matters both in 1906 and 1922 that he considered the "John Galsworthy" essay little more than an inconvenience.

Three instances of grammatical usage peculiar to Conrad's language in the essay confirm the selection of the 1906 text. First, the text that I
advocate as the standard will retain Conrad’s use, on five occasions, of the emphatic “shall” rather than Curle’s substitution of the less emphatic “will.” As a discussion of circumstances surrounding the writing of the text has already shown, Conrad struggled to make his review of The Man of Property seem convincing. “Shall” appears to have been Conrad’s verbal way of trying to convince both himself and Galsworthy that he was arguing from conviction. Second, I advocate retaining the more traditional and formal “want” of Conrad’s original to the “wants” of subsequent editions because it is consistent with meaning and syntax in the 1906 text. Third, Conrad’s original use of “forms” and not the “form” of the pamphlet in both American and English editions of Last Essays is grammatically consistent with its antecedent.

III

Such is the muddle of minutiae that the textual editor believes it important to consider in establishing a minor critical literary text of a major novelist to present to the contemporary student of literature. As Gregg, Bowers, and more than a generation of students working with the Center for Scholarly Editions have affirmed, the text that a contemporary literary critic chooses to analyze does matter, and the context within which literature is created remains important in an era that increasingly places less importance on historical context and canon. Obviously, the more complicated the textual problems, the more complicated are the textual critic’s choices, as the current debate over Hans Walter Gabler’s treatment of some 5000 errors that he contends to have discovered in editions of James Joyce that preceded his Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition suggests.

And what did Conrad actually say about Galsworthy’s craft in The Man of Property? Readers of Conrad can sort through the eleven specific points that Conrad discusses, and interpret for themselves. I simply recommend that they do so based on the Outlook text of 1906. What text one should choose to read when critiquing Joyce’s Ulysses I leave to the good judgment of those more expert in Joyce studies than I to recommend.
Notes

Acknowledgements: I am indebted to Sid Reid and Bruce Harkness of the Center for Conrad Studies at Kent State University for editorial advice and for assistance in collating the texts of "John Galsworthy"; and to Gale Graham, also of Kent State University, for perseverance, understanding, and kindness in deciphering my cryptic handwriting and annotations. I am also indebted to William Cagle of Indiana University's Lilly Library and to Melissa McAfee of Colgate University's Everett Needham Case Library for assistance in studying the texts housed in their special collections; to J. H. Stape of Chiba University for advice on editorial matters; and to Lola Szladits of the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library for assistance in studying Conrad's letters located there.


1. For a discussion of Woolf's critique of Galsworthy's works and its impact on subsequent evaluations of Galsworthy, see my "Mrs. Woolf and Mr. Galsworthy, and the Queer Case of Beyond," ELT Special Series, No. 3 (1985), 65-87.
2. Richard Curie (1883-1968), Conrad's friend and biographer, assisted Conrad late in life both with personal and professional matters. Curie was also a man of letters, known primarily as a journalist and literary critic. Conrad declined a request to write a preface for Curie's volume of travel essays, Wanderings, but wrote "Travel," from Last Essays, as the preface of Curie's volume Into the East.
3. Composer of the musicals Showboat and Roberta, the American Jerome Kern (1885-1924) was also a collector.
6. Conrad met the Nobel Prize-winning John Galsworthy (1867-1933) when Conrad was first mate on the Torrens in 1893. Conrad read parts of the manuscript of Almayer's Folly, his first novel, to Galsworthy and his friend Edward Sanderson, both of whom encouraged Conrad to become a writer. Galsworthy's encouragement was often both aesthetic and financial, especially early in Conrad's career as writer. Remembered today mostly for The Forsyte Saga, Galsworthy also wrote more than two dozen dramas, some of which, especially The Silver Box, Justice, and Loyalties, were successful on the stage.
12. Ibid., 216.
13. Ibid., 240.
15. Ibid., 322.
16. Ibid., 327.
18. The letter is undated, but it most likely was written during the third week of March 1906. Letters, III, 321.
20. Ibid., 318-19.
21. Ibid., 321. Conrad, at the suggestion of Sidney Colvin and with the assistance of Ford Madox Ford, had adapted his short story “Tomorrow” into the one-act drama One Day More. See Zdzisław Najder, Joseph Conrad: A Chronicle (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1983), 296. Sidney Colvin (1845–1927) was Slade Professor of Fine Arts at Cambridge University, and director of the Fitzwilliam Museum. A biographer of William Savage Landor and John Keats, he was also the editor of Robert Louis Stevenson’s letters. Ford Madox Ford (1873–1939) collaborated with Conrad on Romance and The Inheritors.


23. This comment suggests that the text used to emend the essay came from a copy presumably typed by a secretary in the office of Conrad’s agent Pinker. Because other texts do not exist, one might surmise that an omitted paragraph, to be discussed below, might have been omitted by someone in Pinker’s office, for whatever reason—a secretary’s haste, simple oversight, or an editorial decision that even Curie was not aware of.


25. The annotation in the English Literature, First and Early Editions catalogue of the 1931 sale that offered the proofs reads: “Galley-proofs of Conrad’s review of ‘The Man of Property,’ with a few MS corrections of Richard Curle and one by Conrad, and a note to the Printer (in John Galsworthy’s hand?) £2 12s 6d.” The question mark indicates that the compiler of the catalogue was not sure that the note was Galsworthy’s, and analysis of Galsworthy’s manuscripts indicate that the note is definitely not in his hand. One can only speculate why Galsworthy’s possible involvement in the editing process is even mentioned in the catalogue’s annotation, because he was not involved in the process in which Curle and Conrad lost track of a text that the two of them had edited, and which did not even appear in the collected edition for which Conrad intended it. A record of a second sale of the text is included with this text: “2½ galleys no cover Harrard . Heifer . Cambridge, Eng. April 6, 1931. List £2 12s 6d.” The page numbers (43, 61) in the note refer to the pages at the beginning of the “Anatole France” and “Turgenev” essays in the first edition, not the proposed Collected Edition.

26. Lillian Hallowes became Conrad’s secretary and typist in 1904, in which capacity she continued until Conrad’s death.

27. The first paragraph of the essay, for example, reads identically for all three states of the Lilly galleys and for the pamphlet, but the paragraph consists of ten lines in the Lilly text, and thirteen in the pamphlet.

28. Another possibility, much more speculative, is that Conrad made the emendation to enhance its value when it was sold or given to a collector. This would be consistent with Conrad’s practice of rewarding friends or collectors with texts containing his emendations.

29. Two annotations accompany the Colgate page proofs. One is a description of the proofs that was cut from the Conrad library sale catalogue. “45 Conrad (Joseph). John Galsworthy. An Appreciation, 20 pp. (last 5 blank), with trial proof of title afterwards reset, the printer’s address deleted and the date added in Conrad’s hand, without wrapper, as issued. Canterbury, printed for Private Circulation, n.d. [1922].” The other authenticates the proof: “From the Library of / Joseph Conrad / Sold at Messers. Hodgsons, / March 13th, 1925.”

30. Last Essays (London, 1926), xv.

31. (New York, 1926), xii.


34. Major differences can be summarized as follows:

**Watermark:**

- **First Printing**—"206 x 128 mm.; printed on laid paper watermarked ‘[ram’s head] / ORIGINAL/ CHATHAM MILLS/KENT’ in hollow letters."
- **Second Printing**—"210 x 134 mm.; printed on laid paper [not watermarked]."

**Contents:**

- **First Printing**—"pp. 1–13, text; p. 14 and the last two pages, blank."
- **Second Printing**—"Contents: p. 1, title; p. ii, blank; p. iii, half-title ‘JOHN GALSWORTHY.’; p. iv, blank; pp. 1–13, text; p. 14 and the last two pages, blank."

**Binding:**

- **First Printing**—"White wove paper wrappers coated pale turquoise with the title. All edges trimmed. No end-papers. Stapled."
- **Second Printing**—"White wove paper wrappers coated pale turquoise on the outer surface. Front wrapper printed in black with a repeat of the title page. All edges trimmed. No end papers. Sewn."

The collation is provided by William Cagle, of the Lilly Library.

35. The most notable of these are _In Chancery_ (1920), _Awakening_ (1920), and _To Let_ (1921). The texts combined in 1922 with _The Man of Property_ and "Indian Summer of a Forsyte" to become _The Forsyte Saga._

36. The second passage retained in this discussion of text, but omitted from texts published after 1906, is the repetitious phrase "family; and not an upper middle-class." Logic and the desire for consistency dictate that, if the "Irene" paragraph is aesthetically a part of the "John Galsworthy" essay, so should this passage be.