

Colby



Colby Quarterly

Volume 1
Issue 9 *January*

Article 9

January 1945

Hardy's Deference to His Publishers

Carl J. Weber

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.colby.edu/cq>

Recommended Citation

Colby Library Quarterly, series 1, no.9, January 1945, p.148-150

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Colby. It has been accepted for inclusion in Colby Quarterly by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ Colby.

148 Colby Library Quarterly

groans in mortal frailty, strives with unconquerable constancy; *surely not all in vain.*"

It is a shallow hopefulness that would escape the vision of decay. "If life be hard for such resolute and pious spirits, it is harder still for us, had we the wit to understand it." But though we join the cry of lamentation, we must in honor swell the response of hope. That Stevenson could hold up his head and troll his careless ditties to the sun, after that *Miserere* of the soul, opens the mind like a flower to the possibilities of human regnancy. One man has looked hell in the face and stayed undaunted. One man has peered over the gulf where suns are swinging and unmade stars light up the dusk, and yet retained the happy sanity of our common life. He returned from his Tartarean journey lifting to the unseen heaven the great, glad cry of ultimate obedience. Therefore will we not despair, nor wish one thorn the less had sprung before his feet. We are the stronger for his pain; his long conflict helps to make our calm. For very shame, we dare not skulk nor loiter now; and whither Stevenson has gone, there do we in our poor, halting fashion seek the way.



HARDY'S DEFERENCE TO HIS PUBLISHERS

BY CARL J. WEBER

SIXTEEN months after Stevenson's declaration to Barrie, "Surely these editor people are wrong," Thomas Hardy commented in very similar language on the same sort of experience. Stevenson retained a memory of "the slashed and gaping ruins" of his manuscript. But just as his memory proves, on examination, to be inaccurate, so Hardy's remarks — if they are correctly reported — exhibit a similar unreliability. Since these remarks have, so far as I know, never received any attention in all the fifty years

Colby Library Quarterly 149

since they were made, some detailed information about them will be needed.

In *The Young Man** of London, Frederick Dolman reported on "An Evening with Thomas Hardy." Dolman had called on the novelist in his home on the outskirts of Dorchester, and had referred to the continued popularity of *Tess*.

"Yes," replied Hardy, "but the frankness of the book has brought me some asperities. As a matter of fact, my tone has been the same in regard to moral questions for the twenty years or more I have been writing. From the very beginning I resolved to speak out. I remember that in the first edition of *Desperate Remedies* there were many passages exhibiting a similar plainness to *Tess*. Some of these were eliminated in the one-volume edition, in deference to my publishers; but I am sorry now that I did so, and if ever the book is included in the uniform edition of my works the old passages shall be restored."

"Of . . . many passages . . . some . . . were eliminated." Such is Hardy's statement, or at least Dolman's report thereof. What are the facts? At the time when this interview took place, *Desperate Remedies* had been published in London three times: (1) in 1871, by Tinsley Brothers, three volumes; (2) in 1889, by Ward & Downey, a "New Edition" in one volume; (3) in 1892, by William Heinemann, a one-volume "Popular Edition," printed from the same plates as the 1889 edition. Since this third edition offers no textual differences from the second, it can be ignored as far as this examination is concerned. Ward & Downey must be the publishers to whom Hardy deferred.

A close comparison of the three volumes published by Tinsley Brothers with the edition by Ward & Downey has revealed five passages, found in the first edition but "eliminated in the one-volume edition." These are:

* A Monthly Journal and Review, edited by F. A. Atkins and W. J. Dawson: Vol. VIII, No. 87, March 1894; pp. 75-79.

150 Colby Library Quarterly

1. "Ideal conception, necessitated by ignorance of the person so imagined, often results in an incipient love, which otherwise would never have existed." Vol. I, p. 49.

2. —"The sole object of this narration being to present in a regular series the several episodes and incidents which directly helped forward the end, and only these, every contiguous scene without this qualification is necessarily passed over, and as one, the Aldclyffe state dinner." Vol. I, p. 147.

3.—"Mrs. Leat, I ask you, have you, or ha'n't you known me many years?" "True, I have." Vol. II, p. 30.

4.—"what Lavater calls the boundary line between affection and appetite, never very distinct in him, was visibly obliterated. Moreover" Vol. II, p. 178.

5.—"a common p —" Vol. III, p. 166. In the 1889 edition this reads (p. 336): "a common —."

Tinsley Brothers had been willing to suggest the word *prostitute*, but Ward & Downey cut out even the letter p. Had Hardy's imagination, or a memory as faulty as Stevenson's, magnified this trivial difference into another instance of slashed and gaping ruins?

"If ever the book is included in the uniform edition of my works," Hardy is reported as saying, "the old passages shall be restored." Well, in February 1896, he was at work upon *Desperate Remedies*, writing a new preface for the edition published by Osgood, McIlvaine & Co., in London, in 1896. In this preface he explained that "some Wessex towns have been called for the first time by the names under which they appear elsewhere" — i.e. in other Wessex Novels. "This is the only material change." And when, in August 1912, Hardy went over the text for the last time, before the publication of *Desperate Remedies* by Macmillan in the Wessex Edition of 1912, he made no further reference to the restoration of "the old passages." Perhaps Frederick Dolman was not a good reporter and quoted Hardy incorrectly. Or perhaps the story of the suppression of outspoken passages is just another instance, like Stevenson's, of an author's magnifying the slightest editorial tampering with his work.