

TEXTUAL NOTES

The notes below justify or gloss decisions related to emendations to the copy-texts, or otherwise comment upon textual issues at a level of detail inappropriate to 'The Texts: An Essay', which lays out the editorial policy of the Cambridge Edition generally and of this critical edition of *Under Western Eyes*.

In a note where no sigla appear, the reading is common to all texts, including the present one, the matter in bold being the subject of commentary, usually to explain a crux or to justify a refusal to emend where such might be argued.

In notes dealing with alternative readings – whether in the early texts or proposed as emendations (adopted here or not) – a bracket follows the reading drawn from the text (the lemma), and a statement of variation precedes the commentary. Conventions of notation conform to those followed in the 'Emendation and Variation' list and explained in its headnote on pp. 369–70. The sigla for the texts and explanations for the abbreviations used are to be found in the same headnote.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

5.14 **underlays]** TSr underlay TSst underlies A1– Conrad's changing 'underlay' to agree with 'general truth' demonstrates his satisfaction with this word, and A1's form is, on balance, an editorial 'correction'.

6.30 **his healthy]** ED OM TSst his a healthy TSr a healthy A1– Conrad first wrote 'with a healthy desire', and then revised this to 'with his healthy capacity', omitting, however, to delete 'a'. In preparing the clean-copy typescript, the typist presumably failed to notice 'his' in the left-hand margin.

7.17 **Those people]** TSr They couldn't TSst These people A1– Combined with 7.17b, A1's reading is probably an editorial alteration, possibly effected in order to match 'these people are' (7.8) at the paragraph's opening. Conrad's characteristic confusion of 'these' and 'those' argues for retaining TSr's reading.

UNDER WESTERN EYES

12.17 **eloquence – but]** MS eloquence.–.– But TS eloquence . . . But SA– The unusual series of dots and dashes suggests that a long dash rather than an ellipsis might have been present in the typescript from which the clean-copy typescript was prepared. No compelling reason for a long dash can be adduced here, and the manuscript's en-dash is restored.

14.32 **the Thought]** TSr– The Thought TSst Conrad changed the initial 't' in 'The' to lower-case in blue pencil, perhaps to integrate the quotation into the

sentence more smoothly and to emphasize the word 'Thought'. That three words in upper-case in this sentence in TSt appear in lower-case in the manuscript suggests revision in the (now-lost) intermediate typescript.

15.6 **Minister's]** SE– minister's **MS–SA** The adoption of upper-case follows majority use in this section.

15.14 **sleigh]** TS– sledge **MS** This alteration accords with 'sleigh' in the paragraph's opening sentence. This is arguably a typist's correction, but the balance tips towards considering this as a revision in the (now-lost) intermediate typescript, with Conrad alternating throughout between 'sledge' and 'sleigh'.

15.32 **them repeatedly]** TS them **MS** the people **SA–** This is the first instance of an alteration originating in the duplicate copy of TSr arranged through Robert Garnett. Once he had corrected the duplicate copies, they served as printer's copy for SA and SE. Because Conrad did not see SA proofs and because many substantives originating in SA appear in SE and subsequent witnesses, these variants are attributable to Garnett, and, except in cases of obvious error, are rejected. For a discussion, see 'The Texts', p. 354.

16.4 **except for]** TS– except **MS** This is possibly a typist's correction, but the number of single-word revisions in this section of the typescript suggests Conrad's work to be equally as likely.

16.25 **is]** MS–SE **A1** was **E1 E2** Conrad had repeated opportunities to revise this verb but declined to do so; the change to 'was' in E1 is presumably an editorial 'correction' made to accord with the earlier instance of 'was' in this sentence.

17.14 **that]** MS–SE **A1** which **E1 E2** This is another usage with which Conrad characteristically had difficulty; more likely than not, the wording in the English book texts results from editorial 'correction'.

17.28 **it was]** ED was it **MS** was **TS–** An interlinear addition in the manuscript was probably missed by a typist faced with several such revisions on this page. The awkward phrasing that resulted from the placement of the addition seems to have been done in error.

17.28 **in fact was]** MS was in fact **TS–** The typist appears to have inadvertently transposed an interlinear addition.

19.5 **It was not]** MS It was nothing **TSt** There was nothing **TSr–** The typist's error of anticipation prompted revision, leading Conrad away from what he had originally written. The manuscript reading, preferred here, is also restored in the rest of the sentence.

19.10 **silver]** MS Silver **TS–** Conrad's majuscules and minuscules are sometimes extremely difficult to determine, and the typist no doubt had problems deciphering whether the initial letter is in upper- or lower-case. The proximity of 'Government' in the manuscript presumably influenced her decision (and likewise that at 20.30).

20.1 **slightly]** MS slightly **TS–** The *OED* indicates that these words were synonymous in the nineteenth century; TS's form is, on balance, a typist's smoothing out in the direction of what in time was to become standard idiom.

23.10 **persecutors]** MS–SE A1 the persecutors E1 E2 E1's reading is presumably a compositorial error, occasioned perhaps by eyeskip, with the definite article appearing three words prior to the one added.

23.21 **well-horsed]** SE– one-horse MS–SA Ziemianitch is earlier described as owning a 'small number of sledges' and a 'team of three horses' (22.38, 22.41) and the narrator later refers to 'the famous team of Haldin's escape' (30.8). The phrasing in SE is arguably editorial, made better to reflect these descriptions but Conrad's hand is just as likely.

24.10 **connections, friends]** MS–SE A1 connections E1 E2 The last word of a long list, 'friends' was probably missed by the compositor or removed by an editor because of its use several sentences earlier. Hardly superfluous, the repetition emphasizes Razumov's utter friendlessness.

27.9–10 **M'Razu- | mov's]** MS Razumov's TSt Conrad's awkward handwriting, with 'M' and 'Razu-' run together in the manuscript, in combination with the end-of-line break probably caused the typist to overlook the courtesy title. Its use at 27.12, 27.23 and 28.24 lends support to this emendation.

27.32 **into]** TS– to MS Possibly the result of a typist's error, this change could just as well be Conrad's revision, given the number of minor changes in surrounding sentences.

28.34 **gum]** MS gums TS– A singular noun is grammatically acceptable, but the typist probably substituted the more normal form while quickly dealing with Conrad's longhand.

29.5 **Hairy]** MS Bleary TS– Conrad first wrote 'Heads' before crossing that out to begin the sentence with 'Hairy'. The typist read his 'H' as a 'bl' thereby making 'Bleary' an option, but the dot above the 'i' in the manuscript confirms the reading adopted, which arguably makes better sense as well.

29.17 **biting]** TS– baiting MS According to the *OED*, in the nineteenth century 'baiting' was synonymous with 'biting', but such a usage would have been extremely rare and the 'correction' is thus accepted.

29.31 **Tfui]** MS TSr–SE A1 Thin TSt Pfui E1 E2 The *OED* does not note this spelling; however, it occurs in *Lord Jim*, *Romance*, *Nostramo* and *Victory* and is allowed to stand. See also 289.2 where Conrad himself evidently altered SE's form in E1 proofs. The word may be inflected by the Polish analogue *tfu*, which expresses disgust and is an onomatopoeic word intended to convey the sound of spitting. Cf. also 'It was so strange this America, and Tfui! how one was robbed': F. B. Westwood, 'The "Scab"', *Bookman* (New York), February 1905, 567. (This short story involves a Polish emigrant's going to the United States.)

30.39–40 **broken stable fork]** MS–SE A1 stable fork E1 E2 Described as a 'stick' at 31.8, the stable fork's handle is obviously 'broken', a word having fallen out during E1's setting.

35.34 **coarse]** MS–SE hoarse E1– The retention of 'coarse' through several phases of revision strongly suggests that this isolated change is a compositorial error rather than an instance of revision.

39.9–10 **little time]** MS little TS– After writing this sentence Conrad squeezed ‘time’ into the space between ‘little’ and ‘rang’. The typist overlooked the addition on a page bristling with interlinear revisions and excisions.

39.18 **The]** SE E1 E2 All the MS–SA A1 The proximity to the clearly authorial change at 39.19 argues for considering SE’s reading as authorial, rather than editorial, in origin.

39.36 **said]** MS–SE A1 had said E1 E2 The latter is possibly an editorial correction to match the use of the past perfect in the surrounding sentences, and Conrad’s original construction is thus preferred.

40.14 **around it]** ED around MS– This sentence underwent several rounds of revision beginning with the manuscript’s deletion of ‘it’, which left an awkward construction that descended to all printed versions apart from the collected editions. Their editors reasonably adjusted here, and their work guides the emendation made.

41.17 **a]** E1 E2 the MS–SE A1 Since entering the room, the Prince has not been depicted sitting, and, as Conrad (or E1’s editor or compositor) noticed, the definite article thus marks a specificity not warranted by the context.

44.2 **into]** MS–SE A1 to E1 E2 The phrase ‘to Siberia’ occurs at 81.34 and 212.20. Although Conrad might have made the latter correction, its movement towards standardization suggests the greater likelihood of an editor at work.

45.25 **Here]** MS There TS– Conrad’s ‘H’ was probably misread as ‘Th’ by the typist. Comparison with the transcription of similar words nearby supports the restoration of the manuscript.

47.4 **a scrupulous]** E1 E2 OM MS TS^t scrupulous TSr–SE A1 While E1’s reading could be viewed as an editorial intervention, the proximity of other revisions on this page (47.22, 47.24) strongly suggest Conrad’s intervention here. Moreover, he often used an indefinite article in such cases. (For example, SA’s editor removed the indefinite article from ‘a perfect’ (47.12).)

51.20 **grisly nature]** MS [*blank space*] nature TS– Conrad first wrote ‘appalling nature’ in the manuscript before crossing out the first word and awkwardly inserting ‘grisly’. The difficulty of reading this word caused the typist to leave a blank space to be filled in during revision and correction, but Conrad overlooked this. See 55.21 for a case where leaving a space prompted Conrad to supply a word.

51.32 **was not]** SE E1 E2 is not MS–SA A1 The alteration here and in the following sentence implements a past tense more suitable to the narrator’s contemplation of the scene. While the change could have been made by an editor, authorial revision nearby suggests that Conrad himself was at work.

52.8 **into]** MS–SA in SE– Despite the proximity of several other changes in SE that have been attributed to Conrad, this change is, on balance, a compositorial one.

54.21 **only]** E1 E2 he only MS–SE A1 This change and others nearby (55.16, 55.26, 55.40) are conspicuous at the end of the chapter. Although they could be seen as editorial, Conrad is more likely to have taken advantage of a final chance to revise in E1 proofs.

58.6 **perceive]** MS–SA perceived SE– Given that the narrator is writing in the present tense, the past tense makes less sense. SE’s form more likely represents a compositorial error than revision.

59.10 **that]** MS–SE A1 this E1 E2 This is one of the English forms with which Conrad had difficulty throughout his career; the change in E1 proofs is likely to have been the work of a compositor or editor.

59.31 **whenever]** MS–SA when SE– This and the two changes at 59.36 and 59.37, which address English forms with which Conrad was typically uncertain, are probably the work of an *English Review* compositor.

60.10 **that day]** MS–SE A1 day E1 E2 Conrad’s manuscript form is restored here, the deletion of ‘that’ being considered an editorial ‘correction’.

65.15 **all shuffled]** MS–SA shuffled SE– Following 59.31, the change at SE is, on balance, a ‘correction’ of authorial wording.

66.35 **muttering]** SA– he muttered MS TS† he muttering TS† Conrad revised this sentence in the typescript but mistakenly left ‘he’.

70.2 **personage of]** MS–SA personage SE– Similar to 65.15, the alteration in SE is arguably an editorial intervention by an *English Review* compositor.

75.37 **down at]** MS–SA down SE– This and 76.21 are treated in the same way as the case addressed at 70.2 and left unemended because of the probability of an editor or compositor ‘correcting’ for clarity.

76.4 **The young man]** E1 E2 That last MS–SE A1 This and a similar change at 78.21 suggest an editorial change for clarity’s sake. But the nearby alteration at 78.23 that makes Razumov ‘go’ rather than ‘come’ to the door could also have been Conrad’s, made when correcting the chapter’s closing page. These three alterations are considered authorial.

85.2 **an idea]** MS E1 E2 the idea TS–SE A1 The proximity of several changes (84.11–12, 85.6a and 85.17) argues that Conrad rather than an editor was responsible for these alterations.

85.34 **two]** MS tho [*sic*] TS the SA– The typist’s mistranscription or mechanical error led to a further ‘correction’ in SA.

86.34 **alley]** MS–SA A1 valley SE E1 E2 Paul Kirschner in his Penguin edition (1996) notes the absurdity of a ‘valley’ in the Bastions (p. lxxix), and SE’s form is obviously a setting error. In other sections of the typescript, the Bastions is always described as an alley (89.37, 113.3, 134.24, 138.28, 140.14), the correct word being obviously influenced by the French *allée*.

94.19 **bicycle.]** TS– bicycle . . . for her.” MS In executing this large deletion, Conrad probably discarded several pages of the intermediate typescript. He began a new batch of manuscript at MS 404, as the direction ‘1 copy today please’ at the top of the page indicates. He also began this page with the text from ‘distance’ to ‘heard by me’ (94.18–22), which repeats text at MS 401–02 at the beginning of the deletion. The text ‘and in the’ probably fell at the end of a page of intermediate typescript, requiring Conrad to begin the next batch of manuscript with text that was lost with the discarded typescript but was still needed for ongoing composition.

98.19 **guard]** **SE E1 E2** guards **MS-SA A1** There seems little need for changing the plural to the singular, but the proximity of another alteration clearly attributable to Conrad at 98.17 strongly suggests authorial intervention.

98.20 **day]** **MS-SE A1** the day **E1 E2** That Conrad used the phrase 'end of day' in a letter to John Galsworthy of 30 May 1908 (*Letters*, iv, 83) during the same period he was writing 'Razumov' suggests that E1's form is an editorial adjustment in the direction of standard idiom.

103.2 **had]** **MS-SA** has **SE-** The past perfect form was retained from the manuscript after the revision of the beginning of this sentence in the (now-lost) intermediate typescript. This could be seen as an editorial 'correction', or Conrad could have spotted the need for a change in tense. Without further evidence, it seems best to retain the manuscript reading.

103.24 **strength]** **MS** Strength **TSt** In comparison to the same word that opens this sentence in the manuscript, 'strength' is definitely lower-case. 'Spiritual' and 'Strength' are the last and first words on their respective typescript pages. The typist probably capitalized 'strength' in error.

106.3 **fell to]** **E1 E2** fell **MS-SE A1** Conrad or his editors – this is a genuine toss-up – apparently realized that if the door simply 'fell', it would mean it had loosened free of its hinges. The *OED* gives the definition 'to shut automatically' for this usage; cf. 'The door fell to, before I could get to it' (Wilkie Collins, *The Moonstone* (1868), 'First Period', ch. 16), and 'The oaken door fell to behind them' (M. Maartens, *Sin of Joost Avelingh* (1889), l.i.x.130).

110.1 **to-morrow]** **SE E1 E2** to to-morrow **MS-SA A1** Because A1 was set from SE proofs, the removal of 'to' must have been made in the set of proofs that went to the *English Review* and not transcribed into that sent to Harpers. This strongly suggests that Conrad was the source of this change.

110.9 **these]** **MS-SA** those **SE-** Miss Haldin's reference to 'these days' emphasizes the closeness of recent events. The change to 'those' is presumably a compositor's error.

110.20 **Mme]** **ED** Madame **SA E1-** Mrs **MS TS SE** The *English Review* failed to notice Conrad's anomalous 'Mrs', which all later texts changed. The typescript interchangeably uses 'Mme' and 'Madame', and the majority form is adopted for the present edition. (This has been silently emended at 128.33, 128.37 and 128.39.)

118.35 **bear.]** **TSr-** bear. ¶ It seemed . . . disenchantment. **MS** bear. ¶ It seems that she thought that teaching and invective and **TSt** Three sentences follow this in the manuscript. (For the full text, see 'Emendation and Variation'.) TSt's highly truncated text is probably the result of a page having been discarded following TS 298, the last line of which is struck out in blue pencil and is accompanied by the direction 'follow on the next page'. For further discussion, see Appendix C, pp. 599–600.

119.5 **jaws]** **SE E1 E2** jaw **MS-SA A1** With small revisions attributed to Conrad in the surrounding paragraphs, such a 'correction' arguably originated with him.

129.2 **Alexander II]** **MS TSr** Alexander VI **TSt** Alexander **SA-** Conrad's revision clearly exhibits his intention to correct the typist's error, which also caused a historical one, there being no tsar bearing the name Alexander VI.

131.15 **What eggs?**] **MS OM TS**– Deriving from Batch A, this change reflects the beginning of a closer relationship between the manuscript and typescript at 128.11 where no lost intermediate typescript need be considered when assessing the authority of variants. Given several occurrences of ‘eggs’ in the surrounding lines, this brief sentence was probably the victim of eyeskip.

132.39 **related to**] **E2**– related **MS–SE A1** Possibly an editorial ‘correction’, this change could also be attributed to Conrad, given the increasing number of his changes in the subsequent pages of E1.

134.12 **her**] **MS–SA A1** their **SE E1 E2** Miss Haldin is relating her visit to the Château Borel, not the visit of more than one person.

143.24 **met**] **SA**– meet **MS TS** SA’s revision is a reasonable alteration to accord with the past tense used throughout this paragraph.

144.10 **this**] **SE**– that **MS–SA** SE’s reading could represent editorial change made to match the previous use of ‘this’ (144.4), but given other authorial changes nearby, the balance tips to the author.

145.12 **confidant**] **SE**– confident **MS–SA** According to the *OED*, ‘confident’ was an acceptable variant of ‘confidant’ in the early nineteenth century, but by the end of the twentieth century’s first decade had become a misspelling. The word is thus emended to its more usual modern form. (SE’s form is also adopted at 219.33.)

146.22 **of what**] **MS–SA A1** that **SE** what **E1 E2** Several two-letter words in surrounding lines suggest that compositorial eyeskip caused ‘of’ to be dropped.

146.32–33 **empty tables**] **TS**– empty **MS** Falling at the end of a page, ‘empty’ was bereft of the word it modified. The typist’s correction is a reasonable response to the situation.

149.9 **world**] **MS TSt SA**– word **TSr** Conrad crossed out ‘world’ and then inserted ‘word, with the future’, introducing an error, but an obvious one and thus corrected by a typist (or editors or compositors).

150.35 **yawn**] **TS**– yawn. Was . . . yawn. **MS** Conrad crossed out ‘yawn’, the last word on TS 737, and added the direction ‘to p of MS. 792’. The first line of MS 792 begins with the word ‘yawn’, confirming the link. The omission from the typescript of the text that follows in subsequent manuscript pages occurred when the typescript page that ended a batch was discarded. See Appendix C, p. 600.

153.4 **have**] **SE**– had **MS–SA** Razumov could be speaking of his time in Stuttgart, making the past perfect tense the more appropriate one; but the change was probably made to accord with ‘have received’ (153.9). Given Conrad’s problems with perfect tenses, it could be argued that such a change was editorial; however, the close proximity of other authorial changes (152.35, 152.37) argues that he himself was responsible for this alteration.

155.14 **this**] **SE**– his **MS–SA** The *English Review*’s compositor arguably made this change in error, but nearby verbal alterations that are clearly Conrad’s suggest an authorial hand at work.

155.33 **stands**] **SA**– stand **MS TS** Revision in the typescript saw ‘should still stand’ changed to ‘still stand’, necessitating a correction to agree with ‘he’.

157.14 **young man**] SA– OM MS TSt young TSr Conrad failed to include a noun with his interlinear addition in the typescript, and the change made in the typescript prepared through Robert Garnett provides a necessary correction.

157.31 **catch-words**] E1 E2 OM MS TSt watch-words TSr–SE A1 This change transforms the suggestion of a password to one of a catchphrase, a subtle variation that might have resulted from error, but that is arguably authorial.

159.21 **same.**] TSr– same.” The ... ago. [drooped ... ago = OM TSt] MS TSt TSr's heavily truncated text is the result of the discarding of a page at the end of Batch E. Conrad added three lines in lead pencil to provide the link to Batch F's first page.

166.13 **glassy**] MA–SA A1 glossy SE E1 E2 This minor change is more likely a compositor's error than a genuine authorial revision. Conrad regularly used the word 'glassy' in descriptions of Peter Ivanovitch. See 128.13, 169.34, and MS readings in the apparatus at 177.38–39.

166.28 **close**] MS TS closely SA– Conrad's use of 'close' augments the tension in the room by drawing the two characters closer together; SA's unnecessary 'correction' merely modifies the verb, thus reducing this pressure.

168.9 **gospel**] SE E1 E2 gospels MS–SA A1 The omission of the 's' could be attributed to a compositor, but Conrad's nearby revision of 'Tales' in the typescript to 'Tale' and the significant number of revisions in SE at this point argue strongly for this as an authorial change.

168.37 **Voleurs! Voleurs! Voleurs!**] MS Voleurs! Voleurs! TSr– Eyeskip presumably caused the typist to miss out the final exclamation. Later occurrences (169.1) support the triple form.

170.40 **in**] SE E1 E2 to MS–SA A1 Such a small change is arguably a compositorial error, but more certain authorial alteration at 171.4 and 171.11 suggests Conrad's intervention as equally likely.

171.3 **the**] E1– a MS–SE It is established at 169.17 that Mme de S— is on 'the sofa'. The change to the definite article could have been an editorial correction, but is just as likely an authorial revision to accord with the situation described earlier.

171.37 **heads**] E1 E2 head MS–SE A1 Such a 'correction' is a genuine toss-up, attributable either to Conrad or to an editor. That said, the change to the plural matches 'They' in the next sentence and is consequently adopted here.

174.32 **which**] MS–SA that SE– Conrad often had difficulty with these words and the change is possibly an editorial 'correction'. In the absence of conclusive evidence the manuscript reading is retained.

176.39 **along the**] ED along two MS– When Conrad struck the 's' from 'corridors' in the typescript, he signalled an intention to change the form of this sentence. One obvious change would be to reduce the number of corridors from 'two' to one, thereby supporting the present edition's emendation.

178.5 **a sound**] MS–SA A1 sound SE E1 E2 With few revisions in the surrounding lines, SE's form appears to be a compositor's error.

179.30 **sort]** **MS-SA** sorts **SE-** The singular is unidiomatic but acceptable; the change to the plural was probably made by an editor or compositor. Emendation is also rejected at 181.14.

181.14 **an]** **MS-SA** a **SE-** The form 'an humble' was commonly used throughout the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, but by the time of writing was dated, apart from certain formulaic usages (e.g., 'An humble petition'). Conrad could easily have picked up this form in his reading and conversation, with the similar formula 'an hotel' still very much current in his day.

183.10 **suspect]** **MS-SA** a suspect **SE-** The addition of the indefinite article suggests that Tekla is guilty of a particular crime rather than a more general untrustworthiness. While it is possible that such a change is authorial, it is more likely an editorial 'correction' or a compositorial anticipation.

183.32 **would]** **MS-SA** should **SE-** The English serial form looks suspiciously like a 'correction' of the manuscript's and typescript's usage.

187.28 **an accent]** **ED** accent **MS TS** accents **SA-** Conrad first wrote 'He went on in accent' and started a new sentence. In the flow of composition, he struck out the incomplete sentence, going back to add 'of scrupulously [*sic*] inquiry' after 'accent'. Typically having problems with articles, he omitted that required here. SA patched the grammatical error by supplying a somewhat awkward plural, whereas the intention of the original formulation, unaltered in the revision of the typescript, is unambiguously singular.

187.33 **then]** **SA-** them **MS TS** The change to 'then' places the focus on Razumov, not on the revolutionists being discussed. Robert Garnett's valid 'correction' brings the sentence in line with Razumov's realization that he might not be regarded as 'the right sort' (187.6).

188.33 **me]** **MS-SE A1** of me **E1 E2** The addition of 'of' looks suspiciously like a 'correction' of informal phrasing.

190.16 **is]** **MS-SE A1** are **E1 E2** Conrad's verb agrees with 'a lot', and the alteration in E1 probably represents editorial meddling.

199.36 **as if]** **MS-SA** if **SE-** Possibly the result of eyeskip, the omission of 'as' creates a clumsy adjectival clause. Conrad may have made this change, but the isolation of this small omission from other revisions in SE strongly points to compositorial error.

200.19 **Petersburg]** **MS-SE A1** St. Petersburg **E1 E2** 'Petersburg' and 'St Petersburg' alternate throughout the typescript, but the formalising is probably an editorial 'correction'. E1's alterations are also rejected at 209.11 and 212.3.

201.13 **hands]** **SE-** hand **MS-SA** That both Haldin and Razumov are being discussed makes the plural appropriate. The evidence of Conrad's adding 's' to several words in the typescript tips the balance in favour of authorial change.

203.22 **looks]** **MS-SA** looked **SE-** In this sentence, Razumov sums up the woman he has just observed and the present tense makes more sense than SE's reading. The *English Review* compositor might have picked up 'looked' from the first line of the previous paragraph.

205.14 **hand]** MS-SA hands SE- On several occasions (at 205.21, for instance) Conrad squeezed an 's' after a word to make it plural, but here he is directing attention to single features such as the 'bloodless cheek' and the 'fat nape of the neck'. Highlighting the 'hand' at this point might have been designed to prefigure the violent act to come.

208.17 **it's]** MS-SA A1 it is SE E1 E2 The elimination of the contraction is more likely the result of compositorial 'correction' than revision. Conrad made no change of this kind in the typescript.

208.33 **is]** MS-SA are SE- Here and at 208.35 the 'police' are conceived of as a single entity rather than as a collective noun, a mistake commonly made by French speakers of English. In French, police is singular: *la police*. In English, such verb agreement was rare at the time of writing but frequent enough to overrule emendation. Cf., for instance, 'the police has' in *The Secret Agent* (p. 230.21). SE's form is thus an editorial 'correction'.

210.31 **have had]** MS TS had SA- Since at this point Razumov is unaware of Ziemianitch's death, the use of the present perfect tense makes sense.

220.22 **that]** SA- at that MS TS When Conrad cut 'hour of late afternoon' in favour of 'afternoon', he neglected to remove 'at', with Robert Garnett's correction a necessary one.

223.8 **unfrequented]** SA- unfrequent MS TS This anomalous form requires emendation; SA's editor's sensible change is adopted.

223.36 **the papers held]** ED with the papers crushed MS-SE A1 the papers holding E1 E2 Conrad probably meant to write 'papers held'. The clumsy construction in E1 could be an authorial one introduced in E1 proofs, but it could also have originated in a compositorial blunder. A decade later, the Doubleday and Heinemann collected editions corrected the error by moving 'holding' to create 'holding the papers in.' The emendation of the present edition, which changes 'holding' to 'held', comes closer to capturing Conrad's original construction.

227.18 **to require]** SA- for seeing MS TS for require TSr On changing 'seeing' to 'require' Conrad neglected to replace the preposition.

227.35 **intermediary]** MS-SE A1 intermediacy E1 E2 The change in E1 looks suspiciously like a compositorial error. In revising the typescript Conrad rewrote 'intermediary' after crossing out that word with others.

229.31 **robe:]** ED robe TSr The awkwardness of 'which it was' after 'robe' in TS must have caught Conrad's or a compositor's eye, either of whom might have tried to 'improve' the sentence. Removing the pronoun would have made more sense, but deleting 'which' leaves a sentence that requires punctuation.

231.20 **that]** MS-SA the SE- It is highly improbable that the same compositor set up the entire novel. Conrad's 'that' refers back to earlier scenes that a new compositor would not have seen, thereby influencing a change to the definite article.

231.23 **of logical]** MS-SA for SE- Conrad did not alter this when revising 'capabilities' in the typescript, and the change appears to represent editorial intervention.

231.39 **that]** MS-SA which SE- The presence of another 'that' earlier in the sentence probably influenced an editorial 'correction' of a repetition.

235.12 **and struggling]** MS-SE A1 a struggling E1 E2 The multiple appearances of 'a' nearby probably occasioned compositorial eyeskip. The retention of 'and' also makes more sense as it signals the end of a list of Razumov's qualities.

235.13 **in]** MS-SA A1 into SE E1 E2 This and the change from 'invested' to 'vested' (235.15) look to be connected. A compositor possibly mistakenly attached the 'in' from 'invested' to 'to'.

236.25 **was not]** MS-SA A1 not SE E1 E2 This change was probably caused by eyeskip after the setting of the previous 'was' in this sentence, or the word simply dropped out.

237.37 **grave]** MS-SE A1 gravely E1 E2 The change to 'gravely' modifies Councillor Mikulin's 'insistence', whereas the original formulation inserts a pause to direct attention to Mikulin himself. A compositor probably added the terminal '-ly' after setting 'softly' just beforehand.

240.4 **the]** MS-SE A1 a E1 E2 The alteration in E1 was more likely the result of compositorial anticipation than revision.

244.6 A] SA- That MS TS The retired official appears in a section excised from Part Second (see 87.4), and the change from a specific to a general identification is thus necessary because there is no longer a particular official to refer to. The change from 'official' to 'Russian' (244.7) follows through on the alteration.

245.38-39 **Mr Razumov daily,]** SA- Razumov MS TS Revision in SE to introduce 'as I have been meeting' is clearly connected to the 'daily' nature of the meetings, an addition in SA. Robert Garnett's correction is necessarily accepted.

249.23 **unpicturesque]** E1 E2 picturesque MS-SE A1 With revisions in E1 nearby, this change can be attributed to Conrad despite the possibility that a compositor could have been influenced by 'untidy' two words previous. In *Nostramo*, Captain Fidanza is also described as 'unpicturesque' (p. 527).

251.18 **her]** SA- the girl MS TSt the her TSr Conrad's failure to delete the definite article in revising the typescript mandates acceptance of SA's alteration.

256.37 **here]** E1 E2 there MS-SE A1 Miss Haldin refers to the place where she is currently situated, making 'here' the more appropriate choice, but the source of this correction – Conrad or an editor – remains a toss-up.

257.28 **lighted only]** E1 E2 lighted up only MS-SA A1 lighted SE Conrad continued to tinker with small clusters of words throughout the last months of his work on the novel. In the concentrated group of variants unique to SE, several occur where revision in E1 proofs supersedes a revision introduced in SE. In this case, Conrad did not touch the set of SE proofs sent to Harpers but made a change in the set he sent to the *English Review*. He either revised the set of SE proofs that went to Methuen or made this change in the Methuen proofs themselves, marking his final revisions to this small group of words. Similar examples occur at 257.39b, 263.1a, 263.37, 263.39, 264.14 and 268.36.

257.40 **nothing,]** SE nothing. Her white head was bowed. MS-SA E1- This revision is of a different kind from that discussed in the previous note. The omitted

sentence must have been in each set of *English Review* proofs, but was cut only from the set returned to the magazine. Revisions such as this indicate Conrad's final active engagement with the text at these points. One could argue that he passively authorized the readings transmitted to Methuen in the set of SE proofs that did not include all of these last revisions, but the present edition aims to offer a text that incorporates the author's final work. Even though E1 proofs, and Conrad's correction of them, follow SE proofs chronologically, the resulting last document, E1, does not always contain the author's final revisions. For further discussion of this topic, see 'The Texts', pp. 355–57. Similar examples occur at 258.8, 258.18, 258.40, 259.20, 260.15b, 260.17, 260.19, 261.21b, 261.21c, 263.21, 263.33, 264.5a, 266.24a and 269.19a.

261.28 **H'm] MS** It is **TS**– A typist misinterpreted Conrad's poorly formed 'H' as 'It' and the scrawled 'm' as 'is'.

265.3 **had] SA**– has **MS TS** Given that the narrator refers to the couple's first meeting, the past tense is unavoidable.

265.21 **in, in] SA A1** in **MS TS SE E1 E2** Conrad squeezed 'her deep' into a heavily blotted line in the manuscript. It is probable that the additional 'in' lies under this. Conrad evidently noticed the repetition of 'in' and struck it out without seeing the consequence.

266.12 **Providence] SA**– providence **MS TS** Following the introduction of 'Providence', here noted, 'Devil', 'Father' and 'Lies' in this paragraph were put into upper-case in E1 proofs. This kind of change is unlikely to have been effected by an editor as it involves emphasis.

267.6 **who] MS-SA** whom **SE**– The change towards formality in direct speech suggests an editorial 'correction' of grammar.

268.34 **No] MS-SE A1** Not **E1 E2** Because the sentence beginning with 'No' is repeated in the next line, the addition of a 't' is probably a compositorial error.

272.34 **said.] SE** said. Your [Your = and your **Tsr SA E1**–] eyes were trustful **MS-SA E1**– It must have been when adding 'Yes ... eyes' in SE proofs (272.37) that Conrad went back to delete the now-repeated note of her trustful eyes at 272.34. This happened only in the set for SE. This section is part of its last instalment where the triplicate proofs attracted separate proofreadings by Conrad and when the sets of SE proofs destined to serve as A1 and E1 setting copies had probably already been despatched: see 'The Texts', pp. 336–38.

273.21 **price] SE** prize **MS-SA E1**– In the typescript a 'c' and 'z' are typed atop one another, one presumably correcting the other. Similarly, in the manuscript a 'z' is scrawled over a 'c', but in the typescript it is difficult to determine which letter is the correction. Garnett's typist evidently decided a 'z' was intended. Having probably despatched the sets of SE proofs to serve as A1 and E1 setting copies for this last part of the novel, Conrad must have decided to change to 'price', which is accepted here.

279.30 **he heard] SA**– heard **MS TS** The sentence requires a subject, and SA's solution has been unhesitatingly adopted.

282.23 **about her] SE**– her **TS/MSSA** Conrad crossed out 'as to' in the holograph and probably added 'about her' when preparing the *English Review* text many months later.

283.37 **five]** SA- half past **TS/MS** Conrad wrote 'half past' at the end of a line, probably forgetting to add the number after a brief pause. The revision to 'five' is likely to be an authorial solution to the omission.

284.16 **sat down]** SA- down **TS/MS** Conrad began a page with 'down' probably forgetting to add the verb after turning the previous page. Either he or a typist caught the error.