

THE TEXT OF JOHN STUART MILL'S *AUTOBIOGRAPHY*

By JACK STILLINGER, M.A., Ph.D.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

IN a recent paper on the neglect of textual problems in the novel, Professor Bruce Harkness posed the questions, "How many know . . . what [text] they have been teaching? . . . Can not we know *what it is* we have in our hands?"¹ His point applies to other prose as well. Some months ago I had occasion to tell a group of students reading Victorian prose in the anthology by C. F. Harrold and W. D. Templeman just what text of a chapter of Mill's *Autobiography* they had "in their hands". With an announced principle of basing their text on "that of standard and accepted editions",² Professors Harrold and Templeman had reprinted (with a single correction) the text of an early impression of Harold Laski's Oxford World's Classics edition (1924). Laski's text represents an imperfect and in-edited reprinting of the earliest issue of the first edition (1873), which, in turn, is an inaccurate and considerably altered printing of a manuscript based on Mill's own final holograph version but edited and to an extent revised by his stepdaughter, Helen Taylor. The students were thus four or five times removed from Mill's own version of the *Autobiography*.

Doubtless they were unimpressed by the fact, but in these progressing days of textual criticism every scholar will recognize that it is a sad state of affairs when one is aware of having to use an unreliable text, but also of not knowing wherein consists the authoritative version. Very little work has been done on the text of the *Autobiography*.³ Until recently, there have been only

¹ "Bibliography and the Novelistic Fallacy", *Studies in Bibliography*, xii (1959), 67, 73.

² *English Prose of the Victorian Era* (New York, 1938), p. v. Chapter V of the *Autobiography* is included on pp. 707-27.

³ The single piece of scholarship on the subject is A. W. Levi's "The Writing of Mill's *Autobiography*", *Ethics*, lxi (1951), 284-96, which, despite several incidental errors, is an admirable pioneer work, whose conclusions are still largely valid as to dating and process of composition.

two sources of text, the first edition of 1873 and the version in Mill's hand preserved in the Columbia University Library and used as the basis for an edition published by the Columbia University Press in 1924. There are many substantive variants between the two sources, and one could not know, at any given point of disagreement, which version was authoritative. Last July, however, the third of the known manuscripts, the press-copy of the *Autobiography*, came to light when it was acquired by the John Rylands Library. Its discovery now clarifies the relationships between manuscripts and printed text, and for the first time makes possible, with some degree of confidence, the definitive printing of Mill's work.

I

Three manuscripts of the *Autobiography* were among the collection of Mill's letters and papers owned after Mill's death by Helen Taylor, bequeathed by her to her niece Mary Taylor, and sold by the executors of the latter's estate in March 1922. They are listed together, "a large parcel", as lot 720 (third day) in Sotheby's sale catalogue of 27-29 March 1922: "MILL (John Stuart) Auto. MS. of his AUTOBIOGRAPHY upwards of 220 pp. 4to; with an earlier draft of the same in his hand, and a copy, mostly in the hand of Helen Taylor, *with the suppressed passages*". The "large parcel" went for £5 5s. to Maggs Bros., who resold the manuscripts separately.

The "earlier draft" was purchased from Maggs by Jacob H. Hollander (1871-1940), Professor of Economics at the Johns Hopkins University, who kept it until his death, after which it was stored in a Baltimore warehouse. In 1958 it was acquired with the rest of Hollander's library by the University of Illinois.¹

¹ Though Hollander read a paper on the manuscript before the History of Ideas Club at Johns Hopkins on 13 December 1923, students of Mill were generally unaware of its existence until Professor Levi examined it in 1941 and published excerpts in "The 'Mental Crisis' of John Stuart Mill", *Psychoanalytic Review*, xxxii (1945), 86-101, and in the article in *Ethics* (1951) cited in the preceding note. For many years subsequently it was inaccessible to scholars. The excerpts in F. A. Hayek's *John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor* (Chicago, 1951), pp. 31-2, 42, and Michael St. John Packe's *The Life of John Stuart Mill* (London, 1954), pp. 33, 51, 76, derive from the first of Levi's articles, or, in one instance (Hayek, p. 42), from Levi's own notes.

The manuscript is in fact the original draft of the *Autobiography*, consisting of 139 leaves of the first completed version and thirty leaves of rejected text. Written in the late months of 1853 and the early months of 1854,¹ it represents a complete account, as Mill then would have given it, of his life up to his marriage in 1851, the equivalent of the first 168 pages of the Columbia University Press edition.² Its significance to the study of Mill lies in showing how much of the final text of the *Autobiography* Mill got written down in 1853-4; in revealing an early intention to divide the *Autobiography* into two parts, the first covering his life before he met Mrs. Taylor, and "Part II." beginning with his "first introduction to the lady whose friendship has been the honour & blessing of my existence"; and in providing, in passages either cancelled in the manuscript or subsequently omitted, new light on Mill's personality. To the extent that Mill represents not so much a collection of ideas as a complex mental phenomenon in many ways epitomizing the condition of the nineteenth-century intellectual, these passages are quite valuable, and justify the separate edition currently in progress. As a source of text, the manuscript is of negligible value, except as it serves to confirm readings in the final version—for example, "retinences" (144 : 18), which occurs in all manuscripts and as a corrected state in the first edition. In the World's Classics edition Laski printed "reticences", with the note "retinences 1873 : qy. misprint. Cf. O.E.D."; the Columbia editor printed "reticences" without comment. Clearly Mill intended "retinences"; the word should be restored to his text, and his meaning ("controls", "restraints") should be entered in the next supplement to the *Oxford English Dictionary*.³

¹ See Hayek, pp. 190-7. The dating, which agrees with Professor Levi's (*Ethics*, pp. 290-3), will be discussed in a forthcoming edition of the manuscript.

² *Autobiography of John Stuart Mill*, with a preface by John Jacob Coss (New York, 1924). I have taken this edition, edited by Roger Howson, as my standard for reference. Unless another edition is specified, parenthetical documentation in my text, such as "(144 : 18)" in the first instance below, will always refer to this edition by page and line numbers (p. 144, line 18, in the example given).

³ At present the only definition given by the *O.E.D.* is "Power of coherence", with a single example dated 1642. I should add that the New York sub-edition

The second manuscript, to take them in the order in which they were written, was bought by John Jacob Coss for members of the Department of Philosophy at Columbia, who presented it to the Columbia University Library in April 1923.¹ Consisting of 210 leaves, not counting leaves left blank by Mill or used as wrappers, it represents the final holograph version of the *Autobiography*. The first 162 leaves, sewn in twenty-leaf gatherings marked A-I (with the initial leaf of A and the last seventeen leaves of I left blank), are a revised version of the Hollander-Illinois first draft plus a three-page continuation (Columbia edition, pp. 168-70); they were written in 1861. The remaining forty-eight leaves, marked K and made up of twenty-four sheets folded separately and unsewn, are the first (and only) draft of the rest of the *Autobiography*, written in the winter of 1869-70.² The text of the Columbia manuscript varies from that of the first edition (1873) in the following major particulars: (1) a paragraph of the Columbia text (170:35-171:9) was omitted; (2) the remaining nine paragraphs of transition in the Columbia text (169:4-180:11) were rearranged in the order 4-5, 1-3, 9, 6-8 (171:10-176:20, 169:4-170:34, 180:6-11, 176:21-180:5); (3) some fifty or more lines of the Columbia text were "suppressed" in 1873 (184:35-6; 185:2-10, 12-13, 16-18; 186:19-20, 26-7; 189:36-190:5; 214:4-30; 216:4-16; 221:13); (4) some eighty other substantive changes (verbal changes and omissions) of varying length and importance, and several hundred accidental variants (changes in spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and the like) were made. Given the two sources of text, until last year it was impossible to know which was authoritative.

In the *Times Literary Supplement* for 7 August 1959 (p. 459), I enquired about the third of the manuscripts sold at Sotheby's, published by Henry Holt in 1873 (see below) and the 191-page undated "new edition" published by Longmans perhaps in the first decade of this century both reproduce the uncorrected reading of the first issue, "reticences".

¹ It is the only one of the manuscripts that I have found advertised in a Maggs catalogue. In catalogue 436, *Original Manuscripts . . . of Celebrated Authors* (London, 1923), it is item 196, priced at £17 10s.

² The dating is based on Helen Taylor's notes in the 1873 edition, pp. 240, 251; on Mill's own text—"the question now stands (1870)" (201:21-2); and on Helen Taylor's manuscript continuation of the *Autobiography* printed below.

the "copy, mostly in the hand of Helen Taylor, *with the suppressed passages*". By a rare coincidence, it had been discovered and identified only eleven days earlier by the Rylands Keeper of Manuscripts, Dr. Frank Taylor, while examining a miscellaneous collection of letters and papers in the London salerooms of Messrs. Hodgson. It was acquired by the Rylands Library at the last sale of the season, on 30 July.¹ Beyond the obvious likelihood that the manuscript has remained in England, I have learned virtually nothing of its history during the thirty-seven-year interval between auctions. In 1923 or early 1924, when preparing his *World's Classics* text, Harold Laski approached the owner of the manuscript (apparently through Sotheby's or Maggs), but was refused permission to see it, and had to write in his introduction (p. xi), "I have been unable to obtain permission from the present owner of the complete text to reproduce it verbatim". Dr. Joseph Hamburger, of the Department of Political Science, Yale University, informs me that in conversation some eleven years ago Laski indicated that Lord Rosebery (1847-1929) had been the owner, but I have so far been unable to confirm the fact.² Of its more recent history, Messrs. Hodgson were unable to say more than that the manuscript was among a number of miscellaneous collections made up of various properties bought from time to time. Regardless of provenance, however, the manuscript is a valuable acquisition.

II

The Rylands manuscript (English MS. 1243), preserved complete except for the absence of the first leaf, which perhaps served as a blank wrapper or contained the title, consists of 282 leaves, written in three hands on at least two kinds of paper.

¹ For a fuller account of its discovery and acquisition, see Professor Edward Robertson's article, "Sought-For Manuscript Comes to Light", in the *Manchester Guardian*, 19 August 1959, p. 5.

² In reply to my enquiry, Mrs. Laski was unable to name the then owner, but recalled that Laski approached him indirectly, and that the owner was quite insistent in refusing. Professor Hayek has kindly passed along to me an anecdote of Laski's, that in answer to his letter the owner had sent an unsigned note saying the pleasure of possessing a manuscript consisted in the fact that nobody else could see it.

I shall describe its three parts in the order in which they were written.¹ The first consists of twenty-three leaves of blue paper, without watermarks, measuring $12\frac{4}{5}$ by $8\frac{1}{16}$ inches, in the hand of Helen Taylor.² Originally twelve sheets of paper were folded together once, and sewn down the centre to form a gathering of twenty-four leaves. The first leaf is now lost; on the second Helen Taylor began the text of Chapter I, and copied from Mill's final draft (the Columbia manuscript) on rectos and versos until she finished the verso of the eighth leaf (paginated 14), after which she wrote only on recto sides. This part thus contains thirty pages of text, leaves 2-8 (rectos and versos, paginated 1-14) and leaves 9-24 (rectos only, foliated 15-30), the equivalent of pages 1-31 (to the middle of line 14) of the Columbia edition.

Part two consists of twenty-three leaves of white paper, without watermarks, varying in size from roughly $11\frac{1}{2}$ to 12 inches in length and from $8\frac{1}{2}$ to 9 inches in breadth. Written on one side only, the twenty-three leaves represent a fresh start at transcribing Mill's final draft, and give the text of pages 1-25 (entire) of the Columbia edition. The hand is so far unidentified. Dr. Taylor and his colleague in the Department of Manuscripts, Miss Glenis A. Matheson, agree that it is continental in appearance, possibly French; the readings "the successives phases" (1: 18-19), "ressource" (2: 28), "litterary" (3: 12), "A few years later" (10: 1), "correspondance" (18: 19-20), "failiness" (twice, 22: 16, 17, for "failures"), and "implicite" (24: 21), as in general the many blank spaces and misreadings that were left to be filled in or corrected by Helen Taylor, tend to confirm their opinion.

The third part consists of 236 leaves of white paper similar in size and appearance to that of part two, and also written on one side only. The leaves, foliated 31-150, "150 bis", 151-265, and representing the text of pages 31 (from the middle of line 14) through 221 of the Columbia edition, were written in alternate

¹ I wish to record my thanks to Dr. Frank Taylor, who most generously has volunteered information and answered many queries during my investigation of the Rylands manuscript.

² The K section of the Columbia manuscript is also written on blue paper without watermarks, but its leaves measure $10\frac{1}{4}$ by $8\frac{1}{2}$ inches.

sections by Helen Taylor and Mill's sister Mary Elizabeth Colman,¹ as follows: fols. 31-8, 124-42, 185-265 by Helen Taylor; fols. 39-123, 143-84 by Mary Colman. The sections correspond to the lettered gatherings of the Columbia manuscript: Helen Taylor finished copying the gathering marked B, and went on to E, G, H, I, K; Mary Colman copied the gatherings marked C, D, and F.

From these three parts, the other hands sporadically corrected by her, Helen Taylor made up the copy from which the first edition was printed. To the twenty-three leaves of part two, in the continental hand, she added five leaves from her own original transcript (part one), tearing the leaves foliated 26-30 from the sewn gathering described above, renumbering the first of them "24, 25, 26", and deleting the last eleven and a half lines of the continental hand's folio 23 in order to make the connection with her own text. The 236 leaves of part three made up the rest of the press-copy; the whole is marked for printing, with compositors' names in pencil at intervals and other press markings in blue and black pencil and in ink.²

The question of dating is, of course, crucial, and unfortunately the first two parts of the manuscript cannot be dated with any precision. It is a fairly safe conjecture that Helen Taylor began the copying, since the continental hand's part two (fols. 1-23 of the press-copy) was taken over in the press-copy to replace her own transcription of the same text. But since both parts derive independently from Mill's final draft, the order cannot be proved, and it is not clear why part two was used at all, because, even after Helen Taylor read over and corrected it, it contained some 370 more variants from Mill's final draft than her own copy of the same text, and, more significantly, some ninety substantive variants (all but two of them errors) against her own more modest twenty-five. She may have chosen it

¹ The identification of this hand, which I have since confirmed by comparing reproductions of Mary Colman's letters and the manuscript, was first made by Dr. Marjorie Plant, Deputy Librarian of the British Library of Political and Economic Science.

² The manuscript is now preserved in the press-copy arrangement described above, with the rejected eighteen leaves of Helen Taylor's original transcription (part one) relegated to the end.

for its more elegant appearance—the hand, despite its failings in accuracy, is neater and more legible than her own—or she may have reasoned (wrongly) that it guaranteed a better text, since she had herself corrected it.¹ In any case, since both parts transcribed the early pages of Mill's final draft, which were written out in revised form from the Hollander-Illinois draft in 1861, they could have been copied at any time after 1861 and before Helen Taylor came to England with the manuscript in 1873.

With part three, forming the bulk of the press-copy, the problem of dating can be dealt with more satisfactorily. The presence of Mary Colman's hand is significant. After the more or less complete break with his family in 1851,² Mill apparently became reconciled with his sister in the 1860's, for in a draft letter of 6 January 1871 he states his intention of increasing from £80 to £100 an annuity that he had offered her "several years ago".³ Late in 1872 or at the beginning of 1873, Mary Colman and her daughter Minnie visited Mill and Helen Taylor at Avignon, where they made plans to remain for a year. But in January 1873 word came from another of Mill's sisters that Mary Colman's favourite son Archie had died by drowning on the first day of the year, and their plans were thus interrupted. By the end of February, furnished with money by Mill, Mary Colman and her daughter had returned to England, and taken lodgings in Bristol, in order to provide a home for another son, Henry, who wanted "regular & steady habits".⁴ In an undated letter to

¹ It is similarly not known why the continental transcriber stopped (if he did) with folio 23. One may speculate (1) that he gave up the copying as too difficult—he obviously had much trouble in deciphering Mill's holograph—or (2) that Helen Taylor took the manuscript to England to continue the copying there, while the continental transcriber remained in France.

² See Hayek, pp. 171-5; Packe, pp. 351-7, 505.

³ British Library of Political and Economic Science, Mill-Taylor Collection, vol. 47, item 54. I am considerably indebted to Mr. C. G. Allen, Senior Assistant Librarian, for selecting and sending photostats of the relevant documents, and to the Librarian for allowing me to quote unpublished passages from them. In my quotations I have omitted words deleted in the originals.

⁴ Helen Taylor to Stuart Colman (a draft), February 1874; Harriet I. Mill to J. S. Mill, 14 January 1873 (Mill-Taylor Collection, vol. 20, item 202; vol. 2, item 229).

Helen Taylor, written shortly after their arrival in Bristol, Mary Colman reminds her of her promise "to write if I can be of *any* service to you or John".¹

In early May 1873, when she read in the newspapers that Mill was seriously ill, Mary Colman telegraphed to Helen Taylor, "Shall I come? Can start immediately".² Probably Helen Taylor replied that she should not, for the next relevant document, a letter written to her from Paris, 13 May, by another of Mary Colman's sons, Stuart, begins, "We thought that you might like to have my Mother with you—and as she had already started, when your letter arrived I telegraphed the substance to her in London".³ Possibly Helen Taylor was herself preparing to cross the Channel. In midsummer she was in England, "pressing on as quickly as I am able" with the publication of the *Autobiography*, "having come to England for that purpose only".⁴

Mary Colman's opportunities for transcribing her sections of the press-copy are thus limited, from the available facts, to (1) the winter of 1872-3, when she and her daughter visited at Avignon; (2) possibly May 1873, when she may have returned to Avignon immediately after Mill's death; and (3) the summer of 1873, when she could have assisted Helen Taylor in England. The remaining evidence strongly supports the likelihood that part three was copied after Mill's death, and in England rather than at Avignon. For one thing, in a letter to Alexander Bain, 14 September 1873, writing of the passages about herself in the *Autobiography*, Helen Taylor says, "I never saw these passages until it was too late to ask him [Mill] to erase them".⁵ If she speaks the truth, she could not have copied any of Mill's text beginning with page 184 of the Columbia edition until after his death.

¹ Mill-Taylor Collection, vol. 20, item 187.

² Mill-Taylor Collection, vol. 20, item 188 (I have corrected and punctuated the French clerk's copy of the message). The telegram is dated 8 May, one day after Mill's death.

³ Mill-Taylor Collection, vol. 20, item 197.

⁴ From a note or letter drafted on the back of a letter from the editor Howard Evans, dated 30 July 1873 (Mill-Taylor Collection, vol. 53, item 58).

⁵ Mill-Taylor Collection, vol. 4, item 18. The full text of this draft is given below.

In the manuscript itself there is evidence that part three was copied all at one time, and that the work was done hastily, probably just before it was sent to the printer. It has been noticed earlier that part three was written alternately by the two women in sections corresponding to the lettered gatherings of the Columbia manuscript. On the last leaf of each of Mary Colman's sections and two of Helen Taylor's three sections (fols. 38, 123, 142, 184) the text ends short of a full page; the readiest explanation is that the two women copied simultaneously. From the presence of pencilled markings referring to the Columbia manuscript, and the manner in which the press-copy was foliated, the process of simultaneous copying can be reconstructed as follows.¹

While Helen Taylor copied the remainder of the Columbia gathering B, foliating 31-8 from her transcription of the preceding text (part one, which ended with fol. 30), Mary Colman began copying Columbia C, numbering her leaves 1C, 2C, and so on to 27C (fols. 39-65). By the time Mary Colman reached 27C, Helen Taylor had finished folios 31-8, foliated Mary Colman's leaves already copied (1C-26C), and given her the proper number for the leaf she was then writing; Mary Colman continued copying C and D, foliating as she wrote (fols. 65-123). Meanwhile Helen Taylor copied Columbia E, numbering, from the second leaf, E2, E3, and so on to E19 (fols. 124-42), and then went on to G, which she numbered in the same manner (G1-G19, fols. 185-203). She apparently left Columbia H and the three pages of I for Mary Colman to transcribe, and went on to Columbia K, numbering again in the same manner until she reached K6 (fol. 231). At this point it must have become clear to her that Mary Colman was lagging too far behind, whereupon she returned to the last leaf of her transcription of Columbia G, added "H1" after the "G19" already at the top of the page,

¹ The facts may be summarized in a note. In part three Helen Taylor copied fols. 31-8, 124-42, 185-265; Mary Colman copied fols. 39-123, 143-84. Pencilled references to the Columbia manuscript appear as follows: 1C-27C (fols. 39-65), E2-E19 (fols. 125-42), G1-G18 (fols. 185-202), "G19 H1" (fol. 203), H2-H17 (fols. 204-19), K2-K6 (fols. 225-8, 231, which, as I shall show subsequently, were first foliated 227-31). Helen Taylor foliated 31-64, 124-43, 185-265; Mary Colman foliated 65-123, 144-84.

and began (with a different pen) copying H where she had left off at the end of G. When Mary Colman finished Columbia D, Helen Taylor foliated the leaves of her own copy of E (fols. 124-42) and the first of the leaves (fol. 143) on which Mary Colman was to begin copying F. The latter finished copying F (fols. 143-84) apparently when Helen Taylor was writing H17 (fol. 219), whereupon Helen Taylor foliated her own transcription from G1 on (fols. 185-219), finished H, copied I, foliated her six leaves already copied of K, and then continued to the end, foliating as she wrote.

Obviously the copying was done simultaneously in order to gain time. Further evidence of haste lies in the large number of errors in this part, and in the fact that although Helen Taylor here and there corrected and punctuated Mary Colman's transcript, she could not have read it over entirely or attempted to prepare it in any thorough way for the press. Mary Colman's pages of the press-copy went to the printer with more than 1,200 variants from Mill's text unaltered, including some 170 substantive variants—all of them errors, and many quite obvious.¹

III

The *Autobiography* was published by Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, "8vo. price 7s. 6d.", on 17 October 1873.² The "second edition" of 1873 is apparently a re-issue of sheets from the first impression, with a cancellans title-leaf pasted to the stub of the original title and a twelve-page index inserted between signatures Y1 and Y2 and pasted to Y1.³ Several

¹ Several of her variants—"much" for "such" (55 : 7), "few" for "view" (60 : 6), "since" for "hence" (65 : 11), "well" for "fell" (105 : 17), "progress" for "process" (112 : 6), "advice" for "device" (114 : 30), "needs" for "creeds" (117 : 5), and perhaps even "Brown" for "Owen" (118 : 9)—as well as her habit of joining separate sentences, suggest that Mary Colman copied at least partly from dictation.

² See the *Athenaeum*, 11, 18 October 1873, pp. 451, 508; *The Times*, 17 October 1873, p. 6.

³ It is possible that this re-issue represents a second impression, but I have assumed otherwise for lack of evidence. Facts drawn from an examination of three copies cannot, of course, produce bibliographical conclusions; they may, however, serve to initiate research into the printing of the work. Dr. Taylor has enquired in many directions seeking records of the original printers, Savill, Edwards and Co., but without success; Longmans' records of transactions with this company were destroyed by enemy action in 1940.

variant states within the first impression may be identified:¹ 5 : 25, "Theoctetus" (Houghton), "Thecætetus" (Hollander), "Theætetus" (2nd); 113 : 9, "effect me" (Houghton, Hollander), "effect on me" (2nd); 156 : 4, "eine furchtliche Fortschrei-" (Houghton), "ein fürchterliche Fortschrei-" (Hollander, 2nd); 206 : 9, "reticences" (Houghton), "retinences" (Hollander, 2nd); 273 : 1, "there-" (Houghton), "there" (with space for the missing hyphen, Hollander, 2nd); 292 : 17, "defending" (Houghton), "defeating" (Hollander, 2nd); *erratum* leaf correcting 113 : 9 inserted between signatures Y1 and Y2 (Hollander; absent in Houghton, unnecessary in 2nd).² In the first week of November, a sub-edition was issued in New York by Henry Holt and Co., from plates of the first issue. Omitting the *erratum* leaf, it contains the uncorrected readings "Theoctetus", "effect me", "eine furchtliche Fortschrei-", "reticences", but also the corrected reading "defeating"; in addition, it corrects a misprint common to the London issues, "abandoniug" (123 : 15), and replaces a dropped-out hyphen in "country-" (285 : 6).

From collation of the Rylands press-copy with the Columbia manuscript and the 1873 edition, it now appears a near miracle that the printed text preserved as much of Mill's final draft as it did. For, to be brief, the press-copy shows over 2,650 variants from the manuscript on which it was based. The figure includes more than 450 substantive variants—verbal changes and the omission of some 580 of Mill's words, not counting the

¹ In this paragraph, page and line numbers refer to the 1873 edition; the designations "Houghton", "Hollander", and "2nd" refer, respectively, to (1) a copy of the first issue in the Houghton Library, Harvard University (TP2138.79.4); (2) the Hollander copy of the first issue in the University of Illinois Library; and (3) Illinois' copy of the second issue (B/M645/Ed.2). Dr. W. H. Bond has kindly checked readings in the Houghton copy.

² The Oxford World's Classics edition took its text from a copy containing at least three uncorrected readings, "Theoctetus", "eine furchtliche Fortschrei-", and "defending" (the last is emended to "defeating", with the note, p. 248, "defending 1873: misprint"), but with the corrected reading "retinences". It introduces some twenty-five new accidental variants, and four substantives. In impressions after 1944 (the latest I have examined before that of 1958), several lines were reset at the foot of pp. 137, 152-3, 168, 184-5, and in the process a fifth substantive variant (the omission of "an") was introduced on p. 137.

“suppressed” passages omitted in proof-stage—and roughly 2,200 accidental variants (the running-together of separate sentences, variants in paragraphing, spelling, punctuation, italicization, capitalization). To ignore the accidentals and speak only of substantives: the continental hand was responsible for ninety-five variants, of which two were corrections of errors in Mill’s draft; Mary Colman introduced 172 substantives, all of them errors; Helen Taylor was responsible for 190, of which three were corrections.

What is remarkable is that of these 452 variants, not including the five corrections or the “suppressed” passages, only sixty survived proof-correction and appeared in the first edition—three from the continental hand’s transcript, nine from Mary Colman’s pages, and forty-eight from Helen Taylor’s. Proof-correction against Mill’s final draft, whether by Helen Taylor or by some other person (for example, Alexander Bain, who was reading the text of the *Autobiography* in the weeks just before it was published), must have been extensive, since Mill’s text was therefore substantively restored in some 390 places (not to speak of printer’s errors); most of the accidental variants were similarly corrected. A list of substantive variants from Mill’s final draft that originated in the press-copy and were retained in the first edition may be given here:¹

10 : 12	or] and (14 : 14)	35 : 33	it] this (50 : 26)
10 : 19	those] these (14 : 21)	47 : 2	“Jurisprudence”] on Jurisprudence (66 : 9-10)
24 : 36	ordinary corrupting] corrupting (35 : 18)	57 : 21	an official] official (81 : 14)
28 : 29	factitious] fictitious (40 : 17)	61 : 10	Torrens. Under ³] Torrens, and under (87 : 11)
30 : 34	men whom] men (43 : 21)		
33 : 23	sloth ²] ease and sloth (47 : 17)		

¹ The reading of the Columbia manuscript is given first, with page and line reference to the Columbia edition (which does not, however, always give the reading of the manuscript: see below); that of 1873 follows, with reference to the first edition in parentheses. Two uncorrected readings in some copies of the first edition—“Theoctetus” and “defending”—also derive from the Rylands press-copy.

² In the manuscript, Mill first wrote and deleted “indolence”, then interlined and deleted “ease”, and finally interlined “sloth”.

³ In this reading and five others (163 : 29, 167 : 16, 169 : 26, 194 : 18, 194 : 36), Mill first wrote the version given by the Rylands copyist, who either overlooked Mill’s subsequent emendation or preferred the earlier reading; for various

JOHN STUART MILL'S *AUTOBIOGRAPHY* 233

- 67 : 14 extraordinarily] extraordinary (96 : 3-4)
 79 : 16 passing] passive (113 : 10)
 83 : 32 in] on (119 : 21)
 85 : 18 grounded] founded (121 : 28)
 86 : 31 Cooperative] Co-operation (123 : 26)
 103 : 25 should] I should (147 : 8)
 107 : 23 though] although (152 : 26)
 107 : 28 those] these (153 : 3)
 111 : 3 notion] notions (157 : 23)
 130 : 9-10 a very early] an early (185 : 20)¹
 133 : 9 those] these (189 : 28)
 138 : 18 title] title of (197 : 19)
 144 : 9 as far as] as (205 : 26)
 156 : 28 &] or (223 : 13)
 156 : 32 for] for the (223 : 18)
 158 : 35 intuition] intuitive (226 : 20)
 160 : 29 by far the] the (229 : 11)
 163 : 29 modern] and modern (233 : 20)
 166 : 32 for] of (238 : 4)
 167 : 16 & feeling] or feeling (238 : 27)
 169 : 26 To] and to (249 : 20)
 172 : 30 expressing] exposing (243 : 16)
 173 : 27 are] were (244 : 22)
 174 : 29 said] already said (245 : 23)
 174 : 29 the] this (245 : 23)
 176 : 23 that] which (251 : 24)
 178 : 13 many of their] their (254 : 7)
 179 : 22 framed] formed (256 : 2)
 181 : 25 palliatives] palliations (258 : 24)
 182 : 34 of] to (260 : 18)
 182 : 35 ingenious] vigorous (260 : 19)
 185 : 11 another such] another (263 : 25)
 191 : 16 threw] throw (272 : 20)
 194 : 18 In] and, in (277 : 5)
 194 : 36 & under] under (277 : 25)
 198 : 26 who . . . society,] omits (283 : 9)
 198 : 33 give] give answers (283 : 16)
 199 : 21 offended] affronted (284 : 15)
 200 : 9 my own] my (285 : 14)
 201 : 2 zealous response] response (286 : 17)
 202 : 29 this] the (289 : 7)
 203 : 21 before] when (290 : 4)
 206 : 12 England] for England (294 : 2-3)
 207 : 4 of] for (295 : 6)
 208 : 36 House] House of Commons (297 : 25)
 211 : 34 our] the (301 : 20)
 215 : 26 the] to the (306 : 2)
 217 : 1 I took] taken (307 : 7)
 221 : 7 weeks] few weeks (313 : 4)
 221 : 10-11 especially . . . Society,] omits (313 : 8)

In addition, the press-copy was the source of the rearrangement of nine paragraphs (169 : 4-180 : 11) and of the omission of another (170 : 35-171 : 9), as already described.² Of the Rylands folios 224-33, covering the text in question, five leaves also bear pencilled K markings referring to the Columbia draft, as follows : 225 = K2, 226 = K3, 227 = K4, 228 = K5, 231 = K6. Moreover, folios 225-8 were first foliated 227-30, the numbers being later erased and rewritten. The evidence shows that reasons it is impossible that Mill altered his draft after the press-copy was written. Some of his alterations were made with a faint pen, and some imperfectly (e.g. more than half of his original ampersand at 194 : 18 remains undeleted). In one case (194 : 36), the manuscript reading is questionable.

¹ The press-copy originally had " a very early "; " very " was deleted, leaving " a early ".

² See above.

Helen Taylor originally copied (and numbered her pages accordingly in pencil) the text of the first eight leaves of Columbia K in Mill's order, and that, upon deciding to re-order the paragraphs, she partly recopied the text but managed to use five leaves of her first transcript in the new arrangement. Folios 224, 229, 230 (which is spaced out toward the end), and 233 represent a revised transcription. The original order thus stood: 224-6 (three leaves rejected, now lost), 227-32, 233 (rejected, now lost); the revised order now stands: 224 (revised transcript), 225-8 (originally foliated 227-30), 229-30 (revised), 231-2, 233 (revised). The most important change in Mill's text was therefore made by Helen Taylor at a fairly late stage, after Mill's draft was transcribed in the press-copy, and after the press-copy's leaves (for this section, at least) were numbered.

Helen Taylor was also responsible for the omission of the "suppressed" passages. All were originally copied into the press-copy, and only a part of one (214 : 9-30, beginning "though delicate health") was deleted before the manuscript went to the printer; they were, as the asterisks in the 1873 edition make sufficiently clear, cancelled in proof-correction. She worried a great deal over these passages. In response to Alexander Bain's advice concerning them and some passages praising Mill's wife,¹ she drafted a long letter discussing the problem, defending her

¹ In letters of 6, 13 September 1873 (Mill-Taylor Collection, vol. 4, items 15, 17). In the first of these, Bain writes: "There is, indeed, one matter of extreme delicacy, which I have hitherto not remarked upon, but now at last venture to touch: I mean, the terms used in speaking of your mother. Of course, I know well the strength of his admiration for her great and various gifts, and I counted upon his expressing himself very strongly. But I greatly doubt the propriety of your printing those sentences where he declares her to be a greater poet than Carlyle (176), and a greater thinker than himself—and again, a greater leader than his father (or at all events an equal) 205. [He refers to pages of the first edition.] I venture to express the opinion that no such combination has ever been realised in the history of the human race, and I am sure that many will take the same view: and the whole of his statements will be treated as pure hyperbole, proving, indeed, the strength of his feelings, but not the reality of the case. I think that your mother, yourself and Mr Mill, will all be placed in a false position, before the world by such extreme statements. Of course, I do not wish you now to consider the re-casting of the eulogy, but I would earnestly desire that you should omit those three phrases of comparison. The incredulous world will be sufficiently startled by what still remains".

publication of the work, and explaining that Mill left "to no one living, but to me, the power to use any discretion in the matter". Written from Monmouthshire, where she was staying with Lord and Lady Amberley, and dated a little over a month before the *Autobiography* was published, the letter is remarkable enough to be given in full: ¹

Ravenscroft, Chepstow, 14th Sept^r 1873

I feel deeply grateful to you for your letter, and it fully justifies the opinion I had ventured to form of what you would be likely to do. I could have wished only that you had not hesitated to say at once whatever were yr impressions on this or any other topic.

From the point of view of a true and judicious friend of Mr Mill, of his reputation and of his influence at the present time, I believe that you are right; and if so a doubt may arise whether the time has come when the book ought to be published. If the book as it stands is calculated on the whole, all things considered, to diminish the influence of Mr Mill's opinions, it may be right to withhold it until those opinions have had some time to be fairly tested without prejudice.

I have thought much and anxiously about the passages you mention and many others besides that relate to my father my mother and myself. No task can be conceived more painful to me personally than that of publishing the book; if I followed my own inclination I should certainly leave it to be published after my death.² It cost me much meditation and many struggles before I could make up my mind that the impulse I felt at a moment of intense & painful excitement was a right one, & that the book ought to be published at once; & with no substantial omissions or alterations. And now, before answering yr letter I have gone over the whole subject again in my mind.

All the earlier part of the Memoir was revised at least twice by Mr Mill himself. It expresses no passing mood or youthful enthusiasm, but the settled convictions of the experience of forty years. What is said in it was published by himself in terms scarcely, if at all, less open to criticism (*teste* Mr Grote's judgment)³ during his life time. He said these things when he was a young man, a

¹ Mill-Taylor Collection, vol. 4, item 18. In three places I have omitted a word inadvertently left undeleted in revision.

² She left two identical signed notes in the Columbia manuscript (on the first leaf of A, and on the first of two sheets used as wrappers for K), directing that Mill's final draft was "To be published without alterations or omissions within one year after my death".

³ In the letter of 6 September, Bain continues: "To give you some idea of the effect produced by the language already published regarding your mother, I may mention the impression made by it on the mind of the gentlest of human kind, and Mr Mill's tenderest friend—Mr Grote. His remark was to the effect that 'only John Mill's reputation could have survived such an exhibition'. We all admire his [Mill's] courage in avowing his feelings; but if people get the idea that he was liable to exaggerated judgments when the feelings were concerned, they will be apt to set aside his authority on questions generally".

middle aged man and an old man ; he said them publicly & privately, in words in writing and by his actions. He wrote them deliberately & revised them at intervals of long years in a memoir he left behind him expressly that the world might know what manner of man he was, and in his Will he directs that this memoir is to be published within two years of his death, leaving to no one living, but to me, the power to use any discretion in the matter.¹ I know that he trusted me fully ; he told me repeatedly that if I survived him he wished me to use my own judgement in regard to his writings[;] but then I know also that he trusted me because he knew that I regard the general good above all considerations personal either to him or to myself, and truth as essential to the general good. Nothing that I knew of him gave me any reason to suppose that he would have trusted me if he had not known this. The harshest critic could not say of him that he was given to trusting many people nor on short acquaintance.

It seems to me therefore that my duty to his memory, my responsibility to him, cannot be at variance with what is best and rightest in itself. Now, looking beyond the immediate present, can it be right for us to tone down the deliberate and reiterated statements of the impressions of a remarkable man, until we bring them into harmony with the preconceived opinions of the world in general (or of ourselves) as to what his impressions ought to have been? Either the presumed opinion of the world in general (as to which we, like other critics, may be mistaken) is right, or it is wrong. In either case it seems to me false to our own philosophy, to our belief in the value of experience, to attempt to hide this glaring discrepancy between what the world says can be and what a man of trained logical intellect & precision of language, asserts to have been. If this were merely one of the ordinary instances of an extraordinary man sharing common weaknesses it would still be doubtful whether it is not right to permit such instances to be recorded, at least whenever the record will not inflict pain on individuals still living. But, even supposing the world to be right, this is not even such a well known phenomenon. Ordinary men cannot, by the nature of the case, make the mistake Mr Mill made if he did make a mistake, for the very pith of it consists in his statements as to qualities & powers on which ordinary men never dream of having an opinion except what they take from the extraordinary men. Moreover one may safely say that very few peoples experience can furnish them with even a single instance of ordinary men persisting for forty years in saying anything in the least resembling the things which Mr Mill says ; and certainly the history of literature does not furnish another instance. If, on the other hand, the world is wrong in its estimate of human character & faculties, how is it to make progress if the evidence for exceptional facts is to be hushed up and hidden, for fear of its incredulity?

The idea that what Mr Mill has written is the fairest indication of his character, has induced me to leave a great part of what he has written about myself,² yet I

¹ Similarly Mill left his correspondence in her hands, " with directions, verbal & written, to deal with them according to my judgement " (Helen Taylor's note, already cited, drafted on the back of a letter from Howard Evans : Mill-Taylor Collection, vol. 53, item 58).

² In the letter of 13 September (which Helen Taylor may not have received when she drafted the present letter), Bain comments : " It is a position of no small delicacy, as well as of great honour, to yourself, to be commemorated in such

do not see the same objection to omitting this, because it seems to me to come under another category. I never saw these passages until it was too late to ask him to erase them, but I know that he agreed in the rule that nothing known from private intercourse ought to be published if it gives pain to living persons. If, therefore, on the one hand, the picture of his life is incomplete without these passages, on the other, I am entitled to claim their omission if they exhibit me to the world in a light I have a right to object to. In themselves of course they cannot do so; that he should have thought so of me, & even that others should know he thought so, must be gratifying in its own nature even if he only thought so from affectionate prejudice; but as published by myself they may be supposed to indicate a ridiculous vanity in me. I certainly do not agree in them & would rather not publish them, but I am so hardened to what I dislike that I would publish them or not with equal indifference, & should be glad of advice to help me to form a judgement as to the least of three evils—to suppress particular passages—to publish them—or to keep the book back altogether.

The omission of the passages about Helen Taylor was not the only change made in the course of printing. The 1873 edition introduced eighteen new substantive readings that derive from neither Mill's draft nor the Rylands press-copy, and were therefore made by the compositor in printing or by Helen Taylor or someone else in proof-correction:¹

26 : 16	well as] well (37 : 20)	161 : 28	were now] were (230 : 22)
28 : 30	excellencies] excellences (40 : 17)	163 : 30	occasions] occasion (233 : 21-2)
29 : 5	could] can (41 : 3)	173 : 36	conscious] conscious of (244 : 31) ²
42 : 4	or] or to (59 : 24)	174 : 37	methods] method (245 : 31)
51 : 19	on] in (72 : 22)	189 : 27	prevailing] which prevailed (270 : 12)
88 : 23	splendid] fine (126 : 12)	200 : 4	rather] more (285 : 8)
117 : 28	works] work (167 : 10)	201 : 13	who] and who (287 : 2)
128 : 1	have] had (181 : 28)	213 : 21-2	admitting] to admit (304 : 2)
134 : 9	excellencies] excellences (191 : 13-14)		
147 : 1	methods] method (210 : 1)		

lofty terms. You have considered well the question as to the publishing of such a eulogy while you are still alive; and I do not wish to interfere with your judgement. One thing, however, I would suggest, in accordance with what I have already ventured to remark upon: that is, the danger of too pointed comparisons. I would recommend to you, under all the circumstances, to decline the compliment, for yourself, of being more original than Mr Mill."

¹ As in the earlier list, the reading of the Columbia manuscript and reference to the Columbia edition are given first.

² For Mill's "conscious how much of her" (173 : 36), the press copy, omitting two words, has "conscious of her".

Of Helen Taylor's three notes in the 1873 edition, two (pp. 251, 265) appear in the press-copy, with the signature "Ed." at the end of each. There is no trace of the third note (p. 240), "Written about 1861.", which presumably was added during proof-correction. In connection with her editing, it is perhaps worth mentioning that there is, in the British Library of Political and Economic Science, a two-page draft continuation of the *Autobiography* in her hand, relating events of Mill's life after 1870, the year at which he left off writing. Intended as an appendix or a final note, the draft appears unfinished, possibly because she could not bring herself to describe Mill's final illness and death, or perhaps merely because she did not complete it before the work was ready for the press. For the record I shall transcribe it here : ¹

The last portion of this memoir was written, at Avignon, in the winter of 1869-1870. The works mentioned in the concluding paragraph are two—one on Socialism upon which the author was still occupied to the last, & which therefore is in an incomplete state ; & one on Theism which he had finished, but kept by him, as was his custom with most of his works, for further consideration & re-touching. The last three years of his life were fully occupied with literary work in addition to these more important productions ; and he himself was of opinion that if his life were prolonged to complete it, his work on Socialism would rank as, at the least, on a level with that on Representative Government. Of his work on Theism the world will be able to judge.²

Early in the year 1870 he was in England & delivered a speech at a meeting held at the Hanover Square Rooms in favour of women's suffrage. This was the last speech he spoke on that subject with the exception of one at Edinburgh in January 1871. During the year 1870 he wrote three articles for the *Fortnightly Review* ; one on Professor Cliffe Leslie's work on the Land Systems of different countries ; one on Taine's work "De L'Intelligence" & one on "Treaty Obligations" : he also wrote two letters to the *Times* in the month of November 1870 on the same topic. They were called forth by a cry, that arose at that time in a portion of the English press, for plunging England into a war with Russia. They were the first protest that appeared in any well known name against such a war ; they called forth others & helped to calm down the warlike excitement that was being aroused.

¹ Mill-Taylor Collection, box 1, item 32.

² "Chapters on Socialism" appeared in the *Fortnightly Review*, new ser., xxv (1879), 217-37, 373-82, 513-30. [*Three Essays on Religion: Nature, the Utility of Religion, and Theism* was published by Longmans in 1874. The writings mentioned in the following three paragraphs are entered in the *Bibliography of the Published Writings of John Stuart Mill*, ed. Ney MacMinn, et al. (Evanston, Ill., 1945), which was edited from a manuscript notebook that Helen Taylor undoubtedly consulted when she drafted this continuation of the *Autobiography*.

In 1871 he spoke at a public meeting called by the Land Tenure Reform Association, a speech which was afterwards published by the Association. During that year he was much occupied with the subject of Land Tenure. He wrote for the Land Tenure association a programme or Expository Statement, setting forth his scheme of reform, and explaining his idea of the equitable claim of the State, as representing the Community, to the increase in the value of land that may arise from the labour of the community as a whole, and at the same time, suggesting the appropriation of this increased value by means of a land tax. Sir Henry Maine's work on Village Communities interested him greatly at this time, bearing as it does on the question of the tenure of land, & he wrote a review of it for the Fortnightly Review, published in May 1871. The illness & death of his old friend Mr Grote; the threatening illness of a younger but not less valued friend to whom he looked as the man best qualified to carry on his own work; & the failing health of a member of his own family, combined to depress his spirits during the spring & summer of this year & he derived so little benefit from several botanizing excursions he took with an old friend in Cornwall Yorkshire & Scotland, that there seemed danger of his own health giving way. A few weeks in Switzerland & a residence at Avignon however produced the effect that mountain air & a southern climate seldom failed to produce on him, & he seemed to have recovered his usual health. In November 1871 he published, in the Fortnightly Review, an article on Berkeley's Life & Writings, suggested by Professor Fraser's new edition of Berkeleys Works.

In the first half of 1872 he was chiefly occupied with the preparation of a new edition of his System of Logic, upon which he bestowed more than usual time & labour. The summer of that year was spent in the Alps of Tyrol, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, Friuli & Venetia, and it was his invariable custom to do no literary work during the excursions he took for health. In the autumn & winter he wrote a review of Grottes Aristotle, published in the Fortnightly Review for January 1873, and two articles for the "Examiner" (published Jan^y 4th & 11th 1873) on Land Reform.

IV

I have dwelt more particularly on the press-copy and the edition of 1873 in order to explain the ways in which variants from Mill's final draft were introduced into the printed versions. The importance of the Rylands press-copy lies not in its text as such, but in the fact that it provides the necessary evidence for establishing a proper text of the *Autobiography*. That part three was copied hastily and imperfectly almost certainly after Mill's death, that the whole of the press-copy was sent to the printer with hundreds of errors uncorrected, that all the variants from Mill's final draft had their origin as errors or revisions made in transcribing or in printing and proof-correction—these, along with the fact that there is no evidence, internal or external, that

Mill had a hand in any part of the press-copy, all point to the conclusion that there is but a single authoritative source of text for the *Autobiography*, the draft in the Columbia Library.

One might suppose, therefore, that the Columbia edition is, as it is often called, "definitive". The fact is otherwise; for its editor too frequently depended on the 1873 edition as an aid in reading Mill's hand. The result is that his text, "the definitive printing of Mill's own hand, accurately . . . follow[ing] the varying capitalization and punctuation of the manuscript" (p. v), actually departs from Mill's draft in some 900 particulars. Among these are fifty-four substantive variants, of which five are corrections, made independently or in accord with the 1873 edition, but in any case without comment: "think it" for the manuscript's "think" (17:24), "with which" for "with" (17:31), "according to" for "according" (130:4), "would become" for "would be become" (188:16),¹ and "1862" for "1861" (189:35). Of the remaining forty-nine, twenty-six originate as independent errors or misreadings (perhaps six of them misprints), and twenty-three derive from the 1873 edition. Six of the latter represent the retention of independent errors or changes made in the course of printing the original edition; for the seventeen others, the Columbia editor, always ostensibly following the Columbia manuscript, is in the curious position of having printed variant readings originating with the Rylands press-copy and perpetuated in the 1873 edition. The following list (in which the manuscript reading is given first) may serve to emend the Columbia text:

5:31	where] when	42:4	or] or to
7:14	know] knew	46:15	that] the
10:12	or] and	46:34	improvement] improvements
13:29	know of] know	61:10	Torrens. Under] Torrens, and under
15:3	roused] aroused	65:30-1	aristocratical] aristocratic
23:32	on] in	68:5	law of] laws of
28:19	an Evil] Evil	71:34	at] to
29:5	could] can	79:16	passing] passive
29:35	ideal] idea	83:32	in] on
30:34	men whom] men		

¹ In revisions at 17:24 and 188:16, Mill inadvertently struck through "it" and left "be" undeleted.

85 : 18	grounded] founded	167 : 35	evolution] elevation
93 : 1	this time] this	170 : 36	leave] have
103 : 25	should] I should	171 : 25	preceded] preceded it ²
121 : 19	roused] aroused	171 : 26	her] my wife's
126 : 27	or] of	182 : 34	of] to
128 : 1	have] had	185 : 11	another such] another
133 : 9	those] these	191 : 16	threw] throw
134 : 9	excellencies] excellences	194 : 36	& under ³] under
138 : 22	become] became	200 : 9	my own] my
144 : 18	retinences] reticences	201 : 13	who] and who
152 : 19	effect ¹] effects	202 : 29	this] the
156 : 28	&] or	214 : 17	adhesion] adhesions
156 : 32	for] for the	214 : 21	part] past
158 : 35	intuition] intuitive	214 : 25	Glasgow] and Glasgow
161 : 28	were now] were	220 : 13	me] be

Clearly a new scholarly text is in order, based on a fresh examination of Mill's final draft. Its editor may wish to expand abbreviations, emend Mill's punctuation in a more reasonable and consistent manner than has hitherto been achieved, reduce unaltered capital letters of initial words rearranged into some other position within a sentence, and perhaps make other changes according to stated editorial principles. In most respects, including Mill's characteristic spellings (e.g. "shew", "cotemporary", "burthen", "stile"), the draft can be reproduced verbatim.⁴ As this article goes to press, word comes from the University of Toronto Press that detailed plans are being drawn

¹ The manuscript reading is perhaps questionable; in the Hollander-Illinois draft Mill clearly wrote "effect".

² In this and the next entry, the Columbia editor accepted alterations to Mill's draft interlined in pencil by Helen Taylor. Elsewhere he printed five words (the parenthesis at 32 : 19) that are deleted in pencil, presumably by the same hand.

³ As noticed earlier, the manuscript reading is questionable.

⁴ If the editor has the luxury of a full textual apparatus, he may wish to give cancelled readings in the notes. One interesting deletion, hitherto unpublished, occurs in the Columbia manuscript at 216 : 16, a sentence written on the verso of the preceding leaf and marked for insertion after "were hers.": "I must add that whatever has been done by us for the diffusion of our opinions & of our principles of action by private intercourse & the direct influence of mind over mind, has been almost wholly her work, my own capacities of the kind being almost confined to my writings : & no one but myself knows at how great a sacrifice both of her personal tastes & inclinations & of her health that function was performed by her."

up for a scholarly edition of Mill's collected works, with a volume to be devoted to the *Autobiography* and other personal documents. If it attends to the evidence offered by the Rylands press-copy, it can, where the *Autobiography* is concerned, be the first edition to give all the words that Mill intended to have published.