

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

“An appreciative and grateful author”: Edith Wharton and the House of Macmillan

Journal Item

How to cite:

Towheed, Shafquat (2005). “An appreciative and grateful author”: Edith Wharton and the House of Macmillan. *Publishing History*, 58 pp. 43–77.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2005 not known

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

‘AN APPRECIATIVE AND GRATEFUL AUTHOR’: EDITH WHARTON AND THE HOUSE OF MACMILLAN

BY SHAFQUAT TOWHEED

I. CHOOSING THE HOUSE OF MACMILLAN

In December 1896, as Edith Wharton was preparing her first major work, *The Decoration of Houses*, for publication, an intriguing offer came her way. Her friend, sister-in-law and confidante, Minnie Jones, a reader for the New York office of the Macmillan Company, suggested that her firm might be interested in taking the work. The manuscript, co-authored with the architect Ogden Codman, was submitted for consideration and, in February 1897, was provisionally accepted for publication by Macmillan’s established, and by now fully independent, New York office. No sooner had the initial offer been made than the firm seems to have had grave doubts about whether it would sell, and in March 1897 the two authors were summoned to a meeting with the company’s autocratic and domineering first President, George Platt Brett. The meeting went badly, and, unsure about the potential sales of a work on the history of European interior design and its relevance to American domestic furnishing, Brett cancelled the provisional agreement. Recrimination ensued, not between the authors and the publisher, but between the co-authors, with Wharton blaming Codman for mishandling the negotiations with Macmillan and declaring boldly that, in future, she would ‘make it a condition that you leave the transactions entirely to me’.¹

Chastened by the loss of the Macmillan contract, Wharton offered up the manuscript to the next most logical choice – the publisher of her early verse, the established New York firm of Charles Scribner’s Sons – who, in their contract, offered a modest ten per cent royalty to be split between the two authors. Despite the fact that Scribner’s was not effectively her first choice for the work, she diligently saw the project through to completion and, as her biographers have noted, negotiated hard with her editor at Scribner’s, William Crary Brownell, over every aspect of the book’s production – paper quality, typeface, binding, the number of illustrations (particularly the half-tones), the lettering on the front cover, and even the style of print used on the title-page. *The Decoration of Houses* duly appeared on 3 December 1897, and Scribner’s London agent attempted to find a British publisher for the work, sending it to the reputable firms of Kegan Paul and Chapman & Hall, but to no avail, both houses rejecting it out of hand. Eventually, B. T. Batsford, a publisher specializing in ornamental books on interior design, gardening and architecture, agreed to take the work, buying 400 copies of unbound sheets from Scribner’s plates for the British market. *The Decoration of Houses* appeared on Batsford’s ‘List of Standard Books on Ornament and Decoration’ in July 1898, handsomely bound and

priced at 12s 6d.² While the book, effectively a style guide for the more aesthetically and culturally insecure members of America's rapidly expanding *nouveau riche*, sold well at home, going into a second edition in 1901, it made little impact in Britain. In 1927, when Wharton was asked by her friend Robert Bliss to send him copies of all of her publications in an attempt to secure for her the Nobel Prize for Literature, she admitted that this particular book was one of only three works that was unobtainable, even at the best London bookshops.

In many ways the trajectory traced by Wharton's first co-authored work of non-fiction is entirely unremarkable. The overwhelming majority of first submissions by unpublished authors to an established London publishing house like Macmillan were rejected; even though the wholly independent New York office, as Elizabeth James has shown, was considered to be more adventurous in entertaining new authors, particularly novelists (a career Wharton was already determined to pursue), the likelihood of rejection was extremely high.³ What is remarkable is that, in the negotiated space between Wharton's offer of the manuscript to the New York office of the Macmillan Co. and its eventual acceptance and publication by Charles Scribner's Sons, we are offered the narrative trace of her considerable ambition as a writer who insistently demanded both critical and commercial recognition of her literary genius from publishers, readers and reviewers alike.

Wharton's initial rejection by Macmillan Co. did not deter her in the slightest from thinking of them as future custodians of her work. She clearly viewed Macmillan as a critically esteemed, culturally discriminating and commercially successful publishing house, and one that operated to the highest standards in the industry. Writing to Brownell, Scribner's urbane and knowledgeable literary consultant, over her dissatisfaction with their promotion of her collection of short stories, *The Greater Inclination*, in April 1899, Wharton contrasted Scribner's handling of the book with what she perceived to be, accurately enough, the practice of other established publishers, Macmillan among them. 'You will pardon me for saying that I do not think I have been fairly treated as regards the advertising of *The Greater Inclination*', she complained.⁴ Never one knowingly to undersell herself – 'it has met with an unusually favourable reception for a first volume by a writer virtually unknown', she informed Brownell – and aware of her potentially large elite readership on the other side of the Atlantic (the book had been 'taken up by an English publisher within a fortnight'), Wharton presented her reputation as being hampered by Scribner's ineffective deployment of modern methods of advertising:

So much for my part in the transaction: now as to Mr. Scribner's. I have naturally watched with interest the advertising of the book, & have compared it with the notices given by other prominent publishers of books appearing under the same conditions. I find that Messrs. McMillan [*sic*],

Dodd & Mead, McClure, Harper etc, advertise almost continuously in the daily papers every new book they publish, for the first few weeks after publication, giving large space to favourable press-notices; in addition to which, they of course advertise largely in the monthlies.⁵

Ever since the advent of commercially profitable book retailing, the accusation of not having one's work promoted vigorously enough has been one of the commonest charges levelled by authors against publishers. Coming at a time of increasing commercialization and competition in the publishing industry, Wharton's objection appeared to be yet more grist to the grinding mill; but what is interesting is the extent to which she understood the complicity (and influence) of authors themselves in the life of their books *after* publication. Her approach was both didactic and pragmatic, offering Brownell the example of other publishers who, in her eyes, represented best practice ('Messrs. McMillan, Dodd & Mead, McClure, Harper etc') in promoting the work of their authors, while conceding that she alone could not change Scribner's existing advertising policy: 'I don't of course, flatter myself that there is any hope of modifying the business methods of the firm.'⁶

Wharton was clearly keen to consolidate her position in a publishing house that was capable of promoting her work through modern, targeted advertising strategies, thereby ensuring both the largest possible readership and the maximum available remuneration for herself. But, at the same time, she wanted her work associated with the highest standards in book production. Her choice of London publisher for her first collection of short stories, *The Greater Inclination* – John Lane at the Bodley Head – exemplified this conviction of the importance of the material production and presentation of her work.⁷ Despite her natural inclination towards putting her name only on the best-produced and -designed books, such as the Bodley Head's exquisite, hand-stitched, art nouveau volumes printed on hand-made paper, she was perfectly aware that the small print runs of coterie publishers could not deliver her the mass readership, and with it the concomitant earnings, that she wanted for her future works of fiction. For Wharton, the challenge was clearly to identify publishers that could best meet these needs by consolidating her position within their author lists, and to negotiate the conflicting tensions between aesthetic sensibility and her increasing appetite for popular acclaim and substantial financial rewards. As such, the trajectory of Edith Wharton's affiliation to her chosen publishers on both sides of the Atlantic moved inexorably from the coterie to a mass market, the modalities of production from niche publication to [segmentation at multiple price points?? – multi-formatted editions??], and her positioning within the publishers' fiction lists from a peripheral to a central one.

Even at the very beginning of her literary career, Edith Wharton was not averse to reminding her publishers of the potential value of her work to them over the course

of a lifetime. At the end of the letter to Brownell, she offered her editor a clear warning, declaring unequivocally that ‘Mr. Scribner’s methods do not tempt one to offer him one’s wares a second time’.⁸ In offering one of her next works of non-fiction, *Italian Villas and Their Gardens* (1905), to the Century Company, the firm that would publish almost all her work in the United States after 1919, Wharton again brought up the spectre of the best practice expected by her in editorship and book production, warning her future editor, Richard Watson Gilder, of her insistence upon exact standards of editorial sensitivity and excellence:

There is one thing which I must stipulate; & that is that, in the publication of the book, what I consider the rules of English spelling shall be respected. In the magazine I suppose one must submit to being Websterized; but I can’t stand the thought of being made to say clew & theater permanently, & as the Macmillans & Scribners respect these prejudices on the part of their authors, I am sure the Century Co. will show the same consideration.⁹

Just as Wharton had used Macmillan as her exemplar in order to chastise her editor at Scribner’s, so here she brought Scribner’s and Macmillan’s policy of accommodating her personal insistence on English spellings to bear upon the Century Co., a publishing house with a greater emphasis on uniform mass production and distribution. Wharton also established her authorial aesthetic sensibility: while she was prepared to have her serialized work ‘Websterized’, she was not prepared to accept such a perceived lowering of standards for the volume publication. She effectively privileged the published book, revised by its author and presented on the list of a recognized and established publisher, as the definitive text containing her final authorial intentions. As such, a common pattern emerges in the publication of almost all of her writing in the first quarter of the twentieth century: initial magazine serialization for the American market, followed by (sometimes significant) revision and volume publication, and finally publication in London for the British market, with the last few errors and omissions corrected, often at the very last minute.

This sequence of publication was predicated on both legal and commercial imperatives. The first ten of Wharton’s works published by Macmillan appeared after the establishment of the United States’ International Copyright Act of 1891, but before the coming into force in July 1912 of the 1911 Copyright Act in the United Kingdom, a piece of legislation that immensely improved both the domain and effectiveness of copyright protection for British authors and, through bilateral conventions and reciprocal agreements, that of American writers publishing in Britain. In contrast to British writers in this period, Edith Wharton and her fellow American authors were in a relatively privileged position in the British market between 1891 and 1909. The 1891 Act, while offering some protection to foreign authors, insisted that the manufacture and first publication of a work had to take

place in the United States before their country of origin, and that the deposit of a copy had to be at the designated copyright library – the Library of Congress. This posed an exacting dilemma for British authors attempting to exploit their newly acquired legal right to earn royalties from US copyright protection, as each work would have to be published virtually simultaneously on both sides of the Atlantic in order to meet the protectionist terms of the Act. For many British publishers, this proved to be a formidable challenge. Type would have to be set and plates produced and shipped to the United States before those for home publication; overseas publication and deposition for copyright protection would also have to be organized – a sequence of events that required a high level of co-operation between publishers on both sides of the Atlantic.¹⁰ The situation was even trickier for serializations, where the publication of the American number would have to be on the same day, or earlier, than that of its British equivalent.

The ideal for British authors with a transatlantic readership was the serialization of their fiction in both Britain and America, followed by volume publication in both markets. This sequencing would allow their greatest exposure to different types of readership, in both serial and volume form, and the largest financial reward for their efforts, as well as providing extra time for further polishing and revision. However, the anomalous state of international copyright law meant that this was difficult to achieve without compromising the legal standing of the work. This iniquitous situation persisted until 1909, when an amendment to the Act offered British authors a sixty-day grace period between publication at home and the publication and deposit of their work in the United States, thereby allowing the logistics of simultaneous serialization to be resolved.

As an American citizen, albeit an increasingly non-resident one, none of these specific and peculiar conditions applied to Edith Wharton. She was protected by United States copyright law in her home market and, by virtue of British publication and deposition after first American publication, was guaranteed copyright protection in Britain. Owing to the significantly lower rates of payment for serial fiction, she had no interest in the serialization of her fiction in Britain, although the bulk of her work was serialized in America, mainly in *Scribner's Magazine*. After the spectacular success of *The House of Mirth* in America in 1905, she commanded a premium price in her home market, and had no real need to offer her work for serialization in Britain. While British authors had to ensure that first publication and deposition of copies took place in America on the same day, or before, it took place in Britain, Wharton was under no such legal constraint. As a result, all but two of Macmillan's London editions appeared weeks, and sometimes months, after the American versions, giving her the time and opportunity to make final corrections and revisions.¹¹ For example, as well as making final corrections on galley slips, Wharton made specific changes to Chapter 8 of *The House of Mirth* at the page-proof stage, and made

numerous corrections to *Summer* (1917), once again privileging Macmillan's London editions as the definitive texts for posterity.¹²

As George Ramsden has demonstrated, after 1907 a substantial proportion of the editions of Wharton's own books collected in her personal library were of Macmillan's corrected and revised London first editions; consequently, and predictably, American first editions of her books are often encrusted with corrections and revisions that were normalized only in the Macmillan text (where extant), raising serious textual and interpretative implications on which many of Wharton's editors have been silent. The novella *Summer* is a case in point. Ramsden notes that the Appleton first edition in Wharton's private library is marked with 'extensive holograph corrections'; Wharton personally requested Scribner's to return the original typescript for correction for the Macmillan edition, observing that in the New York edition 'several bad misprints have been made, & as I have sent for the only copy I possessed of the MS., I write to ask if you will kindly send me a typed copy of the last paragraph of chap. XV'.¹³ Ramsden correctly observes that these authorial alterations were 'incorporated into the first English edition (Macmillan, 1917) but modern reprints have followed the uncorrected version'.¹⁴ Both artistically and aesthetically, Edith Wharton required a London publisher – effectively, a *re-publisher* – who would maintain the accuracy of her typography and the integrity of her style, and also be able to publish, distribute and promote her work quickly, thereby helping to consolidate her literary standing in Britain. Most importantly, Wharton needed a London publisher that she could trust with her revised, definitive, volume text. For every stipulation, Macmillan proved the best solution.

Certainly, the final authorial intention and execution of almost all her texts is best represented by the British volume publication of each work; and, for the majority of her literary life, the imprimatur that sanctioned this definitive text was that of the House of Macmillan. Throughout her life, Wharton kept faith with the tactile and other material qualities of the printed book, an ideal that had been lodged irrevocably in her childhood pre-literate memory by her handling of volumes by Tauchnitz and Galignani, and which she would later recount with affection in *A Backward Glance* (1934) as instrumental in her compulsion to 'make up'. Wharton's choice of an establishment publisher, who would strive to accommodate her particular vision of the production and presentation of her work, was entirely predictable and clearly predicated on longstanding material and intellectual concerns.

Even before she had established her name and reputation with Scribner's, Edith Wharton had threatened them with the prospect of her defecting to another publisher, one which would help her more fully to realize her somewhat heady literary and financial aspirations. Yet, despite these oft-repeated intimations of possible defection, Wharton remained surprisingly faithful to her chosen publishers, staying with Scribner's in New York and Macmillan in London for two decades. Effectively,

almost all of Edith Wharton's oeuvre was handled by just two publishers in the United States—Charles Scribner's Sons for all but two of her works before 1919, and Appleton (later the Century Co.) all but four of her works, and all of her fiction, bar *A Son at the Front* (1923), after 1919. For British readers in the same period, nearly all of their encounters with Wharton's writing, from the publication of the novella *Sanctuary* (1903) until Appleton took over her British rights in September 1921, took place via the imprimatur of the House of Macmillan.¹⁵ While Wharton's professional relationship with her American publishers, particularly with Scribner's, has been investigated, her parallel relationship with the London House of Macmillan, which is just as fully documented in the archives, has received little scrutiny.¹⁶ Until the sale of her British rights to Appleton, Macmillan remained Edith Wharton's London publisher of choice, nor was she alone amongst her social and literary peers in choosing this firm for her work: Henry James, Vernon Lee, Walter Pater, Rudyard Kipling, Oscar Wilde, and (until her defection to Smith, Elder) Mrs Humphry Ward, all regarded the House of Macmillan as the preferred destination for their work—even when their submissions were turned down as a result of the firm's stringent reader's report policy, or their association with the publisher proved to be less financially rewarding for both parties than anticipated.¹⁷ In terms of both commercial acumen and cultural prestige, Macmillan was clearly viewed almost *instinctively* by aspiring high-culture authors as their publisher of choice, and, in this respect, Wharton's instinct was no different.

II. MACMILLAN'S PUBLISHING PRACTICE

The successful novelist's instinct for finding the right publisher for their work is often supported and vindicated by both quantitative and qualitative empirical data. Macmillan's position during the last quarter of the nineteenth and the first quarter of the twentieth centuries demonstrates the extent to which this particular house became the natural home for quality novelists aspiring both to commercial success and critical esteem. As Simon Eliot has demonstrated, in his detailed bibliometric analysis of the first half-century of Macmillan's activity as a publisher, a firm that had started out as the imprint of a bookshop at 57 Aldersgate Street in 1843 had, by the end of the century, become one of the most important and influential participants in British publishing, effectively reshaping the industry and increasingly acting as a cultural arbiter in defining literary consumption for both the élite and the masses.

Throughout the first half-century of its existence, Macmillan had increased the number of titles it published (which nearly quadrupled, from 45 to 171 per annum, in the three decades from 1856 to 1886) as well as the size of its average print runs (which more than doubled in the same period), thereby consistently increasing its market share.¹⁸ While Eliot observes that 'from the mid-1860s onwards the trends

in Macmillan's annual title production began to parallel those of the industry as a whole', he has also identified specific peculiarities about that production, such as the remarkable longevity of titles in Macmillan's increasingly consolidated list, and the consistent rise in the proportion of reprinted titles. As Eliot notes in his detailed analysis of the reprints, Macmillan was 'becoming spectacularly more successful in identifying potential winners, and thus building a sustained and profitable backlist', thereby guaranteeing the firm's future prosperity and the prestige of its list.¹⁹ As the century progressed, and Macmillan consolidated its financial and critical reputation, the number of reprinted titles as an overall percentage continued to increase, while the average print run per reprinted title fell, thus creating a list of titles that sold unspectacularly but consistently well over a prolonged period of time: in other words, creating a canon of work privileged by the publisher for both profit and posterity. By the end of the century, Eliot notes, Macmillan, like other successful Victorian publishers, 'had a highly stable identity, based on a long backlist of a significant number of medium- and long-term steady sellers that remained in print for decades'.²⁰

This trend towards a consolidated and established list of productive titles, effectively a strategy of publishing high-yield books over a long term, and described by Eliot as a 'safer strategy for a maturing publisher', almost certainly developed an increasingly conservative internal selection process that preferred the sustained success of established authors to the riskier pursuit of potential high-selling titles by unknown writers, with possibly a limited critical and commercial life. In effect, Macmillan was combining the central concern of aspiring high-culture novelists for critical and commercial success with its own determination to raise its commercial profile through the construction of a critically esteemed, yet profitable list of titles. But, at the same time, this strategy would inevitably diminish the chances of new and little-known novelists breaking into Macmillan's list.

As well as moving towards sustainable, higher-yielding titles, Macmillan's own internal *Bibliographical Catalogue of Macmillan and Co.'s Publications from 1843 to 1889* presents clear evidence that the content being offered to readers was changing dramatically in the first half-century of the firm's existence – with literature (and, in particular, fiction) gaining significantly as a proportion of titles published, rising from 17.8% in 1856 to 47.1% in 1886. As Eliot has pointedly noted, this was significantly higher than the average, where literature usually occupied 'between 25 and 29 per cent' of published titles.²¹ Within the ever-increasing number of literary titles being published, the percentage share of new fiction rose dramatically, reaching 46.3% in 1886. But, as Eliot points out, while Macmillan was 'clearly responding to the huge demand for novels by the 1860s', its response was noticeably more restrained than that of other publishers in this period.²²

At the same time, Macmillan's price structure for published titles clearly

indicates the firm's aspirations, for, while the prices charged for books (especially of fiction) fell as the nineteenth century progressed, Macmillan's books increasingly sold at premium rates. Eliot has calculated that, by 1886, the shift in Macmillan's price structure meant that 'for the first time, low-price titles were less numerous at 27.07 per cent than either medium-price titles (41.35 per cent) or high-price titles (31.58 per cent)', a trend which, he notes, was 'in both form and tendency, quite contrary to more general price movements'.²³ As Eliot observes, this trend in Macmillan's price structure was all the more astonishing considering the deflationary pressures in Britain during the 'Great Depression' in the last third of the nineteenth century. At a time when purchasing power was rising, books were becoming cheaper, and cheap fiction was increasing its share in terms of titles published, Macmillan's successful and profitable consolidation towards higher-priced titles (particularly fiction) shows that the firm was increasingly confident about commanding higher prices for its books because it was perceived in the trade and by the wider reading public as offering higher-quality goods, both in terms of production values and cultured content. Macmillan was clearly in the business of accumulating cultural capital.

If Macmillan's relentless march towards higher prices for its books bucked the trend of the late-nineteenth-century book trade, so partly did the terms it offered its authors. At a time when publishers were traditionally offering prospective authors a range of possible contractual terms (including half-profits, commission, outright sale, two-thirds payment, and royalties), Macmillan was clearly anomalous in systematically promoting the royalty payment system. Examining the firm's Terms Book, Eliot calculates that the proportion of contracts offering payment by royalties rose from twenty-six per cent in 1893 to over forty-four per cent in 1899, a striking rise in a decade when most authors were still offering their work for outright sale.²⁴ At a time when the Society of Authors was campaigning for a minimum royalty rate of ten per cent, Macmillan's contract terms almost always exceeded this threshold. All but one of Wharton's nineteen titles with the firm, for example, received a contractual royalty rate of fifteen per cent or more, and five titles were offered a premium twenty-five per cent royalty, a figure that Macmillan almost never exceeded, even for the most profitable authors on its list. Part of the reason for Macmillan's espousal of the royalty system must certainly have been Frederick Macmillan's own personal experience of the ubiquity of royalty payments in the USA. But it also reflects the increasing confidence of the firm in embracing new methods of payment, just as they had enthusiastically adopted such new technologies in book production as electrotype.

The House of Macmillan's inexorable rise to eminence was not without its problems for new authors seeking to establish themselves on the firm's increasingly prestigious list. Foremost amongst the institutional obstacles that prospective novelists had to overcome was the excessively influential barrier of the in-house

reader, usually though not exclusively a man of some social and literary standing who made value judgements about literary merit from within a system that increasingly saw itself as in the vanguard of high culture.²⁵ However, an analysis extrapolated from institutional evidence alone can be potentially misleading. Like any family-run business, the decision to accept manuscripts and the eventual contracts offered to published authors inherently covered a broader, and more private, context than the firm's official records immediately suggest. In their institutional study of Macmillan's handling of female novelists in the last decades of the nineteenth and first decades of the twentieth centuries, Gaye Tuchman and Nina Fortin [hereafter cited as Tuchman] have suggested that the trend in literary culture and the criteria for selection of literature titles for publication inexorably privileged male authors over their female counterparts. Examining the submission, evaluation, and eventual terms of agreement for publishing novels recorded by Macmillan, Tuchman calls the period 1880-99 a '*period of redefinition*', during which male critics, including Macmillan's readers, 'redefined the nature of a good novel and a great author'. During this time, men submitted more novels for consideration than women, but were 'equally likely to have their fiction accepted'.²⁶ In contrast, Tuchman considers the period 1901-17 to be a '*period of institutionalisation*', when the internal selection criteria clearly favoured men, who submitted fewer novels but 'enjoyed a higher rate of acceptance'.²⁷

According to Tuchman, as Macmillan progressively established its position as an arbiter of élitist cultural taste, every stage of the process – from manuscript submission, the initial screening of manuscripts to be sent to readers, the readers' reports and, especially, the contractual terms that were offered – increasingly favoured male over female novelists. What is omitted in such an approach is the compelling evidence offered by privileged authors, both male and female (such as Wharton), who were personally cultivated by Frederick Macmillan and whose traces are less easily observed in the firm's internal structures and forms of selection. Personally favoured and nurtured House authors, like Wharton, Kipling, James and Mrs Ward, never had to submit their manuscripts to Macmillan's formidable House readers because they never needed to, nor were their *accepted* submissions often even recorded in the firm's official ledger of *received* manuscripts.²⁸ Well-liked women novelists, such as Edith Wharton, Elizabeth von Arnim, Gertrude Atherton and Mary Cholmondeley, often had their work personally read and accepted by Frederick Macmillan. As a consequence, the official ledgers of received and accepted manuscripts became increasingly skewed, as often as not recording recursively the failures of first-time novelists rather than the evident successes of established authors.

In a family business that prided itself on establishing and maintaining social contacts with its best authors, and often conducted its affairs (especially preliminary

negotiations over contractual terms) informally, one of the few claims that can be made with any certainty is that Macmillan's established reader-report system, rather than determining and entrenching any gender bias, manifestly privileged personally known, published authors over first-time and previously unpublished ones. The influence of the gatekeeper/reader, the scourge of the unsolicited supplicant, was not something that Wharton, and several other women novelists, had to consider in their dealings with Macmillan. In this respect, Wharton benefited significantly from her informal relationship with Frederick Macmillan, which was further cemented by their mixing in the same social milieu.

Examining the contracts offered to successful male and female novelists, Tuchman claims that women novelists were often paid according to their immediate needs, rather than what they would be worth over the length of a full literary career. Comparing the contracts offered to Margaret Oliphant between 1870 and 1891 and F. Marion Crawford from 1883-1907, Tuchman suggests that a double standard is evident in the forms of payment offered – observing that, while Oliphant was almost always given an outright sum for the sale of her work, Crawford was almost always offered a royalty payment, despite [??] the increasing prevalence of the royalties in Macmillan's contracts.²⁹ Tuchman concludes that this financial double standard was both ubiquitous and institutionalized, with Macmillan's Editions Books indicating 'general differences in the payments made to women and men for novels of approximately equal quality printed in runs of approximately the same size'.³⁰

Macmillan's generosity in negotiations over contractual terms with authors often involved their looking at the broader picture of sales across several territories rather than just one specific market. In consequence, Tuchman's analysis, comparing only British print runs for titles, fails to tell the whole story. As Priya Joshi has demonstrated in her comparison of the print runs of Marion Crawford and Margaret Oliphant in the Colonial Library series, Macmillan risked, and rewarded, the sales success of their authors in emerging colonial markets, particularly India. Crawford's larger sales volume in India compared to Mrs Oliphant gained him progressively more generous contracts, with an increasing scale of royalties, and helps explain the discrepancy in their respective earnings. As Joshi observes, the centripetal force of the periphery on the core meant that 'the happenings in the Indian and colonial market determined Macmillan's policies in the domestic one'.³¹ This trend is even more evident in the case of transatlantic authors during this period; especially, of course, in the case of writers with burgeoning sales in America but only relatively modest success in the British market. Macmillan's contract terms for authors in the Anglo-American market improved not just with sales in either country, but also from the prospect that good sales figures there would translate into better sales in colonial markets, and vice versa.

Institutional analysis of publisher's practices, while helping to identify

important trends and patterns, can sometimes be misleading in interpreting the nature of individual author's interactions with publishers in specific markets. Comparing Macmillan's payments to Maurice Hewlett and Edith Wharton, Tuchman incorrectly suggests that again the male novelist received the better terms: receiving '£1000 for American and British rights to *Richard Yea and Nay*' and a '25 percent royalty on British rights' against Wharton's contract for *The House of Mirth* managing only £250 and twenty per cent respectively.³² Looking at the roughly comparable British print runs for the two books, and conceding that Hewlett's contract had stipulated rights on both sides of the Atlantic while Wharton's had not, Tuchman insists that he was still being paid on average twice as much as Wharton, despite both producing work of similar sales success.

In this case, Tuchman's interpretation of an entrenched double standard at work at Macmillan's is particularly unconvincing. While Hewlett, a writer of popular historical romances, was at the time of the contract an already established name in the British market (and especially with Macmillan), Edith Wharton was not. *The House of Mirth*, though her fourth title, crucially was her first novel contracted to Macmillan, and she had still to establish her literary reputation in Britain, and her ability to command significant sales in the United States.³³ Despite this, Macmillan's royalty rate for *The House of Mirth* was better than Scribner's in New York, who offered a fifteen per cent royalty on a roughly equivalent cover price of \$1.50. The remarkable sales success of Hewlett's first novel, the medieval romance *The Forest Lovers* (1898), encouraged him to give up a legal career for the potentially more lucrative life of the professional author. In contrast, Wharton's main source of income in 1904 remained the considerable amount of money coming in from two separate inheritances.³⁴ Despite the initially poor sales of her earlier work in the British market, Macmillan continued to offer her improved contracts over the course of her time with the firm, largely on the basis of her increasing sales in America; nor was Wharton ever shy in asking for better terms on the basis of this success in her home market.

Macmillan's belief in, and commitment towards, Edith Wharton is evident from the nature of the contracts that they offered her. While Tuchman's analysis of the two novelists has suggested that, as a man, Hewlett could command a higher rate of royalty, this is certainly not the case with the further contracts offered to Wharton, who would demand, and receive, Macmillan's 'gold-standard' twenty-five per cent royalty payment no fewer than five times.³⁵ A twenty-five per cent royalty rate, and an advance of £500 or more, was almost always reserved by Macmillan (both in London and New York) for the stalwarts of their list, who could shift at least 50,000 copies of a novel – writers such as Gertrude Atherton, Winston Churchill (the American author), Marion Crawford, Maurice Hewlett and Owen Wister. Frederick Macmillan's impulsively over-generous advance of £7,000 to Mrs Humphry Ward

for the American rights to *The History of David Grieve* (1892) was a singularly unprofitable anomaly. As George Platt Brett pointed out to him, even the most established and profitable authors should not expect any more: 'I don't think we can make a better offer for the book [Mary Cholmondeley's *Moth and Rust* (1902)] than twenty percent (20%), indeed we should not give any ~~but~~ of our best and most popular writers here more than that royalty, and my own feeling is that if we did give them more than that royalty that we should publish the books so arranged for without profit.'³⁶ Brett's determinedly more stringent limit, denying even the prospect of a royalty rate exceeding twenty per cent, circumscribed the extent of Macmillan New York's potential contractual terms, nor was the London firm's thinking on the matter substantially different. In this context, the twenty-five per cent royalty is an identifiable gold standard for Macmillan authors – men as well as women, British as well as American – and one that Tuchman fails to acknowledge.

Most obviously, of course, Wharton's primary market was the United States, where she was commanding increasingly impressive sales, with concomitant contracts from her publishers. Indeed, Macmillan's early and sustained commitment to Wharton, at a time when her books were selling slowly in Britain, contradicts the general institutional trends ('edging women out') allegedly identified and delineated by Tuchman. Wharton's penetration of the Macmillan list, and her entrenchment within it, was not shaped in any large measure by the institutional arbiters suggested by the official ledgers, or by the size of her British print runs vis-à-vis her British contractual terms (the ostensible record of Macmillan's opinion of her critical and commercial worth), but rather by her personal interaction with Frederick Macmillan, largely documented in their correspondence of nearly 400 letters, which provide both an illuminating insight into the publisher's sophisticated understanding of Wharton's potential, and the author's adept and persuasive ability to negotiate terms on the basis of her own perceived self-worth.

In the decade immediately prior to Wharton's first appearance on their fiction list, the House of Macmillan had consolidated its position amongst British publishers in terms of both the number of titles published and market share. It had resisted the deflationary pressures and managed to increase the prices it commanded for its books, increased the amount of fiction in terms of books published, raised the proportion of authors paid through the royalty system *and* upped their average rate of royalty payment, and, through their espousal of the Net Book Agreement, they had stabilized the book trade in Britain. At the same time, Macmillan, through its institutional systems which relied heavily upon the intuitive, but sometimes parochial and élitist, sensibilities of their in-house readers, had become instrumental in redefining the nature of literary fiction, the profile of its most successful practitioners, and their financial and critical success in the cultural market-place. During the near quarter-century of Edith Wharton's presence on Macmillan's

fiction list, the publisher had effectively become one of the country's most important arbiters of elite literary taste and consumption.

III. INSIDE THE FICTION MACHINE

Edith Wharton's professional correspondence with the House of Macmillan, almost all of it personally addressed to Frederick Macmillan, covers a period of nearly thirty years, from 7 August 1901 to 16 April 1930 – predating and outlasting the formal commercial association with her London publisher. Some 220 letters from Edith Wharton to Frederick Macmillan are catalogued together in the Macmillan & Co. Archive's author-specific files; carbon copies of the publisher's outgoing letters to the novelist, totalling some 180 items (the vast majority bearing Frederick Macmillan's signature), are dispersed through the Archive's well-kept outgoing correspondence folders.³⁷ Together, they offer a compelling account of an author/publisher relationship, and provide a fuller, and more nuanced, appreciation of Macmillan's deft handling of talented and ambitious women novelists than Tuchman's reading would suggest. The correspondence also provides a representative itinerary of how Macmillan managed its valuable and favoured House authors who were hungry for both critical and commercial success.

At no time over a lifetime of publishing with the firm did Edith Wharton officially submit work at manuscript stage without a prior personal commitment from Frederick Macmillan to publish it. As a result, despite the firm's exemplary, efficient and at times stringent system of processing submissions through its in-house readers, Wharton's name is almost entirely missing from Macmillan's own record of submitted manuscripts and from the readers' reports.³⁸ Manuscripts from Macmillan's most illustrious authors were accepted without a reader's report and so these titles were rarely recorded in the publisher's official ledger – typically, only two of Wharton's titles were recorded in this way.³⁹ The official ledgers therefore present only a partial picture of the firm's acceptance policy. While the selection process for Wharton's publications has been largely elided from the official archive, the minutiae of the production, distribution and sales of her oeuvre are recorded in full.⁴⁰ As Wharton's London publisher for most of her illustrious literary career, Macmillan's criteria for selecting her works for publication were largely managed informally, through private meetings and personal correspondence; while the machinery for publishing, promoting and paying for them was handled, as for any author, institutionally. The personal concord between Edith Wharton and Frederick Macmillan meant that, while she maintained a literary agent to manage her relationship with her New York publishers, she did not do so with her trusted London publisher. In her correspondence with Frederick Macmillan, Edith Wharton performed the roles of literary agent, author, publicist, accountant and society hostess, all in one. This

level of direct personal contact between author and publisher clearly resulted in better contractual terms than might otherwise have been the case.

Despite the institutional recognition of the significance of the correspondence within the publisher's archives, one that has been further strengthened by time and official sanction, Wharton's engagement with Macmillan was, in some respects, a privileged one. She did not come to her London publisher cold. Even before she had made first contact with Frederick Macmillan, she had requested her very first go-between at Macmillan's American office, none other than George Platt Brett, to introduce her to her future London publisher. Notwithstanding his earlier rejection of *The Decoration of Houses*, Brett's effusive handwritten encomium urged Frederick to sign her up quickly: 'knowing Mrs. Wharton's work as I do and valuing it as highly as I do', he wrote, 'I am glad to know that Mrs. Wharton desires to put the book into your hands for London publication and I am glad to give her this line of introduction in the hope that the matter may be satisfactorily arranged'.⁴¹ Many major writers, especially successful American ones like Owen Wister, Winston Churchill and Marion Crawford, were immediately signed up by Frederick Macmillan on the basis of Brett's recommendation alone – a recommendation which almost always resulted in guaranteed sales in the British and colonial markets. In this respect, Wharton's official introduction immediately marked her out as a member of the firm's élite.

Empowered by Brett's testimonial, Wharton's professional relationship directly with Macmillan was initiated by the novelist in the summer of 1901, with the completed manuscript of her first novel, *The Valley of Decision*, at her disposal. Announcing her imminent arrival in London, Wharton suggested to Frederick Macmillan that a social call on a Sunday afternoon, to 'have a talk with you about my book', would be appropriate.⁴² Wharton's circumvention of Macmillan's reader's-report system was achieved by way of Brett's introduction, and offering Frederick Macmillan the chance to read the work for himself, as well as through the intervention of Frederick's cousin, George Macmillan. Having already secured American (Scribner's) and London (John Murray) publishers for the novel, her intention in giving Frederick Macmillan the opportunity of reading her work was to facilitate an offer from him for her next work of fiction. The strategy clearly worked, for he offered to take Wharton's next piece, the as yet unwritten novella *Sanctuary* (1903), without submission, reader's report or the intervention of a literary agent. In her very first interaction with the House of Macmillan, Wharton had demonstrated the intimacy of her relationship with her future London publisher.

Always one of the shrewdest of professional authors, Wharton was not prepared to accept the Macmillan imprint on just any terms, despite her appreciation of the prestige of appearing on the publisher's list. While she expressed her personal gratitude for Macmillan's positive comments ('it was very satisfying to me to know

that you think so well of “The Valley of Decision”), she was also clearly playing hard to get, by reminding Macmillan that she remained under an obligation to her current London publisher (Murray), and would have to give good reasons for leaving. ‘As I have not as yet given to Mr Murray the reasons for my not offering him my next book, you will, I am sure, understand my asking you to consider the whole matter confidential at present.’⁴³ In fact, Wharton’s response was somewhat disingenuous; while she was not entirely happy with the terms that Macmillan had offered for her, as yet unwritten, work of fiction, she had already been approached by George Macmillan to open negotiations with the firm. His generous initial offer of £250 in advance and a twenty per cent royalty was clearly just an opening gambit, despite Frederick Macmillan’s wish to see the matter settled immediately: ‘if the thing was settled, well & good’, he wrote to Brett in the New York office, ‘but if it was left over, perhaps you will kindly see Mrs. Wharton and make this offer on our behalf’.⁴⁴ Although she was prepared to accept a twenty per cent royalty on the book – the same rate, she observed, ‘given me by Mr Murray’ – she would not accept it on the basis of a smaller payment up front, and she confidently argued for a higher advance. ‘I think perhaps that I should be entitled to £300 advance royalty, in the case of a second novel’, she told Macmillan, informing him that John Murray had already given her ‘£100 for “The Valley”’, and that her advance for the same book from ‘the Messrs Scribner for the American Edition was \$2000’.⁴⁵

Wharton was certainly prepared to drive a hard bargain with Macmillan, but she was equally clear about her reason for wanting to defect from John Murray – her erstwhile publisher’s reluctance in promoting her work. ‘Mr Murray did not advertise my book sufficiently’, she wrote to Macmillan, adding, ‘you will therefore understand my asking to what extent you would propose to advertise my novel, supposing you were to publish it?’⁴⁶ With the terms for both American serialization (in *Scribner’s Magazine*) and volume publication (with Scribner’s) agreed, Wharton needed to secure a contract for the British edition; and in order to achieve this, she offered Macmillan a plot summary in lieu of a manuscript, admitting that ‘a skeleton of this kind can convey so little idea of a novel of manners’.⁴⁷ Wharton’s personal and informal strategy was successful. Although Macmillan’s final contractual terms were rather less generous than she had initially expected, the relationship had been cemented, with Wharton affirming her belief that Macmillan would make a ‘liberal arrangement’ for the publication of the novella.⁴⁸

Sanctuary, Edith Wharton’s first book with Macmillan, duly appeared on 23 October 1903, the day after its publication in volume form in the United States. While it was well received critically, it was not a sales success in the British market, with Macmillan openly admitting to the author that ‘short novels are, commercially speaking, not very attractive to an English publisher’.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, Wharton’s interaction with Frederick Macmillan over the contract and the arrangements for the

publication of *Sanctuary* represent, as I shall now show, a microcosm of her dealings with her nominated London publisher for the next twenty years. On the author's side, Wharton's letters to Macmillan reveal a remarkably astute professional who negotiated hard for the contract terms that she felt she deserved, repeatedly avoided the in-house readers by offering plot outlines directly to Frederick Macmillan, constantly revised and corrected her work in order to offer Macmillan a 'definitive' text, and generally managed her own financial transactions with an ability equal to that of many literary agents of the time (especially in checking her half-yearly accounts and royalty statements). At the same time, her letters frequently reveal her wish for good sales figures in Britain and her anxiety about whether Macmillan was doing enough promotion of her work, together with a remarkable hard-headedness in promoting herself on the London literary scene.

On the publisher's side, Frederick Macmillan's letters suggest his long-term commitment, despite the prospect of initially poor sales, to yet another quality novelist on his list; his careful consideration of Wharton's specific demands about the treatment of her titles; his determination to negotiate fairly with an author supporting rising sales and a critical reputation to match in the United States; and, perhaps surprisingly, his use of her as an intermediary in co-ordinating the publication of her works with Scribner's in New York. However, his letters also display defensiveness over accusations that he was not promoting Wharton's work sufficiently strongly; his professionalism in dealing with her often incessant demands for copies of her work to be sent to friends and colleagues; and sometimes his mild exasperation at her relentlessly assertive articulation of her authorial rights. Above all, the correspondence between them offers a trenchant example of a financially successful and critically aware female novelist demanding and receiving recognition and esteem as a professional author within a business context. This was in no small measure due to the personalized and informal relationship between the two parties, rather than the apparently institutionalized policies of the firm. As a family-run publishing house, Macmillan clearly valued a trusted relationship with its clients, particularly with those who were critically and commercially productive over a sustained period.

Whether Wharton's entrenched and privileged position in the Macmillan list explicitly led to better terms of contract remains difficult to prove, but the contract details and sales figures available certainly suggest that she was being treated generously in comparison to her peers. Comparing Macmillan's contract for *The House of Mirth* (1905) with that for a work by an author following a similar trajectory – Elizabeth von Arnim's novel, *The Benefactress* (1902) – displays the differences in expectations and obligations from both the authors' and publisher's perspectives. Unlike Wharton, von Arnim had offered Macmillan her first book (the unexpected bestseller, *Elizabeth and her German Garden* (1898)), without any guarantee of

publication, as an unsolicited manuscript, complete with return address and prepaid postage.⁵⁰ By the time she came to offer *The Benefactress* in March 1901, she had already achieved highly respectable sales figures for *Elizabeth and her German Garden* and its sequel, *The Solitary Summer*. They had sold 16,976 and 12,438 copies in Britain respectively; and her children's book, *The April's Baby Book of Tunes*, had added another 7,800 copies in its first year.⁵¹ All of these figures were substantially in excess of Wharton's modest British sales in the four-year period leading up to the publication of *The House of Mirth*. At this point, none of her books had warranted a second printing in London, suggesting sales of well under 3,000 copies per title.⁵² On the eastern side of the Atlantic, at any rate, Wharton was still a coterie writer.

At similar stages in their involvement with Macmillan, Elizabeth von Arnim was thus outselling Edith Wharton by a factor of more than six to one, and yet the contractual terms both eventually were offered when negotiations were complete did not accurately reflect this ratio. The same cannot be said of their expectations. Emboldened by her encouraging sales figures, von Arnim casually issued a series of unrealistic demands for the publication of *The Benefactress*, asking (amongst other things) for a royalty incrementally rising from '1/4d. [1s 4d] on each copy sold up [to??] a thousand' to '1/9d. on each copy after the first thousand', as well as an advance of £500, and at the same time keeping hold of the continental, translation and colonial rights. Macmillan had already offered her an advance of £400 and twenty per cent on the first 5,000, rising to twenty-five per cent thereafter.⁵³ Macmillan simply did not pay even their best-selling authors a royalty equivalent to thirty per cent *and* an advance of £500. As Frederick Macmillan felt obliged to point out, it was 'out of the question to pay as high a royalty as 1/9' as the 'margin of profit therefore is too narrow to allow of the royalty you mention'.⁵⁴ Macmillan's eventual contractual terms for *The Benefactress* were reached pragmatically, but they were also shaped by von Arnim's limited understanding of the firm's publishing practice: offering her much sought-after £500 advance on a royalty rate base of twenty-five per cent, plus a royalty of 4d for including the book on their Colonial Library list, which they claimed was 'what we pay to Mrs Humphry Ward and other popular writers'.⁵⁵ Macmillan had decided to offset von Arnim's seemingly insatiable appetite for royalties and advances against the less generous terms offered for the Colonial Library edition (a side of publishing that von Arnim herself was happy to dismiss), where a royalty rate of sixpence seems to have been more common.⁵⁶

Wharton was offered a £250 advance on a royalty rate of twenty per cent, with an additional sixpenny royalty on the colonial editions, for *The House of Mirth*, despite her lack of established sales success in either of her two main markets at the time.⁵⁷ Despite von Arnim being clearly the more profitable author for Macmillan,

outselling Wharton by a factor of six to one or more at this stage in her engagement with the firm, Macmillan's contract terms for the two female novelists reveal the publisher's implicit assumption about the longevity and quality of Wharton's writing.

Despite their equal sense of ambition for their work, and the similarity of their prospective readerships, the differences between the two authors were acute. Confessing that she felt 'quite incapable of making business arrangements' herself, initially at any rate, von Arnim preferred to delegate the details of negotiations over her literary contracts to her brother-in-law, George Waterlow. Wharton, on the other hand, always dealt with her London publisher directly, foregoing the mediation of a literary agent.⁵⁸ Von Arnim remained confused and sceptical about Macmillan's Colonial Library; she criticized the size of the royalty payment on the series, and mistakenly believed that the appearance of *The Benefactress* on this list was 'directly contrary' to her interests.⁵⁹ Wharton viewed Macmillan's Colonial Library as an extra source of money and new readers, and kept her work with Macmillan for these markets even when her American publisher wanted to take them over.⁶⁰ Benefiting from the progressive publishing culture of New York, Wharton understood the importance and the limitations of the royalty system, and consequently her demands were rarely unrealistic. Von Arnim had sold *Elizabeth and her German Garden* under the antiquated half-profit system, and her eventual royalty demands veered from the exceedingly timid to the wildly unreasonable. Perhaps the greatest distinction between the untitled New York City aristocrat, who for the first ten years of her life as an author wrote in spite of her money, and the Australian-born, English-raised wife of a Prussian count, who ended up writing because she was desperately in need of it, was in their relative understandings of the complex socioeconomics of writing and publishing.

One must be careful not to extrapolate too far from these congruous examples of negotiated contracts between the House of Macmillan and two successful and ambitious novelists. However, both the similarities and the differences between the agreements for the publication of *The Benefactress* and *The House of Mirth* suggest that Wharton fared rather better with Macmillan than her immediate British and colonial sales figures might have warranted, and one of the reasons for this must have been her remarkable knowledge of the trade and her confidence in dealing with publishers. There are intriguing implications here about Macmillan's estimation of the relative value, both artistic and commercial, of the two novelists' work, as well as the possibility that Wharton's *prospective* (and eventually realized) American sales may have counted for more than von Arnim's *actual* sales. Macmillan's predilection for creating a consolidated list of critically acclaimed writers for the benefit of posterity, and not merely a fiction list of short-term best-sellers, is certainly glossed in the differences in Wharton's and von Arnim's contracts.

Wharton's use of the Macmillan imprimatur to designate the final, definitive versions of her work for posterity is evident in her correspondence. Always meticulous about specific details in the publication of her books, Wharton clearly made use of the time required by Macmillan to set up plates for the London edition to suppress misprints in the New York edition, to assert once again her own preference for English forms of punctuation and spelling, and to make final revisions to the text itself. In preparing, for example, her third volume of short stories, *The Descent of Man and Other Stories* (1904), for publication, she inserted an extra tale ('The Letter') that had not appeared in either *Scribner's Magazine* or the New York edition. This prompted a disingenuous complaint of carelessness from Brownell, her editor at Scribner's: 'your brood is so numerous you don't keep track of stray chicks'.⁶¹

In the case of *The House of Mirth* (1905), her authorial intervention was even more precise. Having already sent Macmillan duplicate proofs, Wharton passed to them further galley slips with corrections and very definite advice about presentation: 'I have revised them carefully, and I don't think the English proofs need anymore revision than your own proof-reader can give, provided you will kindly tell him (or her) not to change the punctuation.'⁶² The book was already in the process of the first, and very substantial, print run with Scribner's in New York, yet she continued to make final alterations to the text, sending Macmillan a corrected page proof for Chapter 8, for example, and requesting the insertion of yet more corrections from galley slips just weeks before the London print run commenced.⁶³

Wharton's determination to present the London Macmillan edition of her works as her ultimate author-sanctioned text was both aesthetic and pragmatic. To take one example, while scrutinizing Scribner's New York edition of her First World War battlefield journalism – *Fighting France: From Dunkerque to Belfort* (1915) – she discovered 'three distressing misprints', which she convinced herself would be 'pounced upon by any reviewers who look at the book'.⁶⁴ Macmillan's suppression of these errors would, she hoped, help to fend off unsympathetic reviewers who might otherwise have questioned the credibility of her first-hand knowledge of the Western Front – something she was at great pains to avoid. Aesthetically, Wharton continued to privilege the London Macmillan over the New York editions of her novels. Observing the 'bad misprints' in her author's copy of Appleton's edition of *Summer* (1916), she declared that the Macmillan edition was 'so much better than the American that I prefer to give it to my friends'.⁶⁵

The elimination of the misprints that riddled the New York first editions of her work meant that she continued to privilege the Macmillan text with last-minute corrections and errata slips. But Wharton's approach to the production of her books was materialistic as well as literary, and, in this respect, even Macmillan's performance sometimes did not meet her own exacting and particular standards. Commenting on

the cover and binding of *Ethan Frome*, and with the publication of *The Reef* imminent, Wharton urged Macmillan to 'go back to a simpler binding style without the florid blind tooling', asking for 'as little decoration as possible & a cloth of a good dark red or blue'.⁶⁶ Macmillan's response was typically pragmatic, sending a sample binding, made up as she had described, for her approval.

The appearance of volume after volume of her work in Macmillan's list did not at all diminish Wharton's ability to negotiate the best possible contractual terms from her London publisher, nor did it lessen her literary ambition. Despite becoming a best-selling author in her home country, and receiving consistently good critical reviews on both sides of the Atlantic, she did not manage to achieve concomitant sales success in Britain. However, this scarcely seems to have affected her confidence in dealing with Macmillan. In fact, playing upon Macmillan's increasingly interdependent use of literary market-places, Wharton often brought her meteoric American success to bear in contract negotiations, *and* her expectations for her work in Britain. *The House of Mirth*, the novel that made her name and established her career in America, is a case in point. She eagerly reported the scale of Scribner's first print run – 'Scribner are bringing out 40,000' – and, three weeks after publication, she informed Macmillan that: 'The first 40,000 were sold within 2 weeks of publication & another edition of 20,000 is printing', adding 'these are large figures for me'.⁶⁷ When Macmillan reported that initial sales for the novel had been relatively slow in Britain, with 'very nearly 5,000 copies' sold in the first ten weeks, Wharton's response was predictable – she blamed Macmillan's advertising, or the lack of it.⁶⁸ 'I know that a book must justify, by its sale, the money spent on advertising it', she wrote, 'but I have felt, ever since *The House of Mirth* appeared, that you had hardly given it, in five advertisements, the preliminary fillip needful to start the ball rolling.'⁶⁹ Macmillan's pithy riposte that 'novels in this country never do attain circulations which are common in the United States' had been met with the ball being assertively kicked into touch.⁷⁰

With nearly 8,000 copies sold in its first nine months, British and colonial sales of *The House of Mirth*, despite being less than one-tenth of the American figures for the same period, were far from disappointing. Notwithstanding her chastising of Macmillan for insufficiently promoting the book, Wharton understood what this modest commercial success signified – the prospect of being able to exact better contractual terms from her London publisher. She was also prepared to raise the spectre of her defection, just in case Macmillan did not behave generously. With her next work, *The Fruit of the Tree* (1907), already contracted in both serial and volume form to Scribner's in the United States, Wharton demanded a twenty-five per cent royalty, and a significant advance payment, from Frederick Macmillan, informing him that 'several London publishers have written me lately, offering me 25% on my next novel, but I have not answered as yet, as I much prefer to continue

to give you my books if a satisfactory arrangement can be made'.⁷¹ Macmillan was also prepared to acknowledge the change in stature of his newly successful American acquisition: 'now that your name as a novelist has become known to a wider circle of readers', he wrote, 'I trust that the circulation of your books will increase steadily'.⁷² Aware of Wharton's potential commercial and literary value to his list, Macmillan conceded that, after the success of *The House of Mirth*, it would 'be safe to calculate on a much better English sale than any of your books have ever had', and he offered her both a £250 advance and the requested royalty rate. Wharton was temporarily mollified, but the tensions that had shaped this specific transaction would emerge again and again in the later correspondence.⁷³

Edith Wharton's inability to replicate her burgeoning and spectacular American sales figures on the other side of the Atlantic led her repeatedly to question Macmillan's ability to promote her work to the widest possible readership. Just weeks after the simultaneous publication on both sides of the Atlantic of *The Custom of the Country* (1913), Wharton wrote to Macmillan and imperiously demanded that he do more. This work, which had already sold over 25,000 copies in America, she thought needed greater effort from her publisher in the British market. 'May I take the opportunity', she lectured him, 'to suggest that you might make use of some of the English notices of "The Custom of the Country" to advertise the book a little more than you have been doing?'⁷⁴ For Wharton, the cause of the asymmetry in the sales figures was both predictable and easily remediable: 'it is nevertheless not unreasonable to infer', she concluded, 'that the larger advertising received there [i.e., the USA] may have made a difference'.⁷⁵ Macmillan's patience and courtesy were being sorely tested. His response was both professional and impersonal: he presented the aggrieved novelist with an astonishing itemized ledger of Macmillan's advertising expenditure for the novel in Britain. This amounted to no less than '£112 14s. 0d' having been spent on advertisements in no fewer than ninety-six separate periodicals and newspapers, encompassing a wide spectrum of British readers, from the *Athenaeum* to *Ladies Field* and from the *Publishers' Circular* to the *Dundee Advertiser*.⁷⁶ Wharton's response, if indeed she made one, does not survive, the correspondence immediately after this exchange being disrupted by the outbreak of the First World War. In this instance, it is highly unlikely that Frederick Macmillan found Edith Wharton's perennial complaint about publishers' lack of promotional zeal either justified or amusing.

Despite Macmillan offering proof of both the scope and the amount of their expenditure in their efforts to promote her writing in the British market, Wharton remained sceptical about the publisher's ability to reach the new, wider readership that she so desperately wanted. Wharton's remarkable instinct for self-promotion often made her question Macmillan's seemingly innate conservatism. Interrogating Macmillan about the arrangements for the distribution and sale of *The Marne* (1918)

in Paris, she asked whether he could 'find out why the English booksellers in Paris have not supplied themselves with copies' of the work, arguing that there was 'a considerable demand for it ... owing to its success in America'.⁷⁷ The in-house note scribbled in pencil on the verso of this letter – '12 each to Galignani, Smith for Britons' – demonstrates the effectiveness of some of Wharton's direct interventions with Macmillan.

Sometimes it was not only the effectiveness of Macmillan's promotion that Wharton was sceptical about, but the way in which she was being presented to her potential market. Commenting on Macmillan's advertisement for *Fighting France* (1915) in the *Times Literary Supplement*, Wharton bristled with indignation that she was being portrayed for her novelty value – as a woman novelist at the front – rather than as a knowledgeable commentator with first-hand experience of the war effort. Wharton brandished her credentials at her London publisher: 'I have been several times on the first trenches & a few yards from the Germans – to the extent of being fired at by a sniper!',⁷⁸ adding later: 'I went five times to the front, & this notice gives the impression of a very flying glimpse ... I am naturally anxious to have my book sell in England'.⁷⁹ At a time when she was campaigning vigorously for greater American understanding and support for the Anglo-French war effort, the last impression she wished to create amongst potential British readers was that she was merely a war tourist.

Despite her sensitivity about how she was being presented, Wharton remained consistently hard-headed in negotiating contracts with Macmillan, always bringing up her United States sales figures to secure better terms in Britain. In the autumn of 1918, with her permanent defection from Scribner's to Appleton in New York more or less decided after the offer of a substantial advance, Wharton once again attempted to exact a substantial advance from Macmillan on her next work, *The Marne*. Sending Frederick Macmillan the manuscript, she reminded him of her potential market value by casually mentioning Appleton's terms: 'Messrs. Appleton & Co. think so well of its prospects that they have themselves proposed an advance of \$4,000 on the American edition, a higher sum than I have hitherto received for any volume of short stories.'⁸⁰ There was no way that Macmillan would be prepared to match this figure, especially after memories of the fiasco of the £1,000 advance paid to Henry James in 1903 for a book on London that never materialized. Always a cautious firm, Macmillan rarely paid any but its best-selling authors an advance of more than £500, preferring to reward them with a twenty-five per cent royalty instead. Frederick Macmillan's initial response was one of silence, prompting Wharton to remind him again that 'Messrs. Appleton' were 'making an advance payment of \$4,000'.⁸¹ Clearly, Appleton's terms had convinced her that she could earn significantly more money from her fiction than she had hitherto. She decided that it was now time for her to trade on her accumulated cultural capital, on the strength

of her presence on Scribner's and Macmillan's lists, to achieve mass circulation and a substantial literary income.

Not surprisingly, Macmillan declined to make any kind of advance whatever for *The Marne*, in effect bringing closer the date of the eventual termination of her relationship with her London publisher. Only three more of her titles – and only one novel, *A Son at the Front* (1923) – appeared with the Macmillan imprint after this débâcle. Frederick Macmillan's failure to offer the massive advance that Wharton clearly felt was now her due effectively brought to an end the separate existence of London editions of her works. Her new American publisher, Appleton (later the Century Co.), preferred to offer her contracts that covered both sides of the Atlantic, with British copies simply imported wholesale from the US print run. Wharton coolly informed Macmillan that her deal with Appleton meant that she would no longer be able to offer him her work: 'in view of the fact that Messrs. Appleton now have their own house in London', she wrote, 'it seemed to me only fair to give them the English rights of the novels which they publish for me'.⁸² In fact, her justified belief in being able to earn substantial advances for her work had left her with little choice. Wharton had successfully made the transition, like many other novelists before her, from modestly successful literary figure to one of America's best-selling authors.

Signing off at the end of a mutually productive twenty-six-year commercial relationship with her London publisher, and with an eye to posterity and her literary legacy, Edith Wharton struck a chord of trust and confidence in her penultimate communication with Frederick Macmillan. 'I will not say goodbye to Macmillan & Co', Wharton noted, just days after her sixty-sixth birthday, 'as I hope to survive in the memories of the firm as an appreciative and grateful author.'⁸³ In this judgement, her assessment is vindicated by the remarkable narrative itinerary traced by her correspondence with the House of Macmillan as well as by her literary standing within the firm's fiction list. Edith Wharton's relationship with one of London's most reputable publishers offers an amazing perspective from the inside outwards on the multiple contingencies faced by transatlantic novelists in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Perhaps most tellingly, over the course of a quarter-century, Wharton, in Britain exclusively a House of Macmillan author, became and remained the most esteemed of commodities: a financially remunerative and critically acclaimed novelist entrenched at the heart of a publishing firm that was in the vanguard of defining and promoting the values of élite national literary production and consumption.

NOTES

- 1 Edith Wharton [hereafter cited as EW] to Ogden Codman, 15 Mar. 1897, quoted in Shari Benstock, *No Gifts from Chance: A biography of Edith Wharton* (London 1994), p.84. For a fuller account of Macmillan Co.'s New York activities, see Elizabeth James, 'Letters from America: The Bretts and the Macmillan Company of New York', in Elizabeth James (ed.), *Macmillan: A publishing tradition* (Basingstoke 2002), 170-91. I am grateful to Elizabeth James, Hermione Lee, Adrian Poole, Jane Potter, and the external reader at *Publishing History* for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.
- 2 Stephen Garrison, *Edith Wharton: A descriptive bibliography* (Pittsburgh 1990), pp.10-11.
- 3 The rejection rate for unsolicited manuscripts at Macmillan recorded in the firm's official ledgers (by no means a complete record) was almost always between 90% and 95%, and in some years it was even higher; see Gaye Tuchman and Nina E. Fortin, *Edging Women Out: Victorian novelists, publishers and social change* (London 1989) [hereafter cited as Tuchman], pp.62-92. Elizabeth James notes that Macmillan Co. of NY sometimes accepted first novels by unknown authors, such as Joseph Conrad's *Almayer's Folly* (1895), that had already been rejected by Macmillan in London; 'Letters from America', pp.176-7.
- 4 EW to William Crary Brownell, 25 Apr. 1899, quoted in R. W. B. and Nancy Lewis (eds), *The Letters of Edith Wharton* (London 1988), pp.37-8. (All references to *Letters* are to this edition.)
- 5 Ibid. 38.
- 6 Ibid.
- 7 John Lane's newly established boutique publisher was committed to the highest production values for printed literature in the 1890s, promoting their books as both collectable and aesthetically desirable. The selection of titles on their list was often self-consciously avant-garde. Print runs of beautifully decorated and bound first editions rarely exceeding 500 copies; see James G. Nelson, *The Early Nineties: A view from the Bodley Head* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), and Margaret D. Stetz and Mark Samuels Lasner, *England in the 1890s: Literary publishing at the Bodley Head* (Washington, DC, 1990). The print run for the first edition of *The Greater Inclination* was almost certainly for just 500 copies; see Garrison, pp.18-19.
- 8 EW to Brownell, 25 Apr. 1899 (*Letters*, p.38).
- 9 EW to Richard Watson Gilder, 10 Oct. 1902 (*Letters*, p.74).
- 10 For the terms of manufacture stipulated by the 1891 Act, see Stephen P.

Ladas, *The International Protection of Literary and Artistic Property* (New York 1938), ii. 696-7, 763-7 and 900-1. For some of the complications this created for, e.g., Rudyard Kipling, a British writer with a large American readership, see David Alan Richards, 'Kipling and the Pirates', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 96:1 (Mar. 2002), 59-109, and Shafquat Towheed, 'Rudyard Kipling's Literary Property, International Copyright Law and *The Naulahka* (1891-2)', *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920* [hereafter cited as *ELT*], 48:4 (2005), 420-35.

- 11 The exceptions to this were the simultaneously published *Ethan Frome* (1911) and *The Custom of the Country* (1913), which were simply bound by Macmillan from sheets printed by, and imported wholesale from, Scribner's in New York; see Garrison, pp.142-3, 170. In nearly every single Macmillan publication, Wharton's active intervention with regard to revisions and corrections for the London edition is traced in her correspondence with the publisher.
- 12 See EW to Frederick Macmillan [hereafter cited as FM], 5 Aug. 1905; Macmillan Archive, British Library Additional Manuscript [hereafter cited as MA, BL Add. MS(S).] 54956, ff.46-7; and George Ramsden, *Edith Wharton's Library* (Settrington, Yorks., 1999), pp.136-41.
- 13 Ramsden, p.138; EW to FM, 18 Aug. 1917; MA, BL Add. MS. 54957, f.60.
- 14 Ramsden, p.138n.
- 15 The notable exception from Macmillan's list of Wharton publications in the period 1903-22 was *The Age of Innocence* (1920), which did not in fact have a British edition at all; retail copies were simply imported by Appleton from their massive US print run at a predetermined royalty rate of 30 cents per copy (compared to 10 cents, or 5%, for the US run, and 14 cents, or 20%, for the colonial market), a rare and early example of mass book production for a seemingly undifferentiated universal market; see Garrison, pp.231-2. Wharton noted her personal regret at leaving Macmillan; see EW to [Sir] FM, 18 Sept. 1921, MA, BL Add. MS. 54957, f.103.
- 16 See, for example, Millicent Bell, 'Lady into Author: Edith Wharton and the House of Scribner', *American Quarterly*, 9 (1957), 295-315, and *Edith Wharton and Henry James: The story of their friendship* (London 1965), pp.315-41; and Mary Sidney Watson, 'Gender, Creativity and the Author-Publisher Relationship – Edith Wharton at Scribner's', unpublished PhD thesis, University of South Carolina, 1998.
- 17 For James's relationship with Macmillan, see Rayburn S. Moore (ed.), *The Correspondence of Henry James and the House of Macmillan, 1877-1914* (Basingstoke 1993); for Pater's, see Robert M. Seiler, *The Book Beautiful: Walter Pater and the House of Macmillan* (London 1999); for Kipling's, see

Simon Nowell-Smith, *Letters to Macmillan* (London 1967); for Mrs Humphry Ward's, see John Sutherland, *Mrs Humphry Ward: Eminent Victorian, pre-eminent Edwardian* (Oxford 1990); for Vernon Lee's and Oscar Wilde's attempts at securing Macmillan contracts, see Shafquat Towheed, 'Determining "Fluctuating Opinions": Vernon Lee, "popular" fiction, and theories of reading', *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, 60:2 (2005), [?? pagination] and Anya Clayworth, 'Oscar Wilde and Macmillan & Co.: The publisher and the iconoclast', *ELT*, 44:1 (2001), 64-70. Macmillan incurred losses with Henry James for the £1,000 advance for a novel on London (1903) that was never written, and with Mrs Humphry Ward for her record-breaking £7,000 advance for the American rights to *The History of David Grieve* (1892).

- 18 See Simon Eliot, "'To You in Your Vast Business": Some features of the quantitative history of Macmillan, 1843-1891', in Elizabeth James (ed.), *Macmillan: A publishing tradition*, 11-51, at p.23, Table 1.2. The average print run per un-reprinted title rises from 729 in 1856 to 1,902 in 1886, and the average per reprinted title from 1,313 to 2,786 in the same period. Eliot also observes the trend towards the 'bestseller' in Macmillan's output, noting that the percentage of titles with a total print run of over 10,000 rose from 8.8% to 21.6% per cent in this period.
- 19 Ibid. 26.
- 20 Ibid. 27.
- 21 See James Foster, *A Bibliographical Catalogue of Macmillan and Co.'s Publications from 1843 to 1889* (London 1891), and Eliot, pp.28, 31.
- 22 Eliot, p.33.
- 23 Ibid. 43. Eliot's pricing structure defines low price as 3s 6d or below, medium price at between 4s and 10s, and high price as being above 10s.
- 24 Ibid. 47.
- 25 For a detailed analysis of the influence of the in-house reader, and particularly John Morley, see John L. Kijinski, 'John Morley's "English Men of Letters" Series and the Politics of Reading', *Victorian Studies*, 34:2 (1991), 205-25, and 'Professionalism, Authority, and the Late-Victorian Man of Letters: A view from the Macmillan Archive', *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 24 (1996), 229-47. From 1898 Macmillan did employ a woman, Gertrude Mayer, as one of their readers. For the impact of Mayer on Macmillan, see Gail Chester, 'The Not So Gentle Reader: The role of the publisher's reader as gatekeeper, with particular reference to Macmillan and Co., 1895-1905', unpublished MA dissertation, Centre for English Studies, University of London, 1997.
- 26 Tuchman, p.8.

- 27 Ibid.
- 28 I am grateful to Elizabeth James for alerting me to this telling, and officially sanctioned, discrepancy in Macmillan's record-keeping. See Macmillan's record of manuscripts received, returned and accepted, in MA, BL Add. MSS. 56016-56025; the official ledger recording accepted manuscripts, Add. MS. 56026; and the volumes containing readers' reports, Add. MSS. 55931-55996.
- 29 [Tuchman and Fortin], pp.194-202.
- 30 Ibid. 201; and Editions Books, MA, BL Add. MSS. 55909-55930.
- 31 Priya Joshi, *In Another Country: Colonialism, culture and the English novel in India* (New York 2002), p.120. Joshi observes that Crawford outsold Oliphant by a ratio of four to one in the Colonial Library series, and, if anything, compared to Oliphant he was *underpaid* by Macmillan.
- 32 Tuchman and Fortin, p.201.
- 33 Ibid. Tuchman and Fortin incorrectly claims that Wharton's work was already selling in large numbers in the British market *before* the publication of *The House of Mirth*; this is due to her misattribution of the authorship of Elizabeth von Arnim's *The Benefactress* to Wharton.
- 34 From her father (1882) and from her paternal grandfather's cousin, Joshua Jones (1888); see Benstock, pp.47-8, 66-7.
- 35 For *The Fruit of the Tree* (1907), *The Hermit and the Wild Woman and Other Stories* (1908), *Ethan Frome* (1911), *The Reef* (1912) and *The Custom of the Country* (1913). See MA, BL Add. MS. 54956, ff.59-61, 91-4, and Add. MS. 54957, ff.4-5. In contrast, the popular stalwart of the Macmillan fiction list, and staple of the Colonial Library series, F. Marion Crawford, received a 25% royalty rate only once – for *The Diva* (1907). It is worth pointing out here that, owing to its lower cover price, Maurice Macmillan's Colonial Library always paid a lower royalty rate, of between 4d and 6d a copy.
- 36 Brett to FM, 27 Aug. 1901; MA, BL Add. MS. 54811, f.127.
- 37 Incoming correspondence, EW to FM, MA, BL Add. MSS. 54956, 54957; outgoing correspondence, FM to EW, Add. MSS. 55376-55834.
- 38 Wharton's name appears just four times over the course of twenty years; only two of these titles, *The Hermit and the Wild Woman and Other Stories* (1908) and *The Marne* (1918) were offered as manuscripts to Macmillan, and both had already been accepted for publication prior to submission and were sent to the printer on the date of receipt. Despite publishing nineteen of her titles over the course of twenty years, Wharton's work was never subjected to Macmillan's 'standard' policy for MS submissions; this was equally true of other personally favoured Macmillan authors, such as Mrs Humphry Ward, Rudyard Kipling, Henry James and Elizabeth von Arnim, and is clear

evidence of her membership of a select group of 'House' authors. For the submission of Wharton's *The Valley of Decision* (which had already been contracted to John Murray), the reader was none other than Frederick Macmillan himself.

- 39 For example, Macmillan's record of manuscripts for 1900 notes the acceptance of Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* on the day of receipt (9 Aug.), evidently without recourse to a reader's report. This is one of 23 instances of an immediate acceptance without the intervention of a House reader – out of a total of 62 titles eventually accepted and 657 manuscripts received for the whole year; see MA, BL Add. MS. 56019, and record of manuscripts accepted, Add. MS. 56026.
- 40 See, for example, Macmillan's Editions Books, listing date of order, printer, print run, etc., MA, BL Add. MSS. 55914-55927; and the Terms Book, detailing contracts offered to authors, housed at Basingstoke.
- 41 Brett to FM, 18 July 1901; MA, BL Add. MS. 54811, ff.109-10.
- 42 EW to FM, 7 Aug. 1901; MA, BL Add. MS. 54956, ff.1-2. FM requested that EW call on Monday afternoon, between '2 & 4 o'clock', FM to EW, 8 Aug. 1901, Add. MS. 55466(4), f.1631.
- 43 EW to FM, 28 May 1902; MA, BL Add. MS. 54956, ff.3-4
- 44 FM to Brett, 10 June 1902; MA, BL Add. MS. 55287, f.324. In this letter, he refers to a 'letter from my cousin George dated May 26 with reference to a story by Mrs. Edith Wharton'; clearly FM had enlisted George to make her the offer on his behalf.
- 45 EW to FM, 21 June 1902; MA, BL Add. MS. 54956, f.5. At this time, \$2,000 was equal to £411.
- 46 Ibid., MA, BL Add. MS. 54956, ff.6-7.
- 47 EW to FM, 26 June 1902; MA, BL Add. MS. 54956, ff.8-9.
- 48 EW to FM, 3 July 1903; MA, BL Add. MS. 54956, ff.16-17. Macmillan had offered a 15% royalty with advance payment on the first 2,000 copies; see FM to EW, 13 July 1903, Add. MS. 55473(3), f.1025.
- 49 FM to EW, 23 Oct. 1903; MA, BL Add. MS. 55474(2), f.845. The first (and only) print run for Macmillan's 3s 6d edition of *Sanctuary* was for 3,000 copies, a fairly standard quantity for a first printing of fiction; see Macmillan Editions Book, MA, BL Add. MS. 55915, f.57.
- 50 Elizabeth von Arnim [hereafter cited as EvA] to FM, 3 Mar. 1898; MA, BL Add. MS. 54949, ff.1-2. Macmillan had justified his contract to the author, telling her that it was 'particularly difficult to forecast the fortunes of such a book', and, as a result, they had had to undertake its publication 'at our own risk'; FM to EvA, 28 Mar. 1898, Add. MS. 55456(2), f.699
- 51 FM to EvA, 11 Feb. 1901; MA, BL Add. MS. 55465(1), f.145, and 11 Mar. 1901,

- Add. MS. 55465(2), f.789
- 52 The advance royalty payments for *The Sanctuary* (2,000 copies) and *The Descent of Man and Other Stories* (1,000 copies) bear this out; see FM to EW, 23 Oct. 1903; MA, BL Add. MS. 55474(2), f.845, and 24 May 1904, Add. MS. 55476(3), f.1096.
- 53 FM to EvA, 11 Feb. 1901; MA, BL Add. MS. 55465(1), f.145; and EvA to FM, 16 Feb. 1901, Add. MS. 54949, f.54.
- 54 FM to EvA, 19 Feb. 1901; MA, BL Add. MS. 55465(1), ff.322-4. Advances of over £500 and a royalty rate of 25% were offered only to the stars of Macmillan's fiction list (James Lane Allen, Gertrude Atherton, Winston Churchill, Maurice Hewlett, Owen Wister, etc.), who could guarantee sales of at least 50,000 copies.
- 55 FM to EvA, 19 Feb. 1901.
- 56 For example, Macmillan had voluntarily given a 6d royalty to EW (6 Mar. 1903, MA, BL Add. MS. 55472(2), f.784) and to Dorothy Vernon (4 Apr. 1902, Add. MS. 54811, f.185).
- 57 FM to EW, 3 Nov. 1905; MA, BL Add. MS. 55481(1), f.137.
- 58 EvA to FM, 7 Feb. 1900; MA, BL Add. MS. 54949, ff.28-9.
- 59 EvA to FM, 16 Feb. 1901; MA, BL Add. MS. 54949, f.54.
- 60 Appleton's wanted to take over Australian rights for *Summer*; see EW to FM, 29 July 1917; MA, BL Add. MS. 54957, f.57.
- 61 See *Letters*, p.132. Wharton's insertion of the tale was not accidental, as she was worried about whether the collection would be long enough for the British market; see EW to FM, 7 Apr. 1904; MA, BL Add. MS. 54956, ff.28-9. Macmillan had argued that '75,000 words for six shillings is very short measure'; FM to EW, 5 Apr. 1904, Add. MS. 55476(1), f.217.
- 62 EW to FM, 20 July 1905; MA, BL Add. MS. 54956, ff.44-5.
- 63 See EW to FM, 5 Aug., 15 Aug. and 12 Sept. 1905; MA, BL Add. MS. 54956, ff.46-50.
- 64 EW to FM, 11 Dec. 1915; MA, BL Add. MS. 54957, ff.33-4.
- 65 EW to FM, 18 Aug. and 2 Nov. 1917; MA, BL Add. MS. 54957, ff.60-2.
- 66 EW to FM, 19 Sept. 1912; MA, BL Add. MS. 54956, ff.140-1.
- 67 EW to FM, 4 Nov. 1905; MA, BL Add. MS. 54956, ff.53-4.
- 68 FM to EW, 9 Jan. 1906; MA, BL Add. MS. 55481(4), f.1524.
- 69 EW to FM, 24 Jan. 1906; MA, BL Add. MS. 54956, ff.55-6. In fact, as FM felt obliged to point out, Britain was in the middle of an election campaign at the time, and any publicity to promote the book would have been overshadowed by it.
- 70 FM to EW, 9 Jan. 1906.
- 71 EW to FM, 6 Oct. 1906; MA, BL Add. MS. 54956, ff.59-60.

- 72 FM to EW, 27 Sept. 1906; MA, BL Add. MS. 55484(3), f.1080.
- 73 FM to EW, 19 Oct. 1906; MA, BL Add. MS. 55484(4), f.1615.
- 74 EW to FM, 20 Jan. 1914; MA, BL Add. MS. 54957, ff.17-18.
- 75 Ibid.
- 76 FM to EW, undated, [1914]; MA, BL Add. MS. 54957, ff.19-22. Macmillan's statement of expenditure is archived in Wharton's *outgoing* correspondence – perpetually reminding letter-readers of the invalidity of her charge against her publisher.
- 77 EW to FM, 25 Jan. 1919; MA, BL Add. MS. 54957, f.86.
- 78 EW to FM, 17 Nov. 1915; MA, BL Add. MS. 54957, f.32.
- 79 EW to FM, 17 Dec. 1915; MA, BL Add. MS. 54957, ff.35-6.
- 80 EW to FM, 21 Sept. 1918; MA, BL Add. MS. 54957, f.72. This is equivalent to approximately £830.
- 81 EW to FM, 11 Oct. 1918; MA, BL Add. MS. 54957, f.73.
- 82 EW to FM, 18 Sept. 1921; MA, BL Add. MS. 54957, f.103.
- 83 EW to FM, 3 Feb. 1928; MA, BL Add. MS. 54957, f.162.

