"Austen among the fragments: Understanding the Fate of *Sanditon*"

Emily C. Friedman, Auburn University

AUTHOR PREPRINT: Please consult/cite final version: Emily Friedman, "[Austen among the fragments: Understanding the Fate of *Sanditon*](https://doi.org/10.1080/09699082.2013.754263)" in a special issue of *Women's Writing* on "Rethinking Influence, 1680-1830" edited by Jennie Batchelor. (Volume 20, Issue 1, January 2013) <https://doi.org/10.1080/09699082.2013.754263>

A popular woman writer dies in her early forties in the eighteen-teens. Her heirs are left with letters, prayers, and an incomplete final novel, among other literary remains. This is the story of “a” popular woman writer – namely Jane Austen – though in fact the families of two women writers in the late eighteen-teens faced this situation. Austen’s story is the one well-known to modern readers and critics: her death in 1817 at the age of forty-two, her mass of unpublished work, complete and incomplete, including the final “Fragment of a Novel” that would later come to be known as *Sanditon*. The second, Mary Brunton, though well known to her contemporaries, is more obscure to us. Like Austen, Brunton died in her early forties in the late eighteen-teens. And again like Austen, she left behind an unfinished novel: *Emmeline* (1819).¹

Here the two literary afterlives begin to diverge. Austen’s incomplete final novel would be the very last of her novels (in whole or fragment) to see print, and indeed went unmentioned in print until 1871 and remained unpublished by her heirs until it was printed as part of R.W. Chapman’s standard edition of her works in 1925. The fragment has been fodder for scholarly and creative attention ever since, inspiring multiple “continuations” and completions, beginning with niece Anna Austen Lefroy’s abortive attempt and continuing through the twentieth century.² A reviewer of Juliette Shapiro’s continuation characterizes such a project in terms of reading “clues” one might use to (as Shapiro puts it) “resolve the mysteries of fiction” (189 qtd in “Reader Review”). As both the reviewer and Shapiro make clear, many of these continuations

and scholarly speculations are inspired – and thwarted – by a key feature of Austen’s fragment: It is all setup, with no clear sense of Austen’s intentions towards plot and even primacy of characters. Most thinking about *Sanditon* reflects on “what might have been” had Austen lived. In this essay I tackle a slightly different question: what might have been had Austen had different literary executors, ones more inclined to publish even fragments like *Sanditon*? In other words: what if *Sanditon* had seen print 108 years earlier than it did?

In this essay I will show how the puzzling fate of one canonical woman writer's final work is illuminated when examined alongside a work far less well-known to modern audiences. By so doing, I show a way of contextualizing women writers' different work without imposing a narrative of influence upon those texts' interrelationship. Rather than "influence," I show how one text's reception history can be fruitfully read as a possible "alternate history" for another, illuminating latent possibilities. In so doing is a move away from intertextuality and its remaining connections to notions of authorship³ and closer to Gérard Genette’s final and most abstract category of textual interrelation: architextuality.

Architextuality is the most capacious in a series of terms Genette uses to describe the relationship between two or more texts. At the other end of this spectrum of specificity is intertextuality, describing for Genette the literal presence of a prior text within a text (for example, continuations of *Sanditon* that include Austen’s text within their work). Metatextuality describes a relation based upon language and commentary (such as literary criticism), and paratextuality describes the relationship between a text and the texts that work transforms (as in parodies and pastiches). While none of Genette’s categories are necessarily wholly discrete from one another, they can be. For example, *Pride & Prejudice and Zombies* uses Austen’s novel as paratextual source for parody, its use of Austen’s text verbatim

constitutes a further intertextual mode, and the parody as a whole serves as a commentary on Austen mania in a metatextual way.

Metatext, paratext, and intertext work very well for works whose connects can be mapped in a clear chain of influence. When one wishes, as I do here, to describe the relationship between two works whose content cannot be connected by some connecting text or immediately to each other through influence, another framing term is needed.

Architextuality, in contrast to Genette's other terms, is a "silent" (or very nearly so) relationship of a text to a larger set of generic and other abstract expectations imposed upon it by readers.⁴ In the case of Brunton and Austen's final works, we can propose a way of understanding Austen's *Sanditon* better by using Brunton's *Emmeline* as an illustration of the generic and rhetorical space *Sanditon* could have assumed had it been published in the early nineteenth century. Thus, this essay will begin by sketching broadly the early nineteenth-century literary marketplace for the fragment and for posthumous works, in order to create an architexts that suggest something of the nature of that reading public. While the fragment was by no means a unified or full-fledged "genre," the appeal of the fragment and the general expectations attached to fragmentary publication in the period is an important consideration for the possible alternate history I wish to construct for *Sanditon*. I choose to focus directly on *Sanditon* because of its status as the very last novel fragment composed by Austen, thus paralleled by *Emmeline*'s own placement as Brunton's final manuscript.

I argue that in the hands of another sort of literary executors, *Sanditon* need not have been forgotten or left unpublished, and indeed could have been quite popular. *Sanditon*'s status as literary fragment might have proved a selling feature in the Romantic-era literary marketplace. To do this, I will first discuss the appeal of all sorts of literary fragments, both intentional and

unintentional, in the period before concentrating on the appeal of the posthumous fragment in particular. John Halperin concluded in his "Notes on *Sanditon*," "To this day, in a sense, *Sanditon* has yet to be reviewed" (190). But other posthumous fragments of the period were indeed "reviewed" – published and read carefully and critically by contemporary reviewers, perhaps most famously Mary Wollstonecraft's *Maria, or the Wrongs of Woman* (1798).

From this larger readerly context I turn to the second movement of this essay, which moves beyond general contextualization to a more specifically resonant text – one that cannot, by its very nature, be understood in terms of influence. In order to sidestep influence I turn to the specific case of Austen's contemporary Mary Brunton, examining the modest success of her posthumously-published fragment *Emmeline*. Brunton's novel, though different from *Sanditon* in respect to plot and length, nevertheless provides a possible alternate history for Austen's final fragment. Due to the timing of their deaths and the unpublished nature of these works, it is impossible that either woman encountered the other's final novels. Recently, there have been a few attempts to place Brunton in relation to Austen,⁶ most notably H.J. Jackson's 2006 piece in the *Times Literary Supplement* that envisions Brunton as "Jane Austen's Rival" and Brunton's novels as "Austen plus sex and violence." While Brunton has thus often been imagined as a "minor" writer in comparison to Austen, their incomplete novels had very different, and to modern audiences unexpected, afterlives. Despite being much shorter than the *Sanditon* fragment, *Emmeline* was treated as a "whole" novel in ways that *Sanditon* wasn't and still isn't.

I argue that *Emmeline* illustrates an alternate potential for the fate of *Sanditon*, one as tied up in technique as in contemporary fame and literary executors. Examining these texts side by side would not work within the typical intertextual framework that requires the two works be connected through some mode of direct influence. However, through *Emmeline* we can imagine

an alternate history, and a potential architextural space, for *Sanditon* in the eighteen-teens, one that gives us a better sense of the literary marketplace for the fragment.

The Appeal of the Fragment in Austen's Time

At the time of her early death, Austen left a substantial body of unpublished work: prayers, poems, and letters, as well as five novels in various states of completion. Despite Henry Austen's claim in his "Biographical Preface" that "Every thing came finished from her pen; for on all subjects she had ideas as clear as her expressions were well chosen. It is not hazarding too much to say that she never dispatched a note or letter unworthy of publication" (*Persuasion* 331) *Northanger Abbey* had initially been completed and sold to publishers as *Susan* in 1803, but it was never printed in Austen's lifetime. Henry Austen repurchased the rights to that novel in 1817, and published it alongside another novel, *Persuasion*. Three other novels would be shelved for most of the nineteenth century: the epistolary early novel *Lady Susan* and a novel fragment usually referred to as *The Watsons* would first appear in print in James Edward Austen-Leigh's *A Memoir of Jane Austen* (1870). Austen-Leigh also refers in passing to, but did not include, "The last Work"⁶ now commonly referred to as *Sanditon*. *Sanditon* would not see print for another fifty-five years, when Chapman transcribed the manuscript as *Fragment of a Novel* (1925).

It is important to note here that what the Austen family chose to immediately publish were the two complete novels, one of which had actually been submitted to a publisher, and one that had been completed and then substantially revised, particularly in its final chapters, by Austen

before her death.¹ When the Austen family chose to leave *Sanditon* (among other fragments unpublished, they thus aligned themselves with a particular tradition of judgment in regards to the status of posthumous fragments. Marjorie Levinson notes how Samuel Johnson defends the suppression of Edmund Smith's "sketches and rough drafts" from a posthumous collection of his work, arguing "It cannot be supposed they would suppress anything that was his, but out of respect to his memory, and for want of proper hands to finish what so great a genius had begun".⁷ Johnson's rationale is very close to the Austen family's own thoughts on the subject of posthumous fragments. When giving the public its first account of *Sanditon* in his 1871 *Memoir of Jane Austen*, James-Edward Austen-Leigh explains the family's decision quite simply: "Such an unfinished fragment **cannot** be presented to the public..." (182, emphasis mine), eliding over the family debate over whether to include the fragment (Bree and Todd 233). But Austen-Leigh and his cousins only had control of the manuscripts after Cassandra Austen's death in 1845 – long after Jane Austen's death in 1817, when *Persuasion* and *Northanger Abbey* were published posthumously.

The later nineteenth-century Austen family's choice not to publish *Sanditon* makes sense as a continuing reaffirmation of the original judgment of Cassandra Austen and as an elision that kept Austen's published work in line with the completely polished authoress the Austen family wished to promote. But Cassandra's initial choice is somewhat odd, given the popularity not only of posthumous publications but of fragments of all kinds in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century.⁸ Austen's fragmentary final novel needs reconsideration within the context of the other, published fragments of the period. Fragmentary published writing of all sorts was popular in the long eighteenth-century, and much has been written on the fragment as an

¹ Most recently, see Katie Gemmill's "Jane Austen as Editor: Letters on Fiction and the Cancelled Chapters of *Persuasion*" (*Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 24:1, Fall 2011)

intentional (or unavoidable) choice on the part of poets of the Romantic era in particular.

Thomas McFarland argues that for Romantic poets, the impossibility of complete satisfaction filtered into the form of their work.⁹ And as recent work on the fragment has shown, the appeal was not limited to poetic forms, nor was it limited to the period we think of as “Romantic.”¹⁰

When one turns to study novels of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the notion of fragmentariness is less overwhelming but still significant. One thinks of the work of Laurence Sterne, whose *Tristram Shandy* and *A Sentimental Journey* both flirt with a sense of incompleteness and fragmentariness. Mackenzie's *The Man of Feeling* is assumed to be a manuscript literally blown to pieces, as its pages have indiscriminately been reappropriated for gun wadding. Elizabeth Wanning Harries has drawn critical attention to the epistolary fragments of Richardson's *Clarissa Harlowe*, Laclos' *La Présidente de Tourvel*, and Frances Sheridan's Sidney Bidulph, whose shredded or incoherent writings are fragments designed to communicate the incommunicable (130-150). By the turn of the century, one sees books like *The Age We Live In: A Fragment*. (1813), which, according to the reviews, was “supposed to be the journal of a young lady of fashion who, having sprained her ankle.... Is confined to her dressing-room for a great length of time” (*The Critical Review* 330).

Nor were only “intentional” fragments popular in the period. Some of these published fragments, particularly posthumous fragments, can be called “accidental,” as their authors did not intend to leave them in their incomplete state. Such fragments found increased popularity during the period, in part due to the success of intentionally fragmented works in all genres. Here I wish to make one further step: to explore the unintended fragments for their ties to this larger fragment-craze.

The appeal of posthumous works is by no means exclusively the property or quirk of Romantic-era readers. In his *Naturalis Historia*, Pliny notes that “the latest works of artists and the pictures left unfinished at their death are valued more than any of their finished paintings... The reason is that in these we see traces of the design and the original conception of the artists, while sorry for the hand that perished at its work beguiles us into the bestowal of praise” (35.145, qtd. in Tytell 22). This appeal continues into the early twenty-first century, as seen in the 2009 publication of Vladimir Nabokov’s 138 note cards that comprise the only surviving material from the planned novel *The Original of Laura*. Traces of Pliny’s sentiment surviving into the nineteenth century can be seen in the *Monthly Review*’s 1826 essay on Ann Radcliffe’s posthumous novel, *Gaston de Blondville*:

It seems now to be pretty generally admitted that authors, who in their life-time attracted more than an ordinary share of admiration, should be considered as licensed to accumulate their inferior productions for the purposes of posthumous fame. Friends may thus soothe the poignancy of grief, and gratify the ardour of affection, by preserving those gleanings of the mental harvest, and by presenting them to the world, accompanied by highly-coloured panegyrics upon departed genius. The public are expected to lend, at least, an indulgent attention to the accents of a voice which is not likely to be heard again, and speaks to us, as it were, from the grave; and the critic is rebuked if, in the exercise of his severer office, he forgets what is due to private feeling, and judges of the literary bequests of the dead, by the same standard which he would apply to the works of the living. (280-1)

According to the *Monthly Review*'s writers, a posthumous publication could almost assuredly count on a warm, or at least curious, reception.

This is borne out in the reviews of other posthumous fragments. Posthumous publication of accidental fragments is not without precedent in the period. Perhaps most famously, William Godwin published Mary Wollstonecraft's *Maria, or the Wrongs of Woman* as part of *Posthumous Works of the Author of A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* in 1798. The "fragment in two volumes" included multiple sketches for the ending of the novel, along with Godwin's editorial note:

There are few... that would have wished that this fragment should have been suppressed, because it is a fragment. There is a sentiment, very dear to minds of taste and imagination, that finds a melancholy delight in contemplating these unfinished productions of genius, these sketches of what, if they had been filled up in a manner adequate to the writer's conception, would perhaps have given a new impulse to the manners of the world. (3)

Reviewers of *Maria* were savage indeed. They ruthlessly mocked Godwin's assertion that a complete *Maria* could have changed the world and decried the political and social ideals espoused in the novel. They sneered at the character of the dead woman who wrote it and criticized Godwin's choice to publish Wollstonecraft's letters to himself and Gilbert Imlay. However, in the midst of many such critiques on seemingly every point of Godwin's editorial project, the reviewers did not suggest that Godwin was entirely deluded in presenting to the public Wollstonecraft's final, if incomplete, novel merely because it was incomplete. In that sense, the reviewers too perhaps hoped to find "melancholy delight" in the novel.

It may be argued that “fragments” such as *Maria* are quite unlike the *Sanditon* fragment. Indeed, *Maria* and its ilk may better be compared to *Persuasion*, with its two manuscript endings. While *Maria* lacks the imprimatur of Austen’s two “finis” moments in the *Persuasion* manuscript, they are both of substantial length and fully realized plots. Certainly *Sanditon* is far shorter than an unfinished work like *Maria*, as its twelve chapters and about 23,000 words would scarcely make up a single volume, let alone two or three. In order to further explore the fate of a smaller, more incomplete fragment like *Sanditon*, I turn to the other women writer I mentioned at the opening of this essay, whose life and death so closely coincide with Austen’s.

***Emmeline*: A Thought Experiment**

Emmeline and *Sanditon* were written by women whose lives (and as it turns out, deaths) were running in near-parallel, though they were wholly unaware of that fact, and their final works saw very different afterlives. Unlike *Sanditon*, which languished in family archives for many years, Brunton’s *Emmeline* was published almost immediately after her death and ran into multiple editions shortly thereafter, though it vanished (like Brunton’s other works) as her star waned in the decades after her death. Over a century passed between the last nineteenth-century edition of her work in 1849 and the republication of her two complete novels in the Pandora series in 1986. *Emmeline* would not see a reprint until 1992, when Routledge reproduced the first edition.

Mary Brunton is often dismissed – when she is discussed at all – as a minor author of overly didactic novels with intimidating titles: *Self-Control* and *Discipline*. Though Brunton had no personal or artistic connection to her fellow writer, the few mentions of her tend to highlight the slender, nearly non-existent connection to Austen. Brunton is often invoked in order to quote

some of Jane Austen's cutting commentary on her first novel, *Self-Control*, whose heroine, Laura Montreville, is kidnapped and ultimately falls over an American waterfall in a canoe. Austen writes to her sister Cassandra,

I am looking over Self Control again, & my opinion is confirmed of its' being an excellently-meant, elegantly-written Work, without anything of Nature or Probability in it. I declare I do not know whether Laura's passage down the American River, is not the most natural, possible, every-day thing she ever does.— (Le Faye *Letters* 234)

And her scathing joke a year later to niece Anna Lefroy that she will write

a close Imitation of 'Self-control' as soon as I can;—I will improve upon it;—my Heroine shall not merely be wafted down an American river in a boat by herself, she shall cross the Atlantic in the same way, & never stop till she reaches Gravesent [sic].— (Le Faye *Letters* 282-3)

What is forgotten – or elided over – in emphasizing Austen's mocking is how Austen eagerly sought a copy of the novel, afraid it might “forestall” her “own story and... people” in *Sense and Sensibility* – and that she looked over it at least twice once she did get a copy (Le Faye *Letters* 186).

Moreover, Brunton herself agreed, at least in part, with Austen's description of *Self-Control* as excessive in its heroine and its events. In consequence Ellen Percy, the heroine of Brunton's second novel *Discipline*, is a far more ambiguous character more akin to Austen's erring Emma Woodhouse than to the impossible perfection of many earlier didactic heroines. In her final, fragmentary novel *Emmeline*, Brunton moves, as Austen does with *Sanditon*, to make a potential leap light-years forward. While its heroine is more conventionally passive and

sensitive, her situation as a remarried divorced woman was decidedly unconventional. Indeed, but for Brunton's untimely death, she might have suppressed or given up on the novel herself, though it is clear from the outlines she left behind that she could and did imagine a particular ending for her novel – and not a happy one.

Aside from Anna Lefroy's testimony about Austen's possible plans we know very little about the author's plans for *Sanditon*. What does remain is strikingly unlike Austen's prior novels in many respects. It is emphatically interested in the modern, as the “young and rising” *Sanditon* is in the process of “improvement” and modernization on a commercial scale never before seen in an Austen novel. Many critics have noted parallels between Austen's ill and dying body and her choice to people this final novel with hypochondriacs and quacks of all sorts. Robert Benson has called *Sanditon* “a work in progress... about progress” (212).

In a similar fashion, Brunton's fragment is a work in ruin about the ruin of a marriage. In it, the titular heroine remarries after her divorce from a boring but decent man. The newly-married pair cannot maintain their affection for each other when they are wholly shunned by their families, friends, and social connections. As Sarah Smith points out, Brunton here demonstrates how money and security cannot erase the “dependence” every human being has in the larger community. Brunton describes the remarried hero and heroine as otherwise scrupulously moral and sensitive, which causes them further pain.

Unlike other erring heroines of the period, Emmeline's moral blemish is irreversible, and unlike Ellen Percy, Emmeline is acutely aware of what she has done and is unable to silence her conscience for any lengthy period of time. Too high-minded to associate with the only people who remain willing to associate with her and unable even through good deeds to win the friendship of her good-hearted neighbor, Emmeline grows entirely dependent on her new

husband for emotional support – a burden too great for him to bear. The novel takes on a claustrophobically narrow focus, following every turn and torment of Emmeline’s hyper-sensitive mental processes. Emmeline is increasingly unable to share her whole heart with her new husband, since she feels that any expression of regret, longing for her children, or anxiety would only serve to alienate him from her. But in Brunton’s plan of the novel, the alienation was inevitable, and Emmeline’s husband would ultimately “rejoin the army, avowing his resolution never to return” (lxxxvi). In his presentation of the five first draft chapters of *Emmeline*, Alexander Brunton reproduces the final line from the original outline at the end:

Emmeline did not dare to look her last. She sat motionless and stunned. The noise of a carriage was heard. She gave one start of agony – then listened in the stillness of despair. The sound died in the distance. It was lost – and Emmeline was left ALONE. (100)

How Brunton imagined she might reconcile this ending with the demands of the novel form and her moral universe is unclear. *Emmeline*’s ending is clearly not to be “happy” in any traditional sense of the word. Unlike many novelists, both conservative and revolutionary, who wrote about divorce and women in other problematic moral conundrums, Brunton’s vision of Emmeline is up-close, in her heart and mind, rather than an examination from the outside.

Despite the bleakness of Brunton’s ending and the relentless drag of the declining marital relationship, Brunton’s tone is decidedly generous. There is no villain to the novel; instead, there are flawed, imperfect people. Brunton suggests, again and again, that it is the circumstances that irritate and inflame two relatively ordinary people into grief. The mental torment of *Emmeline* is hard to read now and was hard to read when it appeared in 1819.

I discuss *Emmeline*'s content here at length to show that even potentially controversial or troubling innovations, even in fragment form, did have their place in the literary marketplace of the early nineteenth century. If the Austen family had so chosen, *Sanditon*'s sometimes scathing and pointed look at the crucial issues of the age might have found an audience, as *Emmeline* did. Indeed, Isabelle Bour suggests that the parallel in her assessment of *Emmeline*: "this now reads like praise of a new kind of writing – new in the same way as the narrativized self-examination of characters was new in Jane Austen's novels" (33).

Which is not to say that *Emmeline* was a runaway success. The *Monthly Review* found the fragment problematic, not because it was unfinished, but because it seemed impossible to continue:

Yet we question whether, if Mrs. Brunton had lived to finish this tale, it would have been as pleasing as either of her former novels. The moral, indeed, as in every thing from this lady's pen, is excellent: but the story is painful, and almost repulsive. It is a picture of weakness suffering all the agonies of guilt, or more than the guilty heart ever can suffer;—a picture of weakness amounting indeed to guilt, yet gifted with all the redeeming qualities of sweetness, tenderness, and penitence. The subject of the tale is certainly not happy: our interest is painfully excited in favour of one so young, so beautiful, and so tender-hearted; yet we cannot but acknowledge to ourselves that her sufferings are not undeserved. Mrs. Brunton has thrown too much nobleness and grace round the characters of those whose actions she would represent as vicious and immoral: it is impossible not to regard vice, when clothed in forms so attractive, as something less shameless and disgusting than we have hitherto imagined it; and there seems

to be no utility in setting our feelings at war with our better judgment. (176-77)

Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine agreed:

Had the author prolonged the story of this adulteress, all hearts must either have inevitably been repelled by the detailed account of her agonies, or they must have been made to feel a fatal sympathy with them. We firmly believe that Mrs.

Brunton could not have finished such a tale. (190, qtd. in Bour 33)

While these reviewers discuss *Emmeline* as an impossible-to-complete tale, there is a marked tendency to imagine it already as a self-sufficient **whole**. The reviewers of *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* further write that

...though only a fragment, we conceive that by it the author has sufficiently attained her object, and that the reader could scarcely have borne a long story of such misery and guilt. (qtd. in Bour 32)

To make it longer is unnecessary – a sentiment shared by Alexander Brunton, who argues that the *Emmeline* fragment is polished, coherent, timely, and, thus, publishable:

As the interest of such a story does not very much depend upon the incidents – as what is written of it had received all the correction she ever gave to her compositions – as the principal characters are sufficiently developed to be useful and as the spirit of the times seems to make the lesson particularly seasonable, I have not hesitated to publish *Emmeline* in its unfinished state.

It is this sense of wholeness and pedagogical purposefulness that may explain why the Austen family chose not to publish *Sanditon*, even as work like *Emmeline* was published and reviewed. The Austen family was committed to the publication of works which fit with their understanding of Austen as a polished artist. The mysteriousness of Austen's intentions and plans for "The

final Novel” continued to elude the Austen family – as it eludes scholars and would-be continuation-writers today. While more controversial, *Emmeline* is a fragment that can indeed work as a whole in ways the baggier and open-ended *Sanditon* could not, and Alexander Brunton was less committed to memorializing Brunton as a powerful artist than to amplifying her strongly didactic voice.

As I have argued in this essay, this need not have been the death-knell for *Sanditon*. As readers know now, almost a century after the novel fragment first saw print, *Sanditon* does indeed have the capacity, even in its incomplete form, to amuse, delight, and fascinate. Elaine Bander calls *Sanditon*’s probable heroine Charlotte Heywood the Austen heroine she most wishes she knew better. While generations of the nineteenth-century Austen family thought the fragmentary novel better left unpublished, we now consider ourselves lucky to have it. While we cannot transfer our readerly delights and expectations back to an earlier age without severe damage, using forgotten works like *Emmeline* in a project of reconstructing into the architext of the fragment in the late nineteenth century suggests that the wider nineteenth-century audience, primed as they were by other posthumous fragments like Brunton’s *Emmeline*, could have welcomed *Sanditon* into print as well.

Brunton’s direct influence on the work of Austen during their lifetimes was minimal at best, which has had the effect of relegating Brunton to a footnote for much of her literary afterlife. To write a piece on their interrelationship in a special issue on “identification, borrowing, intertextuality, co-authorship, or displacement” (to quote the original call for papers) between two posthumous works written nearly contemporaneously would therefore seem to be quixotic. But as I have shown, moving beyond direct notions of influence to find modes of connecting texts through architextual, larger-scale, more oblique interrelations like shared

generic modes. While the Austen family's direct, extratextual influence on *Sanditon* most directly affected its fate, the architextural connections *Sanditon* can be shown to have with works like *Emmeline* can reveal something still richer: what might have been.

Notes

¹ To the best of my knowledge, there is no connection between Brunton's *Emmeline* and Charlotte Smith's better-known 1788 novel, *Emmeline, The Orphan of the Castle*. "Emmeline" was also used as the title to Anne Ker's 1801 *Emmeline, or The Happy Discovery*, and Emmelines feature in the titles of Garrick's two-act *Arthur and Emmeline* (1784), John Hawkesworth's *Edgar and Emmeline. A Fairy Tale* (1777), and Elizabeth Helme's *Clara and Emmeline; or, the Maternal Benediction* (1788). Beyond the titles of plays and novels, Emmelines pop up continually throughout eighteenth-century literature, as a seemingly stock pastoral- or romance-tradition name akin to Celia.

² Austen's niece Anna Austen Lefroy, herself the author of several novels, was the first to attempt a completion of the *Sanditon* text sometime between the 1830s and 1840s, though it remained unfinished. Later *Sandition* continuations include Alica Cobbett's *Somehow Lengthened - A Development of Sanditon*, Anne Telscombe (Marie Dobbs)'s *Sanditon* (1975) and Juliette Shapiro's *Sanditon, A Completion* (2002), D.J. Eden's *Sanditon* (2002), and Anne Toledo's *A Return to Sanditon* (2011).

³ For a full consideration of how the Kristevian notion of "*intertextualité*" is both bound to and resistant to prior notions of influence, see Susan Stanford Friedman's "Weavings: Intertextuality and the (Re)Birth of the Author" and Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein's "Figures in the Corpus" in *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (Eds. Clayton and Rothstein. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991) as well as William Irwin, "Against Intertextuality," *Philosophy and Literature* 28.2 (2004): 227-242. For a classic example of an intertextual study that cannot help but make the move to authorial influence, see Susan Stanford

Friedman's "'I go where I love': An Intertextual Study of H.D. and Adrienne Rich" located in *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 9.2 (Winter 1983): 228-245.

⁴ See Gérard Genette's *The Architext: An Introduction*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1992. and briefly recapitulated in *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Lincoln, NE and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997. Anthony Lee has recently made glancing use of Genette's concept in his work on Boswell and Johnson (Lee, Anthony W. "Mentoring and Mimicry in Boswell's *Life of Johnson*." *The Eighteenth Century* 51.1-2 (2010): 67-85. *Project MUSE*. Web. 22 Jan. 2011. <<http://muse.jhu.edu/>>.), though in that work his notion of mimicry and mentoring keep him well within the typical understandings of influence and intertextuality.

⁵ To follow David Ayer's usage of the term as "map of textual origins" ("Materialism and the Book." *Poetics Today* 24.4 (2003): 764).

⁶ This has not always been to Brunton's advantage: Margaret Bruce concludes her assessment of Mary Brunton by claiming "Although one certainly can not associate 'someone named Mary Brunton' with the great Jane Austen..." (13), and Sarah Smith calls Brunton an "incomplete" novelist, who fails to create fully imagined worlds like those of Scott or Austen (56). Isabelle Bour says that Brunton, "unlike Jane Austen, was not a very self-conscious writer" (25) who did not "thin out the implications of her novelistic practice" (34) and thus stands as a metonymy for the larger changes occurring in the novel genre as a whole. However, Bour later parallels the critical praise of *Emmeline* as "like praise of a new kind of writing -- new in the same way as the narrativized self-examination of characters was new in Jane Austen's novels" (33). More recently, Kathryn Sutherland notes in passing Austen's "career-long obsession with the success of her contemporary Mary Brunton" (119), noting that Brunton's novels' "appeal is

un-Austenian" though it "remains today compelling reading" (120).

⁷ *The Works of the Poets of Great Britain and Ireland; with Prefaces Biographical and Critical*. ed. Samuel Johnson, 8 vol. London: Andrew Miller, 188, 1. 252, qtd in Levinson 22.

⁸ Cassandra Austen did make a fair copy of the fragment in 1830, and so two copies of *Sanditon* were passed down through different branches of the Austen family. As Bree and Todd note, this may have been what spurred Austen-Leigh to even mention the *Sanditon* fragment in the Memoir – whetting public appetite while not presenting the entire, unedited text (233).

⁹ For Coleridge, this meant two major unfinished poems ("Kubla Khan" and "Christabel") and another ("The Ancient Mariner") that had, to its author, an unsatisfactory ending (6), along with an avalanche of posthumous unintentional fragments (21). McFarland further argues that Coleridge's most vital work is in his "pure fragments," and that Novalis's "fragments are his glory" (22). Marjorie Levinson, while acknowledging that fragments are not unique to the Romantic period, opens her book by declaring that the poetic fragment is a "peculiarly Romantic form" in that Romantic fragments were composed within a culture that was aware of aesthetic effects that can only be derived from irresolution (5-7).

¹⁰ Elizabeth Wanning Harries builds upon the disparate insights of McFarland, Rajan, and Levinson, arguing for an expanded understanding of the fragment, both generically and historically. First, she wishes to understand the fragment within the context of not only poetry, but also the novel, essays, sermons, and physical "ruins" and other material (4). Through this expanded area of consideration, she is also able to move further back in time, examining the novels and philosophical fragments of the later eighteenth century.

Works Cited

- Alker, Sharon. "The Business of Romance: Mary Brunton and the Virtue of Commerce." *European Romantic Review* 13.2 (2002): 199–205. Print.
- "Art. 22. – *The Age We Live In. A Fragment.*" *The Critical Review, or, Annals of Literature*. IV:III. Ed. Tobias Smollett. London: Printed for J. Mawman, September, 1813.
- Austen, Jane. "Sanditon." *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen: Later Manuscripts*. Ed. Janet Todd and Linda Bree. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. 137-210. Print.
- . *Persuasion*. Ed. Janet Todd and Antje Blank. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Bander, Elaine. "Sanditon, Northanger Abbey, and Camilla - Back to the Future?" *Persuasions* 19 (1997): 195-204. Print.
- Baja, Janeite. "Reader Review: Sanditon: Jane Austen's Unfinished Masterpiece Completed by Juliette Shapiro." *AustenBlog*. n.p.. Web. 4 May 2010.
- Benson, Robert. "Jane Goes to Sanditon: An Eighteenth Century Lady in a Nineteenth Century Landscape." *Persuasions* 19 (1997): 211-218. Print.
- Bour, Isabelle. "Mary Brunton's novels; or, The twilight of sensibility." *Scottish Literary Journal* 24.2 (1997): 24-35. Print.
- Bree, Linda and Janet Todd. "Jane Austen's Unfinished Business." *Persuasions* 30 (2008): 222-234. Print.
- Breur, Rolf. "Jane Austen, Etc. The Completions, Continuations, and Adaptations of Her Novels." Web. <http://webdoc.sub.gwdg.de/edoc/ia/eese/breuer/biblio.html> 13 Jan 2011.
- Bruce, Margaret. "Mary Brunton (1778-1818): An Assessment." *Journal of Women's Studies in Literature* 1 (1979): 1-15. Print.
- Brunton, Mary. *Emmeline with Some other Pieces [...] to Which is Prefixed a Memoir of Her Life*. Ed. Alexander Brunton. Edinburgh: Manners and Miller, 1819. Print.
- . *Self-Control: a Novel*. 1811. 2 vols. Introduction by Gina Lauria. The Feminist Controversy in England Series. Facsim. ed. New York: Garland, 1974. Print.
- . *Discipline: a Novel*. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Manners and Miller, 1814. Print.
- Burlin, Katrin. "'At the Crossroads': Sister Authors and the Sister Arts." *Fetter'd or Free? British Women Novelists 1670–1815*. Ed. Mary Anne Schofield and Cecilia Macheski.

- Athens: Ohio University Press, 1986. 60-84. Print.
- “*Emmeline*.” *Monthly Review*. 2nd ser. 91 (Feb 1820).
- Evans, Jennifer. “Physiognomy, Judgment, and Art in Mary Brunton’s *Self Control*.” *Literature and Aesthetics: The Journal of the Sydney Society of Literature and Aesthetics* 6 (1997): 67-79. Print.
- Halperin, John. “Jane Austen’s Anti-Romantic Fragment: Some Notes on *Sanditon*.” *Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature* 2.2 (1983): 183-191. Print.
- Hanaway, Lorraine. “Did Jane Austen Hint of *Sanditon*’s Future?” *Persuasions* 19 (1997): 41. Print.
- Harries, Elizabeth Wanning. *The Unfinished Manner: Essays on the Fragment in the Later Eighteenth Century*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1994. Print.
- Jackson, H.J. “Raising the Unread: Mary Brunton and Jane Austen.” *Times Literary Supplement* 7 Apr. 2006: 14-15. Print.
- Le Faye, Deirdre, ed. *Jane Austen’s Letters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. Print.
- . “*Sanditon*: Jane Austen’s Manuscript and her Niece’s Continuation.” *The Review of English Studies* 149 (1987): 56-61. Print.
- Levinson, Marjorie. *The Romantic Fragment Poem: A Critique of a Form*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1986. Print.
- Marshall, Mary Gaither, (ed.): *Jane Austen’s Sanditon - A Continuation by Her Niece Together with "Reminiscences of Aunt Jane" by Anna Austen-Lefroy* (Chicago: Chiron Press, 1983)
- McFarland, Thomas. *Romanticism and the Forms of Ruin: Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Modalities of Fragmentation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981. Print.
- Mudrick, Marvin. *Jane Austen: Irony as Defense and Discovery*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952. Print.
- Musgrove, Martha. “Relocating Femininity: Women and the City in Mary Brunton’s Fiction.” *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 20.2 (2007): 219-244. Print.
- Rajan, Balachandra. *The Form of the Unfinished: English Poets from Spenser to Pound*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985. Print.
- Smith, Sarah. “Men, Women and Money: The Case of Mary Brunton.” *Fetter’d or Free? British Women Novelists 1670–1815*. Ed. Mary Anne Schofield and Cecilia Macheski. Athens:

Ohio University Press, 1986. 40-57. Print.

Sutherland, Kathryn. "Why Jane Austen is not Charlotte Bronte." *New Windows on a Woman's World: Essays for Jocelyn Harris*. Ed. Colin Gibson and Lisa Marr. Vol. 2. Dunedin: University of Otago, 2005. Print.

Tytell, John. "Epiphany in Chaos: Fragmentation in Modernism." *Fragments: Incompletion and Discontinuity*. Ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman. New York: New York Literary Forum, 1981. Print.

Wood, Lisa. *Modes of Discipline: Women, Conservatism, and the Novel after the French Revolution*. London: Associated University Press, 2003. Print.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *Maria, or, The Wrongs of Woman*. Ed. Anne Mellor. New York: Norton, 1994.