

REWRITING "THE IMPERIALIST"

Duncan's Revisions

Darlene Kelly

SARA JEANNETTE DUNCAN'S NOVEL *The Imperialist* (1904) has a central place in Canadian literary history. Alfred G. Bailey considers it an outstanding work and a valuable social history.¹ W. J. Keith sees it as the country's first significant achievement in fiction,² and Claude Bissell, while conceding its flaws, calls it one of Canada's best novels.³ But this small masterpiece did not spring into print fully formed; on the contrary, between October 1903 and April 1904, four distinct versions of it appeared. The first, which was published in London's *The Queen, The Lady's Newspaper* between October 3 and December 26, 1903, overlapped briefly with its successor which ran in *The Toronto Daily News* from November 28 to February 17. Duncan had written to John Willison, the paper's editor, disparaging the first published draft of her story, but relatively few changes were made for the Toronto daily. The American edition brought out by D. Appleton and Company of New York in February 1904, however, contained an astonishing number of revisions. These changes, and more besides, were added to the final version printed by Archibald Constable of London in April 1904.

In rewriting *The Imperialist* Duncan aimed for greater realism, more appealing characters, and sharper political analysis. Between printings, for example, she minutely reassessed the accuracy of the novel's details. Her obsession with getting facts straight and choosing the right word — often a matter of very slight nuance — betokened her admiration for the period's great realists, especially Henry James and W. D. Howells, and indicated the considerable effort she made to apply their techniques to a Canadian theme. Her changes in characterization are of a different order: while various, collectively they improve the image of Lorne Murchison, the imperialist of the title, and that of his family. The more impressive group portrait that results may have been meant chiefly to enhance Lorne, and perhaps, by extension, to benefit his political cause as well. But if Duncan was thereby recommending imperialism to her readers it was only imperialism abstractly conceived, for other emendations stress the movement's practical difficulties. Notable in this regard is the criticism of Lorne's position expressed in the revised versions

by his father, John Murchison, a character whose importance critics have generally neglected.

Duncan's attempt to be more realistic can be seen in the trial for theft of bank clerk Walter Ormiston, the first scene that she revised extensively. "The case in court as it appeared in the *Queen* is laughable," she confessed to John Willison. "Please be sure to get these slips substituted for the corresponding matter you have in hand."⁴ The court case is a milestone in the career of Lorne Murchison, whose astute defence of Ormiston makes him appear a good candidate to represent the local Liberals in the next election; yet none of her changes in this scene has anything to do with Lorne. Instead she concentrates on details touching the legal proceedings. It is difficult to see why the original version caused Duncan the embarrassment expressed in the letter to Willison, as the errors, if such they are, seem trivial. In *The Daily News*, as well as in the American and British texts, the evidence against Ormiston is given by witnesses and not, as in *The Queen*, by Ormiston himself. Originally the bank clerk is confronted by a document found in the vault-passage that has on it the combination to the safe. He concedes that the handwriting is his, but cannot account for the document's removal from his bedroom to the scene of the crime. In a second passage omitted from later versions, he denies any knowledge of the greasy scrap of paper inscribed "not less than 3,000 net." A third section, also found only in *The Queen*, features a cross-examination of Ormiston in which he admits to having lost at cards to Miss Belton and, worse, to his not having paid the gambling debt:

Questioned as to the amount of his losses, Ormiston said it was three hundred dollars. He had not paid Miss Belton, but — here the defendant blushed deeply — he intended to do so.

"You have paid Miss Belton nothing at all?" asked the counsel.

"Nothing at all," Ormiston replied, and winced visibly. The slight pause which the lawyer permitted himself at this point accentuated the young man's reply, made it heavily significant. (24 Oct. 1903)

Duncan may have left out these passages because they make Ormiston more interesting than his lawyer. The trial is, after all, Lorne's first great professional triumph, yet he remains a shadowy figure throughout it. Never once, for example, does he actually say anything. It is as if Duncan, being unfamiliar with legal proceedings, does not trust herself to invent them.⁵

One other subject about which Duncan evinces uncertainty is what in a letter to John Willison she calls the "practical intricacies"⁶ of imperialism. Living in India, where her husband worked as a curator in Calcutta's Indian Museum, she was remote from the lively debates about imperialism held in London and Toronto. Given her particular need to know what topics were being discussed in Canada, she asked Willison to send her any material that might be useful. As an example of what she had in mind she requested a week's issues of *The Globe*, of which Willison

was then editor, preferably those numbers dealing editorially with the question of imperial federation, and speeches on the same subject by Sir Wilfrid Laurier.⁷ Although she researched the novel as thoroughly as resources in India permitted her to do, the wealth of details added to the last two versions of the text indicates that she became fully informed about political matters only during her visit to Canada in the autumn of 1903. That may be why many of her initial facts are rejected in favour of others presumed to be more accurate. In both periodicals, for example, Lorne speaks of the "cheap threshing machines" that the tariff would make available; in the American and British editions this becomes "cheap overcoats and tablecloths and a few odds and ends like that."⁸ Similarly, his original assertion that under reciprocity with the Americans, Canadians could not get "an ounce of butter or an egg" across the border is emended in the London text to "a pine plank or a bushel of barley."⁹ New material added to the final version is equally precise, as in the comment made by an Elgin Liberal that the Conservative Party would likely endorse reciprocity with the Americans in raw products and pass a tariff to match theirs on manufactured goods. His further observation that this policy would "shut a pretty tight door on British connection"¹⁰ persuades a prominent Conservative to join the Liberal ranks. Again, it is only in the final London edition that the conversation between Lorne and a British friend deals specifically with "the policy urged by the Colonial representatives at the last Conference."¹¹

DUNCAN'S ATTENTION to factual detail in *The Imperialist* was designed, in keeping with the realistic tradition in which she worked, to give the novel the particularity of lived experience. More important yet, however, were the changes which affected her characters, principally Lorne Murchison and his family who after revision assume a more pleasing shape. The Murchisons were modelled on Duncan's own family whom she was visiting when revising the novel; thus, she may have touched up their portrait out of deference to the feelings of her relatives. But she could also have wanted the Murchisons to appear more favourably in order that the imperialism which Lorne makes a key issue in his campaign and which his loyal family supports at the ballot box might rise in value along with them. Still, while imperial ideas such as the global unity of the Anglo-Saxon race made for stirring rhetoric, they were, as Duncan knew, largely impracticable, a point she emphasizes in revision chiefly by having John Murchison indicate his son's political handicaps.

In changing the Murchisons for the better, Duncan focuses more on personalities than on issues. The most amusing alteration of this sort makes Lorne more gentlemanly in certain remarks addressed to Dora Milburn, the woman he hopes to

marry. Dora tells Lorne how irked she was with her aunt for walking into her bedroom unannounced. Lorne starts to reply boldly, then falls silent. The emended version reads as follows:

“Dora, would you like *me* to promise something?” he asked, with a mischievous look.

“Of course, I would. I don’t care how much *you* promise. What?”

But already he repented of his daring, and sat beside her suddenly conscious and abashed. Nor could any teasing prevail to draw from him what had been on his audacious lips to say.¹²

He had gone further than this in the New York edition, checked there by an outraged Dora:

“Dora, would you like me to promise something?” he asked, with a mischievous look.

“Of course, I would. I don’t care how much *you* promise. What?”

“Never to come—”

“Lorne Murchison!” she stopped him with outraged propriety, but perhaps more outrage than propriety. “And we aren’t even engaged!”¹³

Only in *The Queen* (5 Dec. 1903) and *The Toronto Daily News* (20 Jan. 1904) do we see exactly what mildly indecorous comment Duncan thought it prudent to delete:

“Dora, would you like to promise me something?” he asked with a mischievous look.

“Of course I would. I don’t care how much *you* promise. What?”

“Never to come into your room without knocking.”

“Lorne Murchison!” she exclaimed with outraged propriety, but perhaps more outrage than propriety. “And we aren’t even engaged!”

Inoffensive as Lorne’s remark appears today, Duncan felt that it would not do for her own audience. She might have worried that readers might question her own delicacy in including such a scene, but she more likely excised Lorne’s comment because it was out of character. Throughout the novel Lorne is portrayed as an idealist who breathes a purer air than others do. Afraid perhaps that even a hint of vulgarity might ruin his image, Duncan chooses in revision to make his moral behaviour unexceptionable.

In another move that reflects well on Lorne, Duncan raises the social status of his mother and married sister, Abby. The suggestion that Abby is inferior to her husband, for example, is deleted after its appearance in *The Queen*, where it is said to be “quite as likely that she would draw Dr. Harry down, if we may speak of depth in Elgin, as that he would buoy her up” (10 Oct. 1903). And never did those who only read *The Imperialist* in book form ever learn that Abby’s friends had almost prevented her from marrying well: “Dr. Henry was a fine old figure

in the town, and Abby's chances, but for an obstinate affection for her old friends, were good enough."¹⁴ Mrs. Murchison also moves a few degrees up the social ladder in her revised state. Originally she boiled a barrellful of soap out in the yard every spring; but in the book versions this image of her as a washerwoman gives way to that of mistress of the house who "had a barrellful boiled every spring"¹⁵ by someone else. It was uncultured of Mrs. Murchison in *The Queen* and *The Daily News* to speak of the book that was always in Advena's hand "with a contempt for all literature"; her anger, however, is deflected from literature to her daughter in the revised version, where her contempt is elicited by "such absorption."¹⁶ In the American and London editions her speech becomes more elegant as well. In expressing her displeasure over the relationship between Hugh Finlay and Advena, for example, she first says to her husband, "It hasn't turned out as I expected, that's a fact, John, and I'm just good and mad.'" This colloquial phrase is emended to something more genteel: ". . . that's a fact, John, and I'm just very much annoyed."¹⁷ Duncan also prevents Mrs. Murchison, a staunch Presbyterian, from repeating the following uncharitable comment about newcomers of another faith: "Wesleyans, are they?" Mrs Murchison would remark of the newly arrived, in whom her interest was suggested. "Then let the Wesleyans look after them.'" The statement is retained in the American and British texts, but it is attributed to "a lady of Knox Church."¹⁸

Refining touches are also applied to the portrait of Lorne's unmarried sister, Advena. Although unconventional from the first version of the novel to the last, in the end she too becomes more respectable, if only slightly. After its appearance in *The Queen*, for example, Duncan suppresses the fact that "Things were said about [Advena], about her untidiness, and how she had been found doing her Latin grammar on the roof to escape the children . . ." (10 Oct. 1903). This description is varied in *The Daily News* to read, "She had every trick of the tom-boys; she was known to read novels in the hay-loft when there were more important things to do" (4 Dec. 1903). All that finally survives of this statement is a reference to Advena's hiding in the hay-loft with a novel;¹⁹ the earlier indictments of her as tom-boyish and irresponsible disappear. Also deleted from the London edition are those irregular habits of Advena that prompt acquaintances to commiserate with Mrs. Murchison: "Mothers of daughters, when Advena was undergoing the penible process of growing up — she whistled, and wrote poetry in the local newspaper — sympathised in good set terms with Mrs Murchison. . . ."²⁰

In contrast to Advena is her admirable father, John Murchison, whose demeanour is usually irreproachable. Yet in the final draft even he changes for the better, although the improvements to his character are minute. When he chafes one of his children, for example, in the London edition he does so "innocently," a more dignified alternative to the original "slyly."²¹ His fairness is underlined in a passage added to the London edition in which his family pokes fun at the

aristocratic Englishman, Alfred Hesketh, specifically the dreadful speech he gives to drum up support for Lorne:

“He seems to bring a frost where he goes,” continued Abby’s husband, “in politics, anyhow. I hear Lorne wants to make a present of him to the other side, for use wherever they’ll let him speak longest. Is it true he began his speech out at Jordenville — ‘Gentlemen — and those of you who are not gentlemen?’”

“Could he have meant Mrs Farquharson and Miss Milburn?” asked Mr Murchison quietly, when the derision subsided; and they laughed again.²²

As the laughter that follows his comment shows, Mr. Murchison’s interpretation of Hesketh’s words is humorous as well as fair, but scarcely derisive. And in another episode he reads his son’s remarks as quoted in the local paper, not with the “proud” eye of the periodical versions and the New York edition, but rather with a “critical” eye that better emphasizes the good judgement that is supposed to be his distinctive feature.²³

IN REVISION DUNCAN STRESSES mainly the personal advantages, such as good manners and a respectable family, that seem meant to increase Lorne’s stature. Her other changes have to do with his politics, or the new order that he envisions for Canada and the Empire. Once again she enhances Lorne by association with other characters, in this case British Colonial Secretary Fawcett Wallingham who is not only a source of political ideas, but also a model of how to propagate them. The fictitious Wallingham is modelled on Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain (1836-1914), the advocate of such proposals as tariff reform and common taxation for defence purposes which Lorne also defends. Duncan is often praised for presenting the imperial debate dispassionately, and for the most part she does so; but at one point in the novel her narrator clearly sides with Wallingham. The British working man voting in certain by-elections is described as an instrument used by Providence to bring about the fall of “arrogant empires,” but the narrator undercuts this judgement by advising the reader either to seek refuge in philosophy or to embrace Wallingham’s glorious, if doomed, endeavours: “Meanwhile we may look on and cultivate philosophy; or we may make war upon the gods with Mr Wallingham, *which is, perhaps, the better part*” (emphasis mine).²⁴ While this exalted view of Wallingham is found in the text from the original on, the religious imagery used to emphasize his visionary powers appears only later. In the London edition, for example, he is referred to for the first time as “support[ing] the disabilities of a right honourable evangelist with a gospel of his own [who] was making astonishing conversions.”²⁵ In *The Queen*, *The Daily News*, and the New York edition it is said that Wallingham, wearing the imperial idea like a medal, “seemed to be courting political burial with it, except that

Wallingham was so hard to bury.” But in the final London version this detail is changed, expanding on the religious motif:

In England Wallingham, wearing [the imperial idea] like a medal, seemed to be courting political excommunication with it, except that Wallingham was so hard to effectively curse. The ex-Minister deserved, clearly, any ban that could be put upon him. No sort of remonstrance could hold him from going about openly and persistently exhorting people to “think imperially,” a liberty which, as is well known, the Holy Cobdenite Church, supreme in those islands, expressly forbids.²⁶

While excommunication is oddly described as a “curse,” the thrust of the analogy is plain: to some Wallingham is a prophet but to others he is a heretic, a grim foreshadowing of the fate that his disciple, Lorne Murchison, will meet at the hands of his own party in Elgin, Ontario.

As in the revised version Wallingham is a more charismatic leader, so Lorne becomes his yet more ardent follower. The description in the serial versions of Lorne as a boy — “so true a democrat” — is altered in both books to “so intelligent a meliorist,”²⁷ as if the idea of improvement were more relevant to the reformist gospel that he preaches in manhood. When asked to be secretary to a group of Elgin businessmen travelling to London, he accepts the invitation with the zeal of a missionary: “But it’s the Empire,” he says to them. In the London edition this reply is made “with a sort of shy fire.”²⁸ That Lorne’s idealism is his salient trait emerges in other changes as well. Its importance is signalled, for example, by Duncan’s reworking no less than three times a passage which relates how free Lorne’s economic ideas are from the self-interest that taints the business transactions of the Elgin merchants: “Only Lorne Murchison, whose soul was alive to the inrush of the essential, lifted up his heart,” she writes in *The Queen* (7 Nov. 1903). This is altered slightly in *The Daily News* to read, “Only Lorne Murchison, a creature alive to the inrush of the essential, lifted up his heart” (30 Dec. 1903). The New York edition states that “Only Lorne Murchison among them was alive to the in-rush of the essential, — only he lifted up his heart.”²⁹ But the final version of this passage is the most effective, enlisting as it does the rhythms of poetry to set the young imperialist apart from the businessmen: “Only Lorne Murchison among them looked higher and further; only he was alive to the inrush of the essential; he only lifted up his heart.”³⁰

Ironically Lorne’s imperialism, high-minded as it is, causes the Liberal Party to get rid of him. Privately Duncan held the same views as her hero, but as a realist she was bound to convey the political situation in Canada, not as she wished it to be, but as it was. Thus many changes in the text point up deficiencies common both to Lorne and to the imperial movement itself. A case in point is Lorne’s condescension toward non-English races, an attitude that is almost inevitable in an ideology founded, as imperialism was, upon a belief in Anglo-Saxon supremacy. Although his respect for the English is evinced in every version of the novel, only

the London edition has him praise them as fulsomely as when he says, "They [the English] have developed the finest human product there is, the cleanest, the most disinterested, and we want to keep up the relationship. . . ." ³¹ In another scene Duncan includes a diminishing remark about French Canadians made by Lorne. When a fellow Liberal reminds him that the Prime Minister drives a team comprised equally of French and English, Lorne replies, "Yes . . . but he drives it tandem, and Johnny François is the second horse." ³² To a degree Duncan herself was guilty of the same bias. In another letter to Willison she described, for example, how she found Sir Wilfrid Laurier agreeable in spite of his nationality: "Sir Wilfrid . . . paid me the honour of a visit. He may be a politician *and a Frenchman* but he is a nice thing" (emphasis mine). ³³ Yet in her authorial detachment she could see the unwholesomeness of feeling superior about one's race. When Lorne attacks the United States as a "light woman among nations, welcoming all comers, mingling her pure blood," the narrator virtually apologizes for the intemperance of the metaphor. ³⁴ Moreover, in the London edition it is said that Lorne "went on hotly" ³⁵ to make this statement, as if to underline his rashness.

Unappealing as Lorne's racial views are, a greater drawback to him as a politician is his inability to see the obstacles to imperialism. Duncan makes this weakness more pronounced in her revision of the scene in which Lorne addresses the voters of South Fox. His speech, which is an impassioned plea for his cause, puzzles his listeners. The magnificent place that he assigns Canada in the future Empire elicits a "fine burst of applause" in *The Queen* (19 Dec. 1903), as it does in *The Daily News* and the New York edition. But in the final London version Duncan pointedly substitutes "half-comprehending" for "fine," then adds a helpful gloss: "They would clap first and consider afterward." ³⁶

To the attentive reader Lorne's defeat at the hands of his own Party comes as no surprise. This is largely because the flaws in his approach to imperial questions are quietly but constantly presented in the novel by his father, John Murchison. Duncan's rewriting of the passages in which Mr. Murchison appears in each case strengthens his role as a political commentator, the value of which has never been fully assessed. She emphasizes, for example, the moral perspective from which he passes judgement on his son. Like Duncan's own father, Mr. Murchison was born in the Old Country whose pristine morality he embodies. In a passage added to the final versions of the novel Lorne tells the Scottish Hugh Finlay:

"We're all very well, *but we're not the men our fathers were*. Look at that disgraceful business of ours in the Ontario legislature the other day, and look at that fellow of yours walking out of office at Westminster last session because of a disastrous business connection which he was morally as clear of as you or I! I tell you we've got to hold on to the things that make us ashamed; and I guess we've got sense enough to know it." (emphasis mine) ³⁷

The British politician in this story stands for a moral tradition that Lorne associates

both with England and with his father. Lapsing from this tradition are the Members of Parliament in the Ontario legislature who are guilty of some unspecified misdeed. Duncan may be hinting here at the scandal in the Ontario legislature in March 1903 when Robert Gamey, a member of the Conservative opposition, claimed to have been bribed by the ruling Liberals to switch parties. Duncan's mentor, John Willison, took a strong anti-government stand on the issue in *The Daily News*. "There is not in the history of Canadian politics a more shameful and sordid story," he wrote, "than that which has just been told in the legislature."³⁸ The government's subsequent handling of the charge was also censured by the press, and the controversy was kept alive well into the autumn of Duncan's visit to Canada.³⁹ Indeed, her contemporaries could hardly have read Lorne's comment without the Gamey scandal coming instantly to mind, predisposing them to concur with Lorne that Canada needed the moral guidance of the Mother Country and her progeny.

In order to ally Mr. Murchison even more strongly with England, Duncan alters yet another passage. Her original description of his books and papers includes such periodicals as *Once a Week*, *Good Words for the Young*, and *Appleton's Journal*: the first two were British papers, but the third was an American magazine put out, interestingly, by the American publisher of *The Imperialist*, D. Appleton and Company. In the London edition, however, Duncan replaces *Appleton's Journal* with two famous British periodicals, *Blackwood's* and *The Cornhill*,⁴⁰ thus suggesting the continuing influence of Mr. Murchison's native land.

DUNCAN'S OTHER EMENDATIONS stress Mr. Murchison's political sense. When, upon Lorne's scoring a small victory, his jubilant mother tells him, "You'll be Premier yet, Lorne," Mr. Murchison is said in both periodicals to glance significantly at her, "frowning terribly." This is changed in the London and New York versions to "frowning and pursing his lips,"⁴¹ as if quiet remonstrance better suited his character. Originally a man of few words, he becomes almost voluble in the revised editions where Duncan makes him express several new reservations about imperial policy. For example, when Lorne confidently proclaims, "Common interest, common taxation for defence, common representation, domestic management of domestic affairs, and you've got a working empire," in both the periodical versions and the American text his father remains silent. In the London edition, however, he fully exercises his critical function, eliciting thereby the approval of Horace Williams, the editor of the local paper who happens to be present, and the qualified assent of his son:

"Common interest, yes," said his father; "common taxation, no, for defence or any other purpose. The colonies will never send money to be squandered by the London

War Office. We'll defend ourselves, as soon as we can manage it, and buy our own guns and our own cruisers. We're better business people than they are, and we know it."

"I guess that's right, Mr Murchison," said Horace Williams. "Our own army and navy — in the sweet bye and bye. And let 'em understand they'll be welcome to the use of it, but quite in a family way — no sort of compulsion."

"Well," said Lorne, "that's compatible enough."⁴²

Elsewhere, when Lorne argues that differences between members of the Empire will be resolved as amiably as those between himself and his younger sister, the group laughs; but in the final two versions of the novel this laughter is followed by Mr. Murchison's sobering comment, "If they manage it, they will be clever."⁴³ In another passage added only to the London edition, he demonstrates a keen understanding of imperial trade: "We won't see a duty on cotton, though, or wool either for that matter. The manufacturers would be pleased enough to get it on the stuff they make, but there would be a fine outcry against taxing the stuff they use."⁴⁴ And at the end of the same chapter Duncan emphasizes Mr. Murchison's prediction that the British will serve themselves with an interpolation that, once again, is found only in the final edition: "They'll put up a fence and save their trade — *in their own good time, not next week or next year* — and when they've done that they'll talk to us about our big ideas — not before" (emphasis mine).⁴⁵ Here, as in other passages added at the time of revision, Mr. Murchison alerts the reader to the problems in his son's imperial ideas. His importance as a commentator confers a new meaning upon Duncan's dedication of the novel to her own father, who may have been a main source of Mr. Murchison's incisive analysis.

The variants discussed in this paper are but a sampling of those made in *The Imperialist* after its debut in *The Queen* and subsequent publication in *The Daily News*, the New York edition, and the London text that contains Duncan's final revisions. They are the more significant changes, however, revealing the aspects of theme and character that the author wished to make more prominent. While collation is sometimes tedious, it can also illuminate in a striking way passages that have been either misread or ignored. Indeed, the study of these variants makes the reader a secret sharer in the creative process, questioning along with Duncan the accuracy of facts, reassessing character, and conceding the greater complexity of issues raised in the book. One does not always agree with her decisions: at a distance of over eighty years, for example, certain details seem equally plausible, and some of the warts removed from the Murchison family in the revised texts would, if left, have added a desirable piquancy to their character. Yet studying *The Imperialist* in its several forms is nonetheless fruitful. The difficulties of such a study, however, remind one that the lack of variorum editions is still the bane of Canadian criticism.⁴⁶

- ¹ "The Historical Setting of Sara Duncan's *The Imperialist*," in *Twentieth Century Essays on Confederation Literature*, ed. Lorraine McMullen (Ottawa: Tecumseh, 1976), p. 65.
- ² *Canadian Literature in English* (London: Longman, 1985), p. 49.
- ³ "Introduction," *The Imperialist* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1971), p. ix.
- ⁴ John Willison Papers, National Archives of Canada. Also quoted by Marian Fowler, *Redney: A Life of Sara Jeannette Duncan* (Toronto: Anansi, 1983), p. 263.
- ⁵ As a realist Duncan aspired to model her fictional world as closely as possible upon life, but she shied away from references that were too particular. After revision, for example, Henry Cruickshank, the prosecuting attorney in the Ormiston case, is described in far more general terms, as if to avoid his being identified with an actual lawyer. In *The Queen* Cruickshank is called "the great Cruickshank, Q.C. Standing Counsel for the provincial government" (24 Oct. 1903). In *The Daily News* (18 Dec. 1903) he becomes "Cruickshank K.C." and trades his status as Standing Counsel for that of "the most distinguished criminal lawyer in the Province," a title qualified by "probably" in the New York edition (D. Appleton and Company, 1904) on pp. 139-40, and in the London edition (Archibald Constable and Co. Ltd., 1904) on p. 130. Duncan also deleted a potentially libellous comparison of Cruickshank to 'Rosebery . . . [by which] people meant to indicate more than a frivolous attitude toward responsibility' which had appeared in both *The Queen* (24 Oct. 1903) and *The Daily News* (18 Dec. 1903). The phrase was likely meant as a compliment to British Prime Minister Archibald Rosebery for his well-known defence of imperialism, although Duncan obscured the point by referring to the reputation for frivolity that his passion for racing horses and for yachting had earned for him, among his detractors at least. The "frivolous attitude" could also be an allusion to Rosebery's irascibility, an irascibility which was believed to have inspired his resignation when his government was accidentally defeated on a minor war vote in 1895. In the book versions, Rosebery becomes Renfaire, "a British politician of lofty but abortive views" (New York edition, p. 134; London edition, p. 130). The word "renfaire," in its closeness to *rien faire*, may be a pun on the do-nothing aspect of Rosebery's sixteen months in office. Yet, apart from this reference, Cruickshank in the revised versions is no longer controversial.
- ⁶ John Willison Papers, National Archives of Canada. Also quoted by Fowler, p. 258.
- ⁷ John Willison Papers, National Archives of Canada. Also quoted by Fowler, pp. 257-58. Although nothing is known of Willison's recommendations, a clue about what they were may exist in the reading done by Abby Murchison's father-in-law when trying to decide how to vote on the imperial question. He first studied such luminaries of the Manchester school as Cobden and Bright, and subscribed to the *Times* for six months; then he examined two proposals regarding Canada's political options, one advanced by imperialist George Parkin, whose biography Willison later wrote, and the other by Goldwin Smith, whose arguments for annexation to the United States would have been known to Duncan back in the 1880's when she wrote for his paper, *The Week*.
- ⁸ *The Queen*, 28 Nov. 1903; *The Toronto Daily News*, 18 Jan. 1904; New York edition, p. 307; London edition, p. 302.
- ⁹ *The Queen*, 19 Dec. 1903; *The Toronto Daily News*, 3 Feb. 1904; New York edition, p. 407; London edition, p. 402.

- ¹⁰ London edition, p. 292.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 303.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 322-23. The emphasis on "me" in line one may be an attempt to avoid the syntactical error of the serial versions, where "me" follows "to promise" instead of "like."
- ¹³ New York edition, p. 328.
- ¹⁴ *The Queen*, 10 Oct. 1903; *The Toronto Daily News*, 5 Dec. 1903.
- ¹⁵ *The Queen*, 3 Oct. 1903; *The Toronto Daily News*, 28 Nov. 1903; New York edition, p. 12; London edition, p. 11.
- ¹⁶ *The Queen*, 10 Oct. 1903; *The Toronto Daily News*, 1 Dec. 1903; New York edition, p. 42; London edition, p. 41.
- ¹⁷ *The Queen*, 12 Dec. 1903; *The Toronto Daily News*, 26 Jan. 1904; New York edition, p. 358; and London edition, p. 353.
- ¹⁸ *The Queen*, 17 Oct. 1903; *The Toronto Daily News*, 11 Dec. 1903; New York edition, p. 96; and London edition, p. 94.
- ¹⁹ New York edition, p. 65; London edition, p. 63.
- ²⁰ *The Queen*, 10 Oct. 1903; *The Toronto Daily News*, 4 Dec. 1903. Duncan's stylistic changes in this paragraph are typical of her stylistic changes in the novel as a whole — bafflingly inconsistent. For example, her sacrifice of "penible process" is a good decision, first, because the alliteration is distracting, and second, because the exotic "penible" is more at home in French than English. But her changes do not always result in plainer diction. Both *The Queen* and *The Daily News* state that "Advena, bookish and unconventional, was regarded with suspicion." In the American and British editions Duncan's weakness for elegant phrasing leads her to replace "suspicion" with the less familiar "dubiety." Even more curious is her tinkering with proper names. Except for the shift from James Finlay to Hugh Finlay in the book versions, all of these changes have to do with characters so minor that they are little more than names. In *The Queen* and *The Daily News*, for example, Mr. Murchison purchases the Bennett business; this becomes the Playfair business in the New York and London editions. The Murchisons' servant girl is called Jennie in the first two versions of the novel, but Eliza in the last two. Grocer Thomas Weyms defects from St. Andrew's to Knox Church in both periodicals; he later becomes Thomas Wilcox. Duncan initially names John Finlay as one of the parishioners to receive a visit from the minister; but in the New York edition, perhaps in order to avoid the reader's confusing him with the minister, Hugh Finlay, Duncan changes John Finlay to John Morse; then, unaccountably, in the London edition, she changes John Morse to John Flint. One could multiply examples. Either some names came to sound better than others, or she was avoiding names that might have had some public or private significance.
- ²¹ *The Queen*, 5 Dec. 1903; *The Toronto Daily News*, 25 Jan. 1904; New York edition, p. 351; London edition, p. 345.
- ²² London edition, p. 345.
- ²³ *The Queen*, 21 Nov. 1903; *The Toronto Daily News*, 9 Jan. 1904; New York edition, p. 258; London edition, p. 254.
- ²⁴ London edition, p. 387.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 216.

- ²⁶ *The Queen*, 19 Dec. 1903; *The Toronto Daily News*, 1 Feb. 1904; New York edition, p. 391; London edition, p. 386.
- ²⁷ *The Queen*, 3 Oct. 1903; *The Toronto Daily News*, 28 Nov. 1903; New York edition, p. 3; London edition, p. 3.
- ²⁸ London edition, p. 146.
- ²⁹ New York edition, p. 199.
- ³⁰ London edition, p. 194.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 162.
- ³² *Ibid.*, p. 388.
- ³³ John Willison Papers, National Archives of Canada. Also quoted by Fowler, p. 265.
- ³⁴ London edition, p. 406.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*
- ³⁶ *The Queen*, 19 Dec. 1903; *The Toronto Daily News*, 3 Feb. 1904; New York edition, p. 403; London edition, p. 399.
- ³⁷ London edition, p. 232. The same passage is found on p. 236 of the New York edition, but with the following variants: the word "legislature" is capitalized, and the phrase "you or I" reads "I am."
- ³⁸ As quoted by J. Castell Hopkins, F.S.S., *The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs* (Toronto: The Annual Review Publishing Company Limited, 1904), p. 135.
- ³⁹ John Willison and others demanded that Gamey's allegation be investigated by the legislature; but, in what appeared to be a self-protective measure, the Government appointed a Commission instead. The Commission's exoneration of the government shortly afterwards was greeted sceptically by the press; and charges brought against Gamey on other grounds in the autumn of Duncan's visit to Canada were construed by those hostile to the government as a covert attempt to discredit him further. For a full account of this incident, see J. Castell Hopkins, F.S.S., *The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs* (Toronto: The Annual Review Publishing Company Limited, 1904), pp. 126-48.
- ⁴⁰ *The Queen*, 10 Oct. 1903; *The Toronto Daily News*, 1 Dec. 1903; New York edition, p. 39; and London edition, p. 37.
- ⁴¹ *The Queen*, 10 Oct. 1903; *The Toronto Daily News*, 1 Dec. 1903; New York edition, p. 46; London edition, p. 45.
- ⁴² London edition, p. 217.
- ⁴³ London edition, p. 217. This sentence is varied to "If they manage it they'll be clever" in the New York edition, p. 223.
- ⁴⁴ London edition, p. 219.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 225.
- ⁴⁶ This article was submitted before the publication of Thomas Tausky's edition of *The Imperialist* (Ottawa: Tecumseh, 1988).

