Introduction

John Bryant

Herman Melville’s “Typee” includes four introductory essays. “Editing a Fluid Text” offers a brief rationale for fluid-text editing. “Navigating the Typee Manuscript” serves as an introduction to the online edition’s textual apparatus and fluid-text features. “Writing Typee” is a detailed biographical and historical narrative of how Typee grew from manuscript to book. Finally, “Scenes of Revision” examines more closely certain physical features of the document that indicate how Melville expanded his narrative and continued to revise in collaboration with his brother.

1. Editing a Fluid Text
2. Navigating the Typee Manuscript
3. Writing Typee
4. Scenes of Revision: Expansion and Collaboration

The four introductory essays are also available as a single PDF file for on-screen reading or printing. (If you read the PDF version on-screen with Adobe Reader or equivalent, you’ll find that the HTML links are active and that headings in the essay have been converted to bookmarks.)
Editing a Fluid Text

Marnoo now sought to learn my version of the story as to how I came to be an inmate of the Typee valley.

—Chapter 18, Typee

There’s another rendering now; but still one text.

—“The Doubloon,” Moby-Dick

In nearly all cases, literary works exist in multiple versions. They are what I call fluid texts, and each version represents a revision process triggered, in some moment of intentionality, by the individual writer, or through a collaboration of writers and editors, or because of pressures by certain reader groups. But while all literary works are fluid texts, readers rarely get a chance to witness their fluidity, owing to the private nature of writing, the way books are printed and marketed to the public, and what readers expect to read. The primary cause of textual fluidity is revision, and writers and their editors often consider revisions to be discardable anticipations of a finished readable text; publishers place great stock in being able to offer to the public a “definitive,” that is fixed and established, text; and readers are inured to reading one version of a work, and one version only.

But it is also true that when readers happen upon different versions of a text (whether in the Bible or Shakespeare, in Typee or Moby-Dick, in Ulysses or even in an alternate ending to a film stored on DVD), they perk up and lean into the variants wondering why and how they came about, and what they mean for the writer, themselves as readers, and their culture. Just as there is a powerful desire to experience the pleasures of a fixed and invariant text, there is also a submerged but no less compelling desire to experience the pleasures of a fluid text. This online edition of Melville’s Typee manuscript is designed to exercise this other pleasure.

How can we provide readers access to a fluid text and, more importantly, let them witness the modes of revision that generate textual fluidity? The former problem is a matter of textual editing; the latter, a matter of literary and historical analysis. Both problems are addressed in this online, fluid-text edition (part of the University of Virginia Press’s Rotunda series) and in its print companion, Melville Unfolding (forthcoming from the University of Michigan Press). The online edition offers a full archive of materials that reproduce, transcribe, and analyze the document itself, a heavily revised working draft of three central chapters in Melville’s first published book. Melville Unfolding offers a fuller analysis and a critical approach to Typee based on manuscript findings, and it includes a selected edition of the manuscript as an appendix. The online site and book can be used independently, but they draw upon and reflect upon each other. The book and its selected edition demonstrate how one might use the archive critically; the archive contains a wealth of material for further analysis, but it, like any edition, is itself a critical endeavor.
Rationale and Approach

The now-standard approach to the editing of literary works, as developed through the modern theories of Gregg, Bowers and Tanselle, has been to focus on a single moment in the creative process, usually that moment in which the individual writer surrenders the text to editors, and to build an edition based on that moment, emending it in sensible ways to reflect more accurately the writer’s intentions, at that moment. But to edit a literary work in such a way as to showcase revision, versions, and the multiple and shifting moments of intentionality throughout the creative process presumes the validity of all moments of revision and requires an editorial approach that can accommodate and, most importantly, render readable the flow of shifting intentions. This new focus on revision requires editors to develop strategies of displaying texts to reflect a work’s textual fluidity; at the same time, readers need new strategies in how to read revision and versions.

The goals of editing a fluid text are to display a full range of textual moments and, more importantly, to make the invisible distances between versions visible and readable. Typically, modern editing has focused on the creation of the eclectic critical edition, which features a clear reading text derived from a conflation of authorial variants and (where deemed necessary) editorial invention. But this approach requires the editor to privilege one set of variants, relegating the others to a textual apparatus. Readers seeking to follow a path of revision must labor to construct stages of revision from an apparatus that may itself be heavily encoded. Fluid-text editing offers a reading text that gives readers more immediate access to the full range of revision texts associated with a literary work.

Of course, the fundamental problem in editing revision is that the text of any given revision site is invisible. When writers revise, they engage in a kind of coded linguistic process: they cross out words, insert words, or do both at the same time; they draw lines, arrows, and circles, and add carets or insertion devices to mark a path to an added text. They do not write out at each moment of revision a full rendering of the exact wording they have in mind. Thus, while these wordings exist and have interpretable meaning in the context of the revision process, they do not appear visibly upon the manuscript page as a complete or coherent text. They are invisible wordings, so to speak, registered in mind only, or if registered on the page, then legible only up to the moment of deletion. One illustration of this phenomenon, discussed in chapter 2 of Melville Unfolding, occurs on an insertion slip that Melville made to augment his description of a Typee village edifice. Referring to the decayed sacrificial offerings found there, Melville writes: “the putrefying relics of some blo{{ody}} recent sacrifice.” Here, the false start “blo” records Melville’s intention to write “bloody,” but the word is canceled before it is completed. The implication here is that Melville momentarily intended to recast the Typeean sacrifices as human (or at least animal) rather than just vegetal but that he changed his mind in mid-revision. It would be inaccurate to say that Melville actually wrote the words “bloody recent sacrifice,” for in fact he did not write that text; however, it is certain that he thought that text. Thus, the text “bloody recent sacrifice” is invisible to us even though it is real, and interpretable. The goal of fluid-text editing is to make such invisible texts visible. In the Typee manuscript there are over a thousand such revision sites, each representing a set of sequentialized, invisible texts made visible in this edition for the first time.
Because the witnessing of invisible revision texts requires close inspection of manuscript and print variants and because giving access to the revision process requires speculative editorial construction, the task of editing a fluid text like the *Typee* manuscript immediately raises the problems of interpretation and editorial practice. Of course, all textual editing involves interpretive critical judgments. When, for instance, the editors of the 1968 Northwestern-Newberry (NN) edition of *Typee* changed the phrase “Lacedemonian nations” to “Lacedemonian matrons” (215), they did so even though “matrons” never appears as a manuscript or print variant. They based their change on several judgments: that neither “nations” in the plural nor “nation” in the singular makes sense; that “matrons” would make sense in context; and that in fact, given Melville’s handwriting, “matrons” could have been misread in manuscript as “nations,” such that the erroneous word entered as the printed text and was never corrected by the author. Unfortunately, because the manuscript section of *Typee* in which the phrase “Lacedemonian matrons” might have appeared has not been recovered, the editorial decision to print “matrons” instead of “nations” cannot be tested. Even so, the argument that “nations” is really intended to be “matrons” is plausible, even compelling, and in revising the printed word “nations” to “matrons” in their edition, the NN editors have, through several interpretive acts, made visible what they take to be the once-invisible (but intended) word “matrons.”

Readers may argue that the editor has no “right” to make changes, but the fact of the matter is that editors not only have such a right, they are in a sense obliged to enact it. Texts are representations of intended wordings, and writers will perform various attempts to make their written or printed text correspond effectively with their desired wording. At the same time, publishers, editors, even printers make changes, thus complicating the process. Texts are therefore quite mutable; they exist in different versions and forms; they are revisable, and are inevitably revised either accidentally or intentionally. They are fluid texts, existing in variant versions, and their full reality exists in the total flow from version to version. But since we can read only one version at a time, we expect single reading texts even when we are aware of the existence of multiple versions. Thus, if only to sort out the versions and choose one for reading, a text must be edited, and decisions about wording are unavoidable. In the end, the function and role of an editor as a changer of texts grows out of the very nature of textuality. In the case of “matrons,” the NN editors judged “nations” to be an unintended rendering of “matrons” and altered their version of *Typee* to conform at that textual point to their understanding of Melville’s intended word. A more cautious editor might refrain from making the change to “matrons,” but he or she would nevertheless earmark the word “nations” to raise the question of its status. The issue, again, is not whether editors have the right to edit, but what sort of changes they may make, for what reasons, and with what signals to the reader. Along these lines, a more pertinent complaint concerning the NN edition’s change to “matrons” is that, given the NN edition’s policy of featuring a clear reading text that lacks any overt, on-the-page signal of editorial change, readers are not adequately informed of the editorial decision. They will read “matrons” on page 215 but may discover its status as an editorial invention only if they consult the textual apparatus on page 332 or 338.
Like the standard eclectic approach followed by the NN edition, fluid-text editing is also a critical and interpretive endeavor. However, it adds entirely new categories of critical intervention and interpretation. One practice in fluid-text editing is to make a text’s authorial and editorial variants an integral part of the reading experience. To make the invisible texts of revision visible requires acts of verbal construction that textual editors are not usually expected to perform. In the “bloody sacrifice” example already introduced, we may take two variants of the passage as endpoints of a process of revision: Melville first wrote “some blo”; he ended up printing “some recent sacrifice.” An editor must consider making several judgments: Did Melville write “blo” thinking to say “some bloody recent sacrifice” or simply “some bloody sacrifice”? Is “recent” a substitute for “bloody,” or was a compound adjective intended? More deeply, in considering “bloody” at all, is Melville attempting to copy that text from an earlier version (in which case he had already inscribed “bloody” and would now be rejecting it mid-word while copying it)? Or is he thinking of “bloody” on the fly as a new option, which he then rejects in mid-execution? In either case the rejected word requires even deeper conjecture: why and in what manner is the idea of bloody (hence human or animal) sacrifice impinging upon his image of the less offensive decayed vegetal offering, and what does this encroachment say about Melville’s frame of mind concerning civilization and savagery as he is writing? An editor will surely have an answer for each question. But more importantly, the debates over “blo” are matters for readers to cogitate as well. Readers cannot tell if these options have meaning critically unless they know they are interpretive options to begin with. But they cannot know they exist, critically or otherwise, unless each option is made visible to readers by editors, who, to make them visible, must already engage themselves in the critical debate over the textual option itself. Thus, editors seeking to make invisible texts of revision visible must understand the dynamics of revision, which can be known only as critical constructions of past textual events. Fluid-text editing (more than many forms of textual editing) cannot happen without critical analysis and interpretation.

Because editing that focuses on process as well as objects requires some at-times adventurous theorizing upon the invisible, the editor is obliged to shed an authoritarian mode of address and become a teacher. A fluid-text edition must be a heuristic device that invites readers into the analysis of variants, versions, and revision. That is, if the otherwise invisible text of revision is to be made visible to readers in a critical edition, the editor must be prepared to guide readers through the reasoning behind each editorial judgment and to help them with the new kinds of reading that an edition focusing on textual fluidity requires. Readers need to recognize how an editor locates revision sites in a document like the Typee manuscript, derives revision sequences, and concocts a revision narrative, not simply so that they may understand these features but so that they may engage the array of variants and versions themselves and concoct sites, sequences, and narratives of their own. Editors must invite readers to become editors, or to think editorially, as they read, and thus become attuned to the pleasures of the fluid text.

If the goal of any fluid-text edition is to enhance the pleasure of reading multiple versions by giving readers fuller access to the processes of revision, the editor must also devise new ways of displaying text. But statically displaying the texts of versions side by side in a book, or even on a screen, by no means adequately renders the energy that
was expended to create the variations between the side-by-side texts, that is, the private and cultural energies that contribute to the process of revision itself. Moreover, not all versions exist as coherent, physically separable units; several versions of a work may, for instance, appear interspersed and in fragmentary form throughout a single document (which itself may be a fragment, as is the case of the Typee manuscript) so that widely dispersed and seemingly unconnected revision sites, visible here and there on a document, might be related to each other, whereas adjacent and seemingly connected revisions might not be related at all. In the case of the Typee manuscript, Melville performed several phases of writing at different times, which in Melville Unfolding I relate to three distinct versions. These three versions—transcription, transformation, and translation—represent three modes of revision related to memory, narrative, and rhetoric. Since Melville did not always perform these revision modes in sequential fashion, each version in a sense overlaps the others, and in uneven ways. Therefore, a sequence of revisions at one revision site might reflect one revision mode, the next site might reflect two modes, and a third consecutive site might reflect a combination of two other modes. This actual imbrication of revision texts spread out like a patchwork quilt over the document makes a standard side-by-side display of these three versions impossible. Even so, the versions and sites are discernible, but not without editorial direction.

Accessing the versions requires us to engage different edited forms of the manuscript in different ways. Readers can inspect the edition’s diplomatic transcription, which makes Melville’s near-impossible handwriting and deleted words legible, but that feature alone does not itemize and group the many localized revision sites, make visible the invisible links between otherwise seemingly unconnected revisions throughout the transcription, or reveal the broader context that relates a set of revisions to one version or another. In short, it cannot display the layerings of revision texts and versions represented on the document. The fluid-text editor’s first major critical step, then, is to devise a base reading text upon which revision sites may be mapped.

But what is affixed to this map requires other specialized editorial interventions and new ways of reading. Because a passage in manuscript may be revised repeatedly on the document itself and then changed again when it is transferred into print, a fluid-text editor must establish for each revision site on that document a reasonable sequencing of these revisions: a set of steps, each step textually coherent, each representing the actual optional wording the writer had to have considered. Such a revision sequence has no meaning for readers—its steps cannot be read—without an accompanying revision narrative to explain the motivation, direction, and rhetorical strategy that moves us from step to step. Together, the revision sequences and narratives—like a map and its legend—provide a detailed representation of the workings of the revision process. Because the editor must devise these steps and tell stories, no editorial rendering of revision can be anything other than a critical and interpretive engagement with the materials at hand.

These interventions are Herculean as well as speculative, for each sequence has its own logic, probabilities, and necessities, and each narrative will have a constructable arc (or two, or more). Multiplying those tasks by a thousand, as in the case of the Typee manuscript (itself only a fragment) is exhausting just to contemplate. So one might argue that a cautious editor should just settle for the standard transcription only and let readers...
determine sites, devise sequences, and invent narratives by themselves. But the diplomatic transcription only casts into sharper focus the problem of reading the invisible text of revision in the manuscript. It is a trusty editorial construct, to be sure, but its legibility is deceptive, for even though it clarifies the words located at a thousand revision sites it is inadequate to the task of rendering each site’s various recombinant wordings. That is, if an editor is obliged to make texts visible, his or her transcription only partially enacts that obligation, for the words of a transcription, no matter how sharply delineated, still conceal rather than reveal the invisible texts of their genesis and evolution. An editor’s more fully articulated revision sequences and narrative, then, are not simply a convenient service performed for the reader; they are a plausible editorial, historical, and interpretive explanation, one that guides the reader through the editor’s encounter with the otherwise invisible reaches behind the deceptive clarity of the transcription of a very messy but very important document. And in modeling for the reader that encounter in these revision narratives, the editor implicitly invites readers to make narratives of their own. In doing so, they will discover more text—and more about the nature of texts—than they had previously imagined.

**Reading the Edition: Book and Archive**

Currently, the fluid-text edition of Melville’s *Typee* manuscript exists in two formats: the selected book version attached to *Melville Unfolding*, my critical analysis of *Typee*, and the full online version you are presently viewing. The selected book edition features those revision sites (about 10 percent of the whole number) used to demonstrate various arguments in my reading of *Typee*. The book also examines the sexual, political, and rhetorical implications of Melville’s broader revision strategies. The online version offers the complete archive of revision sites, sequences, and narratives, but refrains from broader critical and cultural interpretation. *Melville Unfolding*, then, is one example of how the online archive may be drawn upon for analysis. At the same time, it contains fuller narratives of how *Typee* grew as a book, what the manuscript tells us about Melville’s early use of sources, and how others may have collaborated with Melville in producing his text. No single revision narrative in the online archive can tell these stories, and readers may therefore want to consult *Melville Unfolding* for these fuller analyses. At the same time, it is hoped that readers of *Melville Unfolding* will want to inspect more than the partial selection of revision sites found in that book, and that they will search the online edition for evidence of their own in thinking about *Typee*, or Melville, or American and Polynesian culture, or colonialism and postcolonialism, or any area of interest in which textual fluidity may be of use. In short, the two editorial forms are designed to be used synergistically, each feeding into the other.

Because *Typee* grew beyond its manuscript and first print versions and appeared in still other radically different versions, including the expurgated 1846 edition and the 1892 revision (both of which Melville supervised) as well as various modern illustrated editions, a film, a comic book, and the scholarly NN critical edition, I hope that this online edition featuring the *Typee* manuscript will grow to include these numerous other instances of this remarkable fluid text, as part of the projected Melville Electronic Library. I would also
hope that scholars and critics will plunge into the archive and write books of their own, to keep *Melville Unfolding* company on the shelf.

### Notes


Navigating the *Typee* Manuscript

The online edition is an electronic archive consisting of digital reproductions of the *Typee* manuscript, a diplomatic transcription of the document, a reading text available with or without mappings of the documents revision sites, and links to the revision sequences and revision narratives for each site. The following describes each feature and how to use it.

**The *Typee* Manuscript**

The manuscript is a three-chapter fragment of the working draft manuscript of Melville’s first book, *Typee* (published in 1846). The so-called “First Draught” actually represents an intermediate stage of composition in which copying from earlier drafts, fresh writing, proofreading revisions, and other phases of writing are combined.

The physical document consists of a single stitched booklet (measuring 7.5 x 12.5 inches) of twenty pages of durable white wove paper, six additional loose leaves torn from similar booklets, and one smaller insertion slip (measuring 8 x 4.33 inches). The manuscript text is inscribed in one kind of ink, now brownish in color, entirely in Melville’s hand; however, some light pencilings of words and marginal markings, probably in Gansevoort Melville’s hand, appear sporadically throughout.

An inscribed paper folder, customized with reinforced edges, was crafted perhaps by Melville or a sister to hold the booklet and loose leaves. The front of the folder bears the following inscription: “First Draught of ‘Typee’—after which much was added & altered. Written in the Spring of 1845—Began in New York in the winter of that year and finished in Lansingburgh in the early part of the summer.” Also inscribed on the front of the folder is a large numeral “3,” indicating that the entire manuscript may have been divided and stored in several similar, appropriately numbered, folders. On the front inside of the folder are several experimental spellings, in Melville’s hand, of the name that finally became “Marheyo.”

The manuscript text, designated as chapters 10, 11, and 12, corresponds to chapters 12, 13, and 14 of the print edition of *Typee*. This discrepancy in numbering indicates that two chapters of text were added to earlier chapters in the manuscript some time after the “first draught” was completed. The text of the document is a virtually continuous version of the three chapters, with three exceptions: the manuscript chapter 10 begins in mid-sentence with text from the third paragraph of print chapter 12 (that is, the opening of that chapter is missing), the text of one unlocated leaf (designated as Leaf 12) is missing, and the texts of several unlocated insertion slips are also missing.

The booklet and five of the six extant loose leaves were discovered in 1983, in Gansevoort, New York, and since 1984 have been located in the Gansevoort-Lansing Collection of the Rare Book and Manuscript Division of the New York Public Library. One exception to this provenance is Leaf 13, which was acquired for the NYPL in the 1940s by librarian Victor H. Paltsits and transcribed in an essay published in 1943. This leaf, also transcribed in the *NN Typee*, pp. 363–74, is encapsulated in plastic and resides...
now alongside the other loose leaves in the New York Public Library. How or why Leaf 13 was separated from the others is not known.

The digital reproduction of the manuscript and folder were produced by the New York Public Library and appear here with its permission.

**Transcription**

The *Typee* manuscript transcription is a simulation or “diplomatic” rendering of the manuscript text. It presents Melville’s handwritten text—including his baseline inscription, cancellations, and insertions—typographically as it appears on the document page. Melville’s inserted texts have been positioned in proximal relation to their placement on the document, and Melville’s carets (when used), specialized insertion devices, paragraph marks, and marginal doodles have also been reproduced. The pen strokes and cross-hatching of Melville’s cancellations have been reproduced as precisely as possible to indicate the exact beginning and end of each set of canceled words. Every attempt has been made to decipher obscured and canceled text; undeciphered words are indicated by a question mark in parentheses: (?).

Beginning in 1985, I prepared the transcription by first inspecting a microfilm of the manuscript provided by the New York Public Library and xerographic enlargements drawn from that microfilm. I then compared my initial transcription draft to the actual manuscript several times from 1993 to 1999 and corrected the draft accordingly. In preparing the revision sequences and narratives from 1995 to 2003, I deciphered certain previously undeciphered words, corrected one or two misreadings, and altered the transcription accordingly. A final proofreading of the transcription against the manuscript was made during the preparation of this electronic edition.

Melville composed on both sides of his paper. Each leaf of the manuscript (including the missing Leaf 12) has been given a consecutive number, and the two pages of each leaf have also been numbered. Both leaf and page numbers appear on the upper right-hand corner of each transcription page. The NN edition page and line numbers for the corresponding print text of each manuscript page appear below the “Leaf” and “Page” designations. Each manuscript line is numbered in the left-hand margin. Each numbered line of the transcription corresponds to a single inscribed baseline in manuscript. This transcription lineation is sustained in other features of the edition, including the reading text base version and the relevant corresponding sections of the British first edition text.

The following symbols are used to convey specific physical aspects of the document and Melville’s inscription practices:

- Canceled words appear in blue print with strikethrough lines that correspond precisely to Melville’s actual cancellation lines.
- Inserted words appearing in smaller red type are positioned to correspond accurately with their position in manuscript.
- Canceled insertions appear in smaller blue type with strikethrough lines.
- A caret (^) indicates Melville’s standard insertion mark.
- Braces indicate editorial speculation on wording, as in the false start "blo{ody}".
- An equal sign (=) replicates Melville’s hyphen.
- A plus sign (+) indicates letters added to or written over a word to create a new word, as in “thi+e”, which means that an e has been inscribed over the “is” in “this” to give “the.”
- A paragraph mark (¶) replicates Melville’s own paragraph mark.
- A filled circle (•) indicates a marginal penciled dot.

Marginal notes describe more idiosyncratic physical features of individual manuscript pages (such as tears and pinholes) as well as the series of penciled notations (attributed in *Melville Unfolding* to Gansevoort Melville).

In general, I have attempted to preserve Melville’s imperfect spellings. All handwriting, especially in working drafts, involves idiosyncratic flourishes, abbreviations, unfinished words, and the inadvertent dropping of letters; and such shorthand does not constitute actual misspelling. In these instances, I have given the full word intended, not the abbreviated scribble actually written. Conjectured or debatable readings of undeciphered words are followed by a question mark in parentheses, “(?),” and any word that has not been deciphered in this edition appears with its legible letters printed and each undeciphered letter indicated by a “?.”

No effort has been made in the transcription to go beyond a visual representation of the document itself and indicate, through arcane genetic transcription symbols and the like, the process of revision. The chief value of the transcription is that it enhances the document’s legibility; it enables readers to read Melville’s scrawl and to discern his canceled words.

### Reading Text

The central feature of the edition is the reading text of the manuscript, which consists of an editorially constructed “base version” and a set of links, one for each of the manuscript’s one thousand or so revision sites. Essentially, the base version text is an edited version of the manuscript’s “final reading.” That is, it represents the resultant text when all of Melville’s instructions to add and delete text are followed. This final reading version varies significantly from the text of the first print edition of *Typee*; indeed, about half of the revision sites mapped on the reading text indicate changes made to Melville’s text after he completed his first draft of the manuscript.

To explain the reading text and provide a rationale for its use as this edition’s base version, we need to recall Melville’s revision method and recognize the limitations of standard scholarly editing in rendering that process.

### Base Version

In manuscript, Melville performed several phases of writing: he inscribed initial words on the baselines of his pages either by copying from previous (now lost) texts or through immediate invention; he canceled words as he wrote, revised later as he proofread, and
revised several times again in later stages of composition. And this series of manuscript writing events can be witnessed in over five hundred revision sites. Moreover, as noted above, when we compare Melville’s manuscript text to the text he actually published in his first British edition, we discover another five hundred or so revisions made either by himself when he created his own fair copy (derived from the working draft and now unlocated), by his editors when they prepared the British edition, or by his brother Gansevoort when he corrected page proofs. Obviously, the diplomatic transcription of the manuscript, by itself, cannot possibly represent Melville’s revision processes. It merely depicts the revision markings and wordings in manuscript; it does not show what Melville did to create the mess, nor what he did after he tried to clean it up, nor how he continued to revise while making his fair copy and preparing his text for publication. What is needed in addition to the transcription, then, is some suitable “base version” of Typee that can be used to display, like a map, all of Melville’s discernible acts of revision, both in and subsequent to the manuscript.

The idea of a base version is drawn from the traditional notion of “copy text.” A primary concern for anyone attempting to edit a literary work (whether a fragment like the manuscript or the entire work called Typee) is selecting from the available versions of the text the one most useful for copying. Typically, in modern scholarly editing, the editor selects as “copy text” the version that most closely represents the writer’s “final” intention before going to press: either a fair-copy manuscript, corrected page proofs, or a first-edition text. (Editors aiming to represent the writer’s words without editorial intervention might want to use the writer’s fair copy, if it can be found. Since the Typee fair-copy manuscript has not been recovered, the editors of the NN Typee settled on the closest version of the fair copy they could find, the first British print text, for their copy text.) The editor then reproduces this copy text, emending any passages judged to be in need of emendation, either by substituting for them variant texts (drawn from other versions) that are deemed to be more reliable than the copy-text version, or by inventing suitable wording (see the discussion of “nations” and “matrons” in “Editing a Fluid Text: Rationale and Approach”). This form of eclectic critical editing can effectively represent an editor’s conception of final intention, but as I note more fully in The Fluid Text, it is a highly problematic approach to displaying the revision text of a literary work spread out over multiple versions (in both manuscript and print forms) of that work, which is itself the accumulated effect of numerous moments of intentionality. If our goal is to make a full range of revision available to readers—throughout its manuscript and print versions—we need a base version upon which we can map out all of the literary work’s revision sites. For various reasons, discussed below, no single historical print version of Typee exists that is suited to this end; therefore, a base version derived from the manuscript needs to be editorially constructed.

The problem for the fluid-text editor is to establish a base version that is large enough in its textual field to encompass the total range of revision so that all revision sites can be displayed. In the case of the Typee manuscript, we have three texts that might possibly serve as a base version: Melville’s initial baseline inscription, the “final” version that includes his cancellations and insertions, and the first British edition. The first option is not advisable because Melville inscribed his text in alternating waves of copying, fresh
composition, and subsequent multiple stages of revision. An initial baseline version is simply not coherent without incorporating certain revisions, and since some of these revisions (even baseline cancellations) cannot be determined as having happened at the time of initial inscription, we cannot establish a historically stable initial inscription version with any certainty. The third option (the first British edition) is a fully readable and coherent text, but it is not viable because its text necessarily incorporates the collaborative revisions of editors as well as Melville. Of course, collaboration is a major cause of revision in any fluid text and is not, in itself, a problem. But if we seek to differentiate Melville’s revisions from his editors’, we can best demonstrate that collaboration by avoiding a collaborative text as a base version. Better to use the purely authorial version that precedes the collaboration as a foundation upon which to map out authorial and editorial revisions.

With these restrictions in mind, I have chosen to construct a base version on the second option: the “final” manuscript version. To establish this text, I did nothing more than follow the editorial instructions implicit in Melville’s cancellations and insertions. That is, I canceled what he canceled and inserted into his baseline text what he inserted. In performing this mechanical process of addition and deletion, I created what may be called a kind of fair copy of the working draft manuscript. Of course, my “fair copy” should not be confused with the actual fair copy Melville prepared himself. In preparing his own fair copy to send out to publishers, Melville most certainly revised what he was also copying. (Indeed, some of those revisions appear in the variation of text between the manuscript and first British edition versions.) In preparing my mechanical fair copy for the base version of this fluid-text edition, I have, needless to say, refrained from any revising of my own, including any of the small logical corrections to the resultant text that Melville (or any writer) would have made. That is, in a handful of cases Melville inadvertently dropped necessary words or added unnecessary ones while he revised so that the final reading includes several obvious inadvertencies such as “a a college of vestals.” Since these inadvertencies are few and inconsequential, I have not edited them away. The resultant base version text, then, is quite readable but not perfectly “smooth.” Happily, these minor incoherencies do not seriously impede the flow of reading, and I preserve them as a vestige of the roughness of Melville’s original document and as flaws that remind us of the “constructedness” of the base version itself.

Revision Sites

Despite its one or two rough spots, the base version text provides a “smooth enough” reading experience. But though it can be read conventionally for its surface content, the base version principally functions as a map for designating Melville’s revision sites. As such, the mapping feature of the base version may pose small challenges to our normal reading expectations. Each numbered line corresponds precisely to the lines in the transcription. Since some lines are affected by cancellation, they will appear shorter than others, or simply as a blank “canceled line.” Other lines include lengthy insertions and are therefore so long in accumulated content that they cannot fit on a single line. Thus,
while most consecutive lines in the base version appear in uniform lengths, those lines with substantial revision will vary remarkably in length.

The base version can be viewed as a clear text (without “mapping”) or with its color-coded revision sites mapped in three ways; each mapping is available under Revision Sites in the frame selector. In these views, each revision site is also designated by its own revision code that pops up when the reader moves the cursor over any site. (The numbering of the codes restarts at “one” for each of the three manuscript chapters.)

- Text revised in manuscript is highlighted in yellow and coded with the prefix ms
- Text revised in Melville’s fair copy or later in the preparation of the British (often called the English) edition is highlighted in pink and coded with the prefix e
- Text revised in both manuscript and subsequent stages is highlighted in orange and is designated with a combination of ms and e prefixed codes.

To illustrate the mappings, let’s look at four sample lines from chapter 10 in the Reading Text.

Located under Texts in the frame selector is the “base version,” which offers a clear reading of the final wording of Melville’s manuscript:

22 ¶ Here were situated the Taboo Groves of the valley — the scene
23 of many a sensual feast, of many a horrid rite.
24 Beneath the deep shadows of the consecrated Breadfruit trees
25 there reigned a solemn twilight, a cathedral like gloom.

Users may read this text without having to bother with any codings, and this version may be used in comparison to the first print edition (also located under Texts in the selector) with its altered text indicated in pink. This color-coded print text, however, is not “clickable.” For the links to revision sequences and narratives, readers must use the mapped reading texts located under Revision Sites.

By clicking on “In manuscript” under Revision Sites, users may view the same four sample lines, but here with the manuscript revision sites highlighted in yellow.

22 ¶ Here were situated the Taboo Groves of the valley — the scene
23 of many a sensual feast, of many a horrid rite.
24 Beneath the deep shadows of the consecrated Breadfruit trees
25 there reigned a solemn twilight, a cathedral like gloom.

The yellow sites indicate places in the text Melville revised in manuscript only. When you move the cursor over a site, that site’s revision code will pop up; the revision code for the site in line 22 is RS10ms40, meaning revision site 40 in manuscript chapter 10. When you click the site, a separate, resizable window containing the site’s revision sequence and narrative will appear.

By clicking on “Later stages” under Revision Sites, users will find the text color-coded in pink to indicate revisions to Melville’s text that were made subsequent to the completion of his working draft manuscript.

22 ¶ Here were situated the Taboo Groves of the valley — the scene
23 of many a sensual feast, of many a horrid rite.
24 Beneath the deep shadows of the consecrated Breadfruit trees
25 there reigned a solemn twilight, a cathedral like gloom.

These changes, evident by a comparison of the base version to the first print edition, were made either in the preparation of his fair copy (now lost) or in galleys and page proofs (also), by Melville himself, his brother, or his publisher, editor or printer. These sites are also linked to corresponding revision sequences and narratives.

Finally, by clicking on “All combined” under Revision Sites, the user will find all revision sites displayed, both the manuscript and print-text sites in their respective, yellow and pink, highlighting.

22 ¶ Here were situated the Taboo Groves of the valley — the scene
23 of many a sensual feast, of many a horrid rite.
26 Beneath the deep shadows of the consecrated Breadfruit trees
27 there reigned a solemn twilight, a cathedral like gloom.

In addition, sites revised in both manuscript and later stages, such as “deep shadows” in the illustration above, appear in orange highlighting to indicate the overlapping of the separate revision processes.

The revision site codes are assigned in a routine and linear manner, following the text from left to right on a line and top to bottom on a page, one page after another. Thus, the reader can be assured that RS10ms41 follows RS10ms40 and RS10e33 follows RS10e32 on the reading text; however, the numbers have no relation to the actual temporal sequencing of the revisions themselves. That is, Melville may have performed the revision at site RS10ms41 before revising at RS10ms40. Similarly, a revision on one page may have been performed at the same time or in coordination with a revision a page or two later. Again, the numbering of codes is purely arbitrary and designates the physical location of the sites on the document, not their sequence in time. In order to clarify the temporal sequencing of revisions at a particular site and to tell the story of those textual events, we need revision sequences and narratives.

Revision Sequence

In traditional scholarly editing, variant texts are represented in a textual apparatus, either as footnotes or in an appendix, often in a severely concise, highly encoded format to convey the necessary information in as little space as possible. In the genetic text editing of the one extant leaf of the Typee manuscript available to the editors of the 1968 NN edition of Typee, an attempt is made within a transcription format to give bracketed and coded instructions to readers on how and when Melville revised certain bits of text. The resultant genetic transcription is not meant for casual reading, and the technique has proven to be a barrier to critics and scholars as well as general readers. Even if a reader can decode either the footnoted or textually integrated transcriptions of revisions, he or she has little hope of tying one revision within the transcription to another, or determining the sequence of revisions that produced each new wording, or discerning the larger revision narrative that links the variants together. In fluid-text editing, the editor is obliged to work out the sequences for the reader, and to tell their stories.4
The purpose of a “revision sequence” is to display in precise and numbered steps the actual wordings Melville considered as he revised, step by step, at a given revision site or set of sites. Even though the full texts of these wordings do not, of course, appear physically spelled out in the manuscript, they are not conjectural but represent what had to have gone through Melville’s mind as he revised. When the user of this electronic edition clicks on a highlighted revision site, a separate window opens containing that site’s revision sequence with its series of steps. The first step in each sequence represents Melville’s earliest documentary inscription as he inscribed it; subsequent steps (usually several, but as many as twelve or eighteen in certain cases) repeat the previous step but add or delete words depending upon Melville’s insertion or cancellation at the site. If, for instance, a manuscript revision site indicates that Melville stopped writing to cancel a word or set of words or a false start on a word, the wording of that step ends where Melville stopped and the words he canceled are indicated in bold (step 1). The subsequent step repeats any text of the previous step left uncanceled, indicating the canceled wording with a bracketed ellipsis ([…]), and continues on in boldface with the newly inscribed wording (step 2). If they exist in the selected revision site, any revisions found in the British edition print text will appear as the final step of a sequence (step 3), with a revision narrative code (RN) referring the reader specifically to that particular British edition revision.

As with the mapped base version, the revision sequence requires a new kind of reading. Rather than reading linearly, one must read in both regression and progression as one moves from one step to the next, for each new step contains the same phrase or sentence of the previous step but also the textual modification that moves the revision forward in that new step. While moving through the revision sequence, the reader can watch the full text of the passage grow or shrink as Melville makes each successive revision indicated in the revision site. In addition, each numbered step in the revision sequence is keyed to the same numbered step in the revision narrative so that readers can easily find an explanation of each step.

The shaping of the revision sequences is not always a simple or routine matter. To be sure, many revision sites involve the alteration of a single word, requiring only a two-step revision sequence, and there is little likely debate over the shaping of that sequence. And even in the many cases involving a lengthy and complex set of steps, the sequencing is often indisputable because the logic of grammar determines the only possible next step. That is, because each revision step must be linguistically viable, matters of syntax and sentence structure frequently dictate a necessary progression. But in certain ambiguous grammatical situations, a site will lend itself to variant hypothetical sequencings, and in such cases the editor is obliged to voice as many hypotheses as possible. In revision sites with variant sequencings, each set of possible sequences is designated with a letter (A, B, C, D) prefixing each numbered step within the variant sequencing (A1, A2, A3, then B1, B2, B3, etc.). For example, in RS10ms4, we find the phrase “previous to his taking his departure” with “taking” and the second “his” canceled in two separate strokes. Two revision sequences are possible: (A) Melville stopped after writing “taking his,” canceled both words, then continued with “departure”; or (B) Melville composed the entire phrase
and returned later to cancel “taking his.” The two revision sequences would appear as follows:

- A1. previous to his taking his
- A2. previous to his [...] departure
- B1. previous to his taking his departure
- B2. previous to his [...] departure

While A2 and B2 are essentially the same text, they are derived through a different possible revision sequence, and it is impossible to tell whether Melville decided to remove “taking his” as he wrote, or later while proofreading.

In many cases, a revision site cannot be explained independently of other sites, so that readers will find combinations of consecutive revision sites arrayed, sequenced, and narrated as a unit. Often with these compound revision sites, the sequence of revisions actually follows the linear progression of the arbitrarily designated numbering of the revision sites themselves; thus, in the compound revision site RS10ms79-80, the revision at ms80 actually followed in time as well as in space the revision at ms79. Accordingly, in the revision sequence it can be assumed that step 2 treats ms79 and step 3 treats ms80. And in such cases where the temporal sequencing happens to follow the spatial arrangement, no indication is made to designate which step accounts for which revision site. However, in larger compound revision sites, the temporal sequencing may not follow the spatial arrangement, so that, as in the case of RS12ms67-72, the revisions do not follow the sequence of the arbitrary numbering of sites (67, 68, 69, etc.), but actually occurred in the following pattern: 69, 70, 68, 67, 72, and 71. In such cases, each step ends with the appropriate revision site number in brackets.

**Revision Narrative**

Revision sequences are essentially an array of textual data arranged in a logical, temporal order. By themselves, however, they do not explain the strategies of revision embedded in each step. The purpose of a “revision narrative” is to tell the story of each revision site. Each narrative is a concise but readable tale that explains the textual events or revision steps occurring at a given revision site. Traditional scholarly editors may feel that the use of the word “narrative” suggests a departure from the rigorous discipline of objective analysis. But in fluid-text analysis, each revision site is taken as the scene of a textual event, and to explain the dynamics or “work” that constitutes each event requires us to consider writers as people motivated for one reason or another to perform actions that have one meaning rather than another. Moreover, a revision site can be the product of multiple hands and shifting intentions. As language is changed, strategies are revealed; inevitably, the sense of an audience or actual audiences come into play. What’s more, in analyzing a textual event, the editor has no choice but to imagine a likely scenario, and tell a story. Analysis—or ratiocination as Poe calls it—is an act of imagination. Scenes, play, strategies, writer, audience, actions, motives, language: these are the elements of textual scholarship, and of narrative. It is inevitable and not simply a critical conceit that analysis and narration are conjoined, especially if we are to analyze the events that create textual objects (variants and versions), not just the objects themselves.
Like any critical construction of a historical event, an edition (whether traditional or in the fluid-text mode) is an imagined thing; it represents what the historian or editor imagines is the case. Rather than dismiss the thousand or so revision narratives as merely “imagined,” I argue that they represent what is “imaginable” and “plausible.” They relate what probably had to have happened. And their credibility stems from the reliable methods with which they were produced. To begin with, each revision narrative is firmly rooted in an analysis of the material condition of each site. Direct, repeated, and magnified inspection of the document itself—the layering of one pen stroke over another, the squeezing of words in unexpected places, the thinness or thickness of an inking, the appearance of penciled markings, the disparity of chapter numbers—these and other peculiarities help establish sequencing. As noted above, the logic of grammar, syntax, and sentence structure along with the writer’s (any writer’s) desire to reduce repetitions in one place or increase them elsewhere, the varied effects of variant word choices, all become evidence of possible rhetorical strategies in the text. Of course, assembling data at such a microscopic level has the odd effect of rendering one insensible, from time to time, of the larger flow of sentences, paragraphs, and chapters that make up the writer’s larger work. Therefore, the editor also needs to get away from the document and simply read the book itself, and to teach it. This provides a needed perspective (not to mention an annual income), and this larger perspective allowed me to consider broader strategies and even textual events that had to have taken place beyond the realm of the manuscript fragment, such as the growth of Typee chapter by chapter and Melville’s use of sources (as discussed in Melville Unfolding).

In writing the revision narratives, I developed a concise manner of exposition to give a unity and consistency throughout. I began as early as 1993, sharing samples with participants in my NEH Summer Seminar on Melville and asking them to create sequences and revisions of their own. In the process, I learned more efficient ways to explain complex events, and this forced me to revise narratives composed earlier on. At the same time, I found that in some cases the writing of the narrative made me see a more likely sequencing of revisions and thus forced me to revise the revision sequence itself, which in turn required me to reinspect the manuscript directly. And on one such reinspection, I discovered the nearly invisible set of pencil marks tucked away in the margins of the manuscript, which in turn required me to establish new revision sites and further revise other, related revision sequences and narratives. In this process of writing and research, not only does analysis become narrative but narrative induces further analysis.

In each revision narrative, I lay down facts, arguments, and theories concerning the given revision site. Each step in the revision sequence receives a straightforward explanation that has its own corresponding number placed in brackets. Thus, readers of a particular step in a revision sequence can quickly find my explanation of it by finding the corresponding step number in the revision narrative. To achieve a unified and unobtrusive voice in my narrations, I developed a consistent habit of using the present tense to describe Melville’s revisions as he is composing and the past tense to describe his subsequent proofreading revisions. At each step, I describe the revision process in terms of the actual words Melville writes as he writes them (or in the case of false starts, intends to write them), and indicate the possible phases of writing Melville employed and
the stages of composition in which each revision may have occurred. In each case, I also provide a plausible rationale for the revision in terms of grammar, aesthetics, social or cultural pressures, or rhetorical strategy. Where appropriate (either regarding the penciled markings or the fair copy and British edition revisions), I relate not only how a revision occurred but who performed it—Melville, his brother Gansevoort, his publisher John Murray, or copy editor Henry Milton—and why. Also where applicable, I provide cross-references to other revision sites that are related to or coordinated with the revision site under narration. In compound revision sites in which text revised in manuscript was also revised in fair copy or for the British edition, I always place the revision narrative for the British edition in its proper sequencing, after the manuscript narrative.

Notes


2. In constructing my transcription, I have profited greatly from Mary-Jo Kline, A Guide to Documentary Editing (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).


Writing Typee

Until I was twenty-five, I had no development at all. From my twenty-fifth year I date my life. Three weeks have scarcely passed, at any time between then and now, that I have not unfolded within myself. But I feel that I am now come to the inmost leaf of the bulb, and that shortly the flower must fall to the mould.  

As a text, Melville’s Typee: A Peep at Polynesian Life represents two experiences: a four-week adventure in the South Seas, which we shall assume actually occurred, for the most part; and a several-month adventure in writing, which we know did occur. The first experience may not have happened exactly as Melville records it in Typee; as with any human event, reality fades the moment “happening” becomes “memory.” Melville’s more concrete experience was in his writing of the event, for he grew as his text grew, and the reality of that growth is recorded in the revisions of his manuscript.

From Sailor to Writer

On January 3, 1841, Melville set sail out of Fairhaven, Massachusetts, on the whaling ship Acushnet bound for the sperm whale ground in the South Pacific. In eighteen months of cruising along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of South America, his ship entered port only twice, and on July 9, 1842, he and Richard Tobias Greene, two land-starved men in their early twenties, jumped ship as the Acushnet lay anchored in the bay of Nuku Hiva, one of the Marquesas islands situated about eight hundred miles northeast of Tahiti and a few degrees south of the equator.

Melville and Greene (known as Toby in Typee) made their way into the interior of the island, got lost, landed in the farthest reaches of Taipivai, the valley of the Taipi tribe, and resided there until each escaped individually during what scholars believe was little more than a three-week period. Melville and Greene were not reunited until after Typee was published, at which point Melville added “The Story of Toby” to his publication. Melville sailed from the Marquesas on another whaler, resisted authority again, but this time was punished for his resistance and spent a month in a Tahiti jail. From that island, he shipped out again on another whaler and landed in Hawai’i where in August, 1843, (a year after his sojourn in Taipivai) he enlisted in the navy on board the US frigate United States, at which point his mutinous days ceased. During these sailing years, Melville apparently did not keep a written journal. He was discharged from the navy in Boston on October 14, 1844, and made his way home to Lansingburgh, New York. There he was encouraged by friends and family to write down (or write up) his South Pacific adventures, and in the winter of 1845 he began writing in New York City.

What Melville called his “First Draught” of Typee may not have been much more than eighteen chapters long. And throughout the spring and summer of 1845, before and after he submitted a fair copy (no longer extant) to publishers, he augmented his text
Writing Typee

with additional materials and chapters. Rejected by the American publishing firm Harper & Brothers, he gave the text to his brother, Gansevoort Melville, newly appointed as a diplomat to London, to peddle the book in England in the summer of 1845. British publisher John Murray picked up the book in the fall of 1845 and Gansevoort saw the text through the press, correcting proofs for his brother during the winter of 1846. At that time Gansevoort also read selections in proof to Washington Irving (then visiting London), who recommended the book to his American publisher, Wiley & Putnam.

*Typee* first appeared as a book in England in February, 1846. A slightly altered and moderately expurgated version was published the following month in the United States. Almost immediately, on both sides of the Atlantic, this remarkable tale, remarkably written by what one somewhat skeptical reviewer called a “common sailor [but] no common man,” became if not a national best-seller then certainly Melville’s best-selling book. It would remain Melville’s most popular title throughout his life, eclipsing in reputation *Moby-Dick*.

Part of that popularity was linked to controversies over Melville’s strident critique of missionary abuses in the Pacific, whether the narrative was true, and even whether Melville had been the common sailor he claimed to be in that narrative. Reviewers, thinking the improbably named “Herman Melville”—is he Dutch? is he French?—was perhaps a seagoing gentleman taking liberties with facts, could winkingly accept the more romanticized Robinson Crusoe–like episodes in the book, but members of the religious press, especially in the United States, complained bitterly of Melville’s “moral obtuseness” with regard to the cause of missions in the South Pacific. And in response to criticisms, Melville issued a more fully expurgated version of his text in the fall of 1846 that reduced the book by almost one-fourth its original length.

Thus, in the course of six months, from February to August 1846, *Typee* went through three separate versions, and on the basis of this much variation alone, it could lay claim to being one of American literature’s most intriguing fluid texts. But the discovery in 1983 of the working draft manuscript of *Typee* revealed that Melville’s text was even more fluid than had previously been known, for the manuscript shows that Melville’s text traveled through at least three additional versions before it ever reached print. The extant manuscript itself is a portion of the original eighteen-chapter text that grew in its final form to over thirty chapters. But this three-chapter fragment is a sizable and central portion of Melville’s narrative, and it is laden with myriad revision sites, enough to indicate that at this earliest point in his publishing career, Melville was not only learning how to shape a narrative and hone his skills; he was also growing, as I argue in *Melville Unfolding*, in terms of his sexual identity and politics.

Herman Melville’s life changed the moment he began *Typee*. The simple act of inscription, initially just a matter of writing down some already well-rehearsed anecdotes, transformed him from sailor to writer. But the process was more than a trigger for a career shift; it became for Melville a way of knowing. He found himself trying to describe his past, dredging up memories and writing them down, but at the same time he found himself transforming memory into narrative and writing it up, making it all up. These inventions and romancings would in turn trigger deeper self-inspections and higher speculations. In a letter to Nathaniel Hawthorne, written five years after he began *Typee* and while he was...
composing *Moby-Dick*, Melville described what his writing process was like: he felt like the bulb or bud of a flower and found that from the moment he had begun writing at the age of twenty-five, scarcely three weeks had passed “that I have not unfolded within myself.” Each act of writing is the unfolding of the layerings of the self. For Melville, the unfoldings had not ceased with *Moby-Dick*, nor would they cease until Melville’s death in 1891. But what the readers of the letter to Hawthorne often fail to note is that Melville’s lifelong unfolding began, in his “twenty-fifth year,” with the revising of *Typee*.

In order to witness Melville’s revision process, we need to know where the manuscript fits in the stages of composition associated with *Typee*, and what kinds or phases of writing it exhibits.

**Stages of Composition**

**The Growth of *Typee***

Some assume that Melville wrote *Typee* with an array of source books in front of him and composed each chapter pretty much in the order in which it appears. But manuscript evidence suggests otherwise. Most likely, Melville completed a shorter personal narrative to which he returned in discrete periods of revision, expanding the text with new chapters first based solely upon personal experience, and then based upon source books that he began to consult for the purposes of further expansion. That consultation of sources for factual information eventually aroused in Melville a desire to digress upon missionaries and Western interventionists, which swelled his text even more, and in directions that would lead to the expurgations of the American Revised edition. These broad developments are elucidated more fully in the following stages of composition. (See the Growth Chart [PDF, will open in a new window].)

**Stage A: Performances and Rehearsals**

After his three weeks in Taipivai and almost immediately upon his return to shipboard life, Melville was regaling his mates with anecdotes culled from his island experiences. He most certainly continued that practice for the benefit of friends and family upon his return home in October 1844. These oral performances were his rehearsal for the composition of *Typee*, and such polished episodes (in both manuscript and print) as the baked-baby feast and the fire-lighting scene (chapters 12 and 14, respectively) are just a few of over a dozen likely candidates for written versions of these performed anecdotes. (See the Anecdote Chart [PDF, will open in a new window].) Also, during the fall and winter months of 1844–45, Melville may have prepared written outlines, notes, scribblings, even brief trial drafts, although none of these survives.

**Stage I: “First Draught”**

In its earliest complete version, *Typee* was probably a personal narrative of about eighteen chapters drawn entirely from the author’s personal experiences and anecdotes, including his shipboard life, his escape with Toby into the mountains and Taipivai, his growing attachment to Taipe culture and people (including a girl he
first called Faaua), but also his apprehension over cannibalism and tattooing, and his escape. These sections (which are represented as Stage I, chapters 1–18; see the Growth Chart) include those chapters or parts of chapters presently numbered 2–14, 16–19, and 32–34. The Typee manuscript includes all but one page of the text of the three print chapters 12–14, which Melville originally numbered 10–12. Melville revised this document in various phases of writing up to the time he created his fair copy (Stage VI).

Stage II: Early Narratorial Expansions
Recognizing that he did not have enough material for a book-length publication, Melville probably made two manipulations to augment tensions within his narrative. He split up and expanded upon a hypothetical manuscript chapter 13 to create what would become print chapters 16 and 17, and did the same to a hypothetical manuscript chapter 15 to create print chapters 19 and 30. The effect of this splitting and augmentation of chapters, which may be one cause of the manuscript’s loose leaves, is to allow Tommo to elaborate more upon island harmony before he encounters the crucial problem of tattooing elaborated in print chapter 30. This gave Melville a total of twenty chapters.

Stage III: Early Non-Narratorial Expansions
Still less than two-thirds of the way toward his finished book, Melville probably added the two digressive chapters on breadfruit (print chapter 15) and on “Fishing Parties” and the eating of raw fish (print chapter 28). The insertion of the breadfruit chapter is another possible cause of the loose leaves in the manuscript. This gave Melville a total of twenty-two chapters.

Stage IV: Source Expansions I
Having added four chapters to the latter half of the book, Melville probably then turned to his opening chapters, which in their original form most likely comprised major portions of print chapters 2, 4, and 5. He augmented this section by two chapters’ worth of materials that help to establish his voice and add factual detail drawn from certain source books, in particular Charles Stewart’s Visit to the South Seas (see Melville Unfolding, chapters 13 and 14). However, in the process he began to develop a critical distance from Stewart’s missionary ideology and Western imperialism in general. A number of hypotheses can be developed to explain Melville’s possible sequence of revisions at this stage (see Melville Unfolding, chapter 9). At this stage, Typee grew to a chapter count of twenty-four.

Stage V: Source Expansions II
Reviewing Stewart inspired Melville to read more source books, in particular David Porter’s Journal of a Cruise. Returning to the latter half of his book, he would have added the Feast of Calabashes section (print chapters 22–26) and may have also augmented print chapter 30 on tattooing, by adding a section on taboo and an anecdote concerning Captain Vangs’s violations of taboo while bird hunting in the glen of Tior. These new and augmented chapters (echoing Tommo’s Stewart-
related anecdote of Tior in chapter 4 added in Stage IV) contain a blending of
direct source appropriations and Melville’s own anecdotes that focus mostly on island
customs, including Porter-related materials on religion, social rank, governance, and
burial (see Melville Unfolding, chapter 15). At this point, Melville may have also
submitted his first draft to his brother Gansevoort for a vetting that resulted in a set
of suggested revisions in pencil (discussed in Melville Unfolding, chapter 12). At this
point, Melville had twenty-nine chapters.

Stage VI: Final Filler and Fair Copy
With a book-length work in hand, Melville probably submitted his Typee “draught”
for fair-copying. During this period, Melville, family members, and other editors
contributed a round of revisions that do not appear in the manuscript but must have
occurred because Melville’s text in manuscript varies significantly from the text that
appears in print. At the same time, Melville may have added two Porteresque chapters
of “filler”: the chapter on island natural history (print chapter 29) and a chapter on
additional island customs (print chapter 31). These polishings and filler may have
been made before or after he submitted his fair copy (which has not been located)
to Harper and Brothers, who rejected the book in May 1845. The chapter count now
reaches thirty-one.

Stage VII: Source Expansions III
In July 1845, Melville entrusted his book to his brother Gansevoort, who successfully
peddled the work to publisher John Murray. In the summer and fall months, Melville
composed and sent by steamer (either on his own initiative, as Hershel Parker
believes, or upon Murray’s request, according to Leon Howard) three new chapters:
A “history of a day” in Typee (print chapter 20) including a salacious section on
native dance (later removed at Murray’s request and added to Omoo), a chapter on
island ruins (print chapter 21), and another new chapter on “The Social Condition
and General Character of the Typees” (chapter 27). The latter two draw heavily upon
Porter. This brought Melville’s book to its present thirty-four chapters.

The remaining four stages involve the printed versions of Typee that appeared during or
soon after Melville’s lifetime. 6

Stage VIII: Murray’s British Edition
On Herman’s behalf, Gansevoort squired the fair-copy text of Typee through page
proofs of this first edition published in February 1846; thus, he as well as Murray’s
copy editor Henry Milton and Murray himself could have contributed changes to any
of the more than five hundred additional revision sites created as early as the fair-copy
Stage VI. Murray published this version throughout the rest of the century. (Gibbs’s
1850 pirated edition follows this version.)

Stage IX: Wiley’s American Edition
After reading sections of Typee in page proofs aloud to Washington Irving in London
and with Irving’s enthusiastic recommendation, Gansevoort gained the acceptance of
his brother’s book in the London office of the American publishing firm of Wiley
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and Putnam. Prepared from pages from the British edition, this version appeared in March 1846, and contains numerous accidental variations (misspellings and typos) and a handful of substantive changes, including line-length expurgations made by John Wiley.

Stage X: Wiley’s Revised American Edition
This revision of the American edition, appearing in August 1846, involves 129 expurgations ranging from single words to an entire chapter and the appendix. It also includes changes made on Melville’s behalf as well as the addition of “The Story of Toby.” Harpers took over publication in 1849. (Routledge’s 1850 pirated edition follows this version.)

Stage XI: Stedman’s Edition
Melville’s literary executor Arthur Stedman based his 1892 United States Book Company edition on the British version, but made numerous changes of his own, including a handful of requests made by Melville before his death.

While Melville’s participation in revising his working draft manuscript is abundantly evident in the numerous deletions and insertions in his hand on that document, we have more difficulty discerning whether the variants appearing in any of the subsequent print versions of Typee were initiated by Melville. A number of “readers” (including his brother Gansevoort, his British and American editors, and later, perhaps, even his wife) would have had the opportunity to revise or correct the text either on Melville’s behalf or on their own initiative. At the same time, meaningful variants in print might also be typos, the kind of accidental error and corruption endemic to the printing process. The problems to confront, then, are how to distinguish among correction, revision, and corruption, and how to assign responsibility for them. Because definitive answers are not likely to be found, the best alternative solutions to a given textual problem are shaped by discourses that take into account the probabilities and necessities inherent in the relationships among manuscript and print documents.

To begin with, the Typee working draft manuscript is not the fair-copy manuscript Melville sent to England with Gansevoort. Moreover, that fair copy, which Herman subsequently expanded, was also copyedited by Henry Milton and further revised by Gansevoort (NN Typee 282), so that its final text was significantly altered before it was submitted for publication on January 5, 1846. Proofs began to arrive at the end of the month, and Gansevoort would have read the British proof sheets against the augmented fair-copy document; however, neither fair copy nor proofs survive, so we can only guess at what changes to the British edition were made by whom. Murray’s printer was able to present Gansevoort with two complete sets of corrected proofs on February 3, at which time Gansevoort delivered one set to Putnam, and it is from these proofs that the American text would be set in New York. Gansevoort had only enough time to perform a cursory proofreading of the corrected proofs; therefore, it is highly unlikely that he (or his brother for that matter) had any additional input into the first American edition text (309). And if Gansevoort had been able to correct what was sent across the Atlantic, those corrections would have been made against the augmented and copyedited
fair copy that no longer exists. The major changes to the first American edition—four sentence-long expurgations—were made by Melville’s American publisher John Wiley, who later recommended that the author himself make or agree to the additional and far more extensive expurgations found in the American revised edition, which appeared in the summer of 1846. Melville also added material including small changes (like “literal” to “liberal”) and large (“The Story of Toby”).

Because the base version of this present edition covers only the range of text represented in the three-chapter fragment of the Typee manuscript, the edition reports only those print-text variants found in the corresponding texts of the three 1846 print editions. Since Gansevoort had little opportunity and his brother even less to revise or correct the text destined to become the first American edition, only a handful of the fifteen or so variants that fall within the three-chapter range (such as Melville’s “L-word” or other “oscillating variants” like luxurious/luxuriant and inefficacy/inefficiency) are discussed in the edition’s revision narratives. Minor variants that may be typographical—such as annoyance/annoyances and parent/parents—are listed in NN Typee 350. However, changes found in the English and American Revised editions, in which several individuals played identifiable roles, are treated fully here. Of course, with the working draft manuscript itself, there is no doubt that (with the exception of certain marginal pencilings) the revisions on the page and in different Phases of Writing are Melville’s and that they represent an intermediate stage of composition. [rev. 2009]

**Melville’s “First Draught”: An Intermediate Stage of Composition**

There is no doubt that the Typee manuscript fragment represents an early period in Melville’s highly creative compositional process, but though the inscription on Melville’s cover to the document states that it is the “First Draught of ‘Typee’—after which much was added & altered,” it probably does not represent the very first penning Melville made. Melville’s cover caption is certainly accurate in the one sense that “much was added and altered” to the final reading text of the manuscript, but the material evidence also suggests that Melville’s designation of “First” should not be taken to mean earlier, now lost, “pre-writing” or “rough draft” documents—notes, outlines, even full-length passages of prose—that would constitute the actual first draftings of Melville’s personal narrative, including trial versions of his oral presentations.

Properly speaking, the document represents a set of intermediate stages of composition between Melville’s actual first “draughts” (Stage A) and his fair copy (Stage VI), neither of which has been found. On this intermediate document, we find various distinct phases of writing, including passages of copying from the earlier materials as well as passages of new composition.

Two factors argue for this intermediate status. First, while the document is heavily revised, it does not bear the markings on all pages of the kind of incessant revising—false starts, interrupted thoughts or sentences, reworked phrases, and transposed passages—that we find in other, far rougher, working drafts such as The Confidence-Man fragments or certain poetry manuscripts. And while the handwriting is generally difficult to read or obscured by cancellations and insertions (suggesting that Melville was inventing, not
copying), we also find pages that are far more legible than others, suggesting that Melville was attempting to put his handwriting on good behavior for the purposes of creating fair copy. In all likelihood, Melville was intending to make a concerted effort at creating a polished version of certain rudimentary materials already rehearsed, composed, and now lost to us, but he was also improvising new material as he wrote.

This impression is supported by word counts of each manuscript page. In all, the 32 pages of writing amount to 12,103 words, including all cancellations and insertions. If we list the pages in order of word count with the lowest and highest yields per page being 326 words (MS p. 34) and 453 words (MS p. 17), respectively, we find that the median word count of 378 words per page is almost the same as the average of 376 words per page (see Table 1). (The median represents the point at which there are an equal number of pages with lower word counts as there are pages with higher.) Taking the median and average word counts to represent the typical amount of revision per manuscript page, we can readily distinguish those pages with higher counts as having more revision relative to those with lower counts and less revision. If Melville were starting entirely from scratch and simply pre-writing in this document, we would expect a fairly uniform degree of revision on each page, and the average word count per page would be significantly higher and the highest and lowest word count leaves would range closer to the median. Instead, we find significantly more revision in the first twenty pages, which appear in the stitched booklet, and less revision in ten of the loose-leaf pages (see Table 2). Moreover, throughout the entire document, pages of comparatively less revision are interspersed with pages of more revision. In short, the intensity of revision seems to come in waves, beginning with a high tide at the beginning of the document that recedes toward the end. This distribution supports the idea that Melville would copy for a spell, then revise as he copied or compose afresh, then return to his copying, and so on. The word counts also show that, despite their rough physical appearance, the loose-leaf pages have comparatively less revision and seem to be in a more polished state than the bound booklet leaves.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS Page No</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Ascending word counts. Here, manuscript pages are arranged by ascending word count; the range containing both mean and median counts (376 and 378, respectively) is shaded. Higher word counts (listed here below the shaded range) indicate a relatively higher amount of revision. (Pages 23–24 are missing.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS Page No</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Sequential word counts. With manuscript pages displayed in proper sequence and the comparatively higher word counts shaded in, the dispersal of the more heavily revised pages throughout the entire manuscript can be seen. The “booklet” pages (1–20) bear evidence of more revision than the loose-leaf pages (21–34). (Pages 23–24 are missing.)

Besides having been torn from a booklet, some of the loose leaves have tears in the upper and lower edges that obliterate bits of text. Chances are that a half dozen of these tears mark the spots where insertion slips (now lost) were pinned to the loose leaf and then torn off at some later date (probably during the creation of the fair copy), thus taking fragments of the manuscript with them.

A second factor arguing for the manuscript as an intermediate document is the existence of the six loose leaves (actually seven, if we count the lost loose Leaf 12). These pages indicate that at various stages of composition, Melville moved chunks of text by tearing already composed leaves away from his booklets either to reposition chapters or to make room for new materials. Common sense suggests that Melville would not have been so bold as to commit his first pennings to neatly bound booklets of good quality paper; instead he would have composed initial notes, outlines, and drafts on single sheets of cheaper foolscap.

Of course, we should not presume the young writer had common sense or cared at this point in his career about cost and convenience. In fact, never having written a book before, he may not have anticipated the kind of paper stock his new writing adventure would require. The use of neat composition booklets, only slightly more refined than the kind he and his siblings had used in school, may have been ill-advised for the composition of a novel from scratch, but not a prohibition for the novice. Perhaps, too, Melville did not feel he needed to do much pre-writing or rough-drafting. After all, with his oral rehearsals fresh in mind, he might have felt free to write his first book from scratch in neatly stitched booklets. While this is true, after only a few days of inscribing even the best-rehearsed bits of narrative, Melville might well have thought twice about composing from the very start in booklets. If so, he would have likely found himself tearing away and discarding leaves of botched writing from his booklets. Revision, he would quickly learn, was inevitable.

Phases of Writing

Keeping the larger stages of composition in mind, we can turn now to the more minute operations of Melville’s creative process, or what I call his phases of writing. These six phases consist of:

- copying
- correction while copying
- revision while copying
- fresh composition
- revision while proofreading
- the use of insertion slips pinned to manuscript leaves

Although these phases seem to follow logically from one to the other in the sequence indicated here, the manuscript shows that at any given revision site Melville may have
combined any of these phases in various ways. For instance, he may have copied for a
stretch, making minor corrections as he copied, but then begun to compose fresh material
as he copied and thus saved any proofreading for later, when he would revise once more as
he proofed. Or he may have stopped periodically while copying or composing to proofread
and revise before continuing with more copying or composition. Each revision site offers
up its own set of sequencing problems, and since Melville did not use different inks when
he wrote—which might have allowed us to distinguish, let’s say, revisions made while
composing in one ink from revisions made in another while proofreading—we cannot
readily discern in a given revision site whether a particular revision derives from the one
phase or the other. Thus, an important function of the revision narrative, and indeed its
principal challenge, is to articulate the more plausible sequencings of the phases of writing
evident at the revision site in question. As we shall see, too, the meanings we can construct
out of a revision site depend entirely upon the sequencing we find there.

Often, the only grounds for distinguishing among Melville’s phases of writing are the
dictates of English grammar, syntax, and sentence structure. Other clues are the physical
positioning of canceled words on, above, or below the baseline (indicating immediate,
subsequent, and later revisions); or the fact that one insertion is squeezed between two
other inserted words (indicating its subsequent addition); or the fact that we find a canceled
word within a larger phrase that has also been canceled (indicating that the shorter
cancellation preceded the longer). These and other features help us distinguish certain
phases of writing and speculate on their probable sequencing in a given revision site. Only
the insertion slips offer a higher degree of certainty about the sequence of a revision, for
their existence on separate slips of paper attached to particular manuscript leaves clearly
shows that this kind of proofreading revision or fresh composition occurred, in most cases,
late in the manuscript revision process, well after the manuscript leaves on which the slips
were pinned had been completed.

The six compositional phases are more than just conjectural. In copying, Melville would
have had to his left any of his notes or rough-draft materials and to his right a set of blank
twenty-page composition booklets. As he copied from his pre-writing materials into his
booklets, he soon enough caught himself miswriting or skipping ahead, and therefore he
corrected himself immediately on the baseline of the text he was writing. He also found
himself rethinking certain wordings, and therefore he paused, reread what he had copied,
and revised. He also found himself inventing new material, or squeezing in insertions
between words and lines or down margins. In this kind of revision, he departed from the
pre-writing materials to incorporate as much as a page or two of fresh composition. But
more likely as not he also returned to his notes or outline to copy again. After some time,
he would also proofread what he had written, and in proofing he found more reason to
revise certain passages, some so severely that he rewrote their final texts on insertion slips.
Melville may have proofed periodically throughout the process, not letting a paragraph
go by without rereading it. But hard evidence shows that he also revised with all or most
of the fully completed manuscript in hand, with the repositioning of certain loose leaves,
and during a discernible moment in which he responded in ink to his brother’s penciled
suggestions for revision. Melville also manipulated the text at some point when he added
paragraph marks. 9
Probably the most difficult issue in reading the manuscript is discerning copying from fresh composition. One is tempted to speculate that the relative neatness of a certain page suggests areas of copying, but let’s recall that Melville had rehearsed his “yarns” repeatedly, and there is every likelihood that he could have transposed those rehearsed tales directly onto paper without much revision simply because the words were already well-established in his mind. On the other hand, speaking is not writing and drafting words is tougher than spinning fireside yarns, so one cannot rely too heavily upon the idea of rehearsed tales yielding clean pages. Cleanliness is no certain measure of either copying or fresh composition.

Nor should one depend too heavily upon what scholars have, up until the discovery of the *Typee* manuscript fragment, determined was Melville’s “typical” method of composition and manuscript preparation. We know that later in his life Melville typically relied upon his wife Elizabeth or his sister Augusta to make fair copies from his rough drafts, which he in turn revised, had fair-copied again, and revised again until his material was ready for a final fair-copying and submission to the publisher. Aside from the faint pencilings we may attribute to Gansevoort, there is no evidence of anyone other than Melville performing the six phases listed here. And one might thus argue that since he “typically” left his copying for others to do, the absence of other handwriting in manuscript suggests Melville was engaging more in fresh composition than copying.

But again, the Melville who composed *Typee* was a freshman when it came to the processes of literary creation. Except for two juvenile publications, he had never, to our knowledge, attempted so involved a literary work; nor did he have at the time a wife who would dutifully fair-copy for him. Chances are he felt obliged to “do it all himself” at least until the very end, when he may have used the services of an amanuensis or willing sister at home in Lansingburgh to transform his difficult handwriting into something readable. The absence of other hands (except for Gansevoort’s faint marginal pencilings), then, does not necessarily have any special relevance here in resolving the question of copying versus composing. It does indicate, however, that Melville was in full charge of this particular document. In short, the *Typee* manuscript does not necessarily conform to Melville’s putatively typical practice. Moreover, since the document predates the evidence previously used to determine that practice, and since the *Typee* manuscript represents the earliest extant evidence of his fiction writing, we are obliged to consider it coming from a point in Melville's career in which nothing had yet become “typical.”

**False Starts**

Evidence of copying or fresh composition is best found in seemingly insignificant details. Take the “false start,” for instance. This is a word that the author considers in mind, begins to write on paper but never completes, and cancels in mid-execution. A kind of sprite dancing between mental and physical states, the false start may be a word, partial word, single letter, or even a half letter such as an uncrossed t. If it can be decoded—that is, if a full, intended wording can be determined from its partial execution—a false start can provide a glimpse at the author’s more volatile mental twists and turns: the decisions and indecisions at the moment of creation. On the one hand, it might indicate that at a certain
point the writer, rather than simply copying his words mechanically from an earlier draft, momentarily considered alternative words or whole new sentence structures as he copied. (A partially inscribed w for the word “which” may be all we need to know that Melville had considered converting an independent clause to a dependent clause.) On the other hand, the false start might indicate the interruption of a flow of freshly composed words for the elaboration of a newly invented image; it may, as well, indicate the frustration of trying to get an image out, as with “blo{ody} recent sacrifice,” a false start discussed in “Editing a Fluid Text.”

Some false starts, however, help identify fresh composition. A set of revision sites (RS10ms145-146) shows Melville interrupting one genetic moment to elaborate a new point he has generated as he writes. In speaking of what he first calls a “wild” but then “musical recitative” of the natives, Melville came to something of a block, as the following revision sequence shows. He first wrote:

1. the musical recitative, which for all I knew might

Given the phrasing that Melville finally used later on in his next paragraph, he probably intended to complete this false start with something like “which for all I knew might {have been taken for a throng of the devotees of Ceres}.” But Melville interrupts this thought at the word “might” and cancels “for all I knew might.” With the idea of first evoking the sound of the natives’ singing (rather than the classical reference to Ceres), he then considers something like

2. the musical recitative, which […] they s{ang}

but interrupts himself again and cancels the false start “s” before he can complete the word “sang.” He then tries his third and final option:

3. the musical recitative, which […] with various alternations they continued until we arrived at the place of our destination.

Here, the full range of revisions strongly argues that Melville is making things up as he writes. With the false start “they s{ang},” Melville’s first impulse was to change the structure of his nested clauses; that is, to connect his “which for all I knew might” clause to a simpler “which they sang” clause. But the interruption of “which they sang” suggests he wanted some intervening phrase between “which” and “they” to replace the rhythms of “for all I knew.” He chose to add “with various alternations,” and continued on, going back to “they” to add “continued” in place of the partially inscribed “s{ang}.” At this point, Melville then composed his next new paragraph describing the “picturesque procession” of chanting natives, which delivers us to Melville’s usage of “a throng of the devotees of Ceres.” In short, the false start “they s{ang}” is part of a process of fresh composition in which Melville first conceives then delays the image of devotees in order to record, on the spot, newly invented phrasings concerning the “picturesque procession.” The relevance of the revision sequence is that we can “see” the sudden appearance of a classical allusion and how it triggers related thoughts. Moreover, the fact that Melville or an editor cut the
Ceres image from the first British edition (see RS10e119) suggests that this aspect of the crafting of Tommo’s voice surely carried with it a certain rhetorical anxiety.

False starts can be determinants of fresh composition or revision occurring during copying. No less concrete but just as hard to pin down in time are the myriad other cancellations and insertions that, despite our difficulty in sequencing them, may be associated with specific versions of the manuscript. A canceled word, for instance, that is replaced by a word immediately following it on the baseline generally indicates that the revision occurred spontaneously while Melville was copying out or composing down an empty line, and this distinguishes that revision from later revisions typically inserted above the baseline when Melville in a different frame of mind returned to his fully inscribed lines to proofread. Immediate baseline revisions imply fresh composition or invention and may be linked to what I call Melville’s transcription version of Typee. However, insertions replacing canceled words and inserted material without cancellations generally indicate revisions made in a later proofreading phase and may be features of the transformation and translation versions. All three versions are discussed next in “Versions of Typee.”

**Versions of Typee: A Narrative of Revision**

Given its classification as an intermediate-stage composition exhibiting several phases of writing, the revision text of Typee does not exist in several distinct, physically separable versions; instead, it consists of a layering of “inferred versions,” or modes of revision. To distinguish these versions, we need first to link them to a broader understanding of the interrelationship of the manuscript’s various revision sites. That is to say, we need to construct a revision narrative of Typee that allows us to connect its seemingly disparate, utterly localized sites into a global understanding of Melville’s revision process.

**A Revision Narrative of Typee**

A “revision narrative” is a detailed story of how a particular agent revises words in a particular sequence at a particular revision site. But to tell the story of the complex strategies that can account for all or even a representative selection of those localized revision sites, we need a more comprehensive narrative of revision, one that elucidates the interpenetrations of writer and cultural discourse evident in a range of revision practices and intentions. In writing Typee, Melville’s unfoldings were deeply personal yet manifestly public; they were driven by sexual anxieties, aesthetic quandaries, political rage, and cultural bafflement. And his manuscript revisions are the material manifestation of these forces. Each revision site can be transcribed, and each site’s revision sequence can be presented as an array of texts, but as such they simply cannot be “read” in any coherent way until we begin to disclose their relation to other localized revision sites and sequences, and such relations cannot be addressed without our construction of a global narrative that can explain them in concert. Because the construction of this comprehensive narrative of revision articulates speculations on personal and social causes of textual evolution, it permits a more usable form of cultural analysis than found in the interpretation of single
Sexuality and Self-Colonization

The revision narrative developed in Melville Unfolding stresses politics, family, and sexuality, and follows a thesis both private and cultural through the stages of composition already discussed. In all likelihood, Melville began writing Typee with the idea of supplying readers with a personal narrative of his escape from the whaling ship Acushnet into the valley of Taipivai, home of a fierce, reputedly cannibal tribe, from which he soon enough also escaped. He began by relating his experiences in oral anecdotes rehearsd before fellow sailors, friends, and family (Stage A). Eventually, he came to write those anecdotes down, thus rendering a world from his past that he first called “Tipii” and a world of his imagination as well, eventually to be called Typee (Stage I). To be sure, the necessarily partial recollection of the past required an active imagination to fill in holes, if fullness of a narrative eventually to be called Typee was Melville’s professional goal. Inevitably, the writing process taxed both his memory and self-awareness. As he composed, he found himself laboring to recollect even mundane details: Was there one building on the hoolah hoolah ground, or two? Getting thoughts and words to correspond to memory was a primary concern; making his words vivid and communicative came as a natural adjunct to accuracy but invariably led to fictionalizations. In describing people and places, Melville found himself creating characters, setting scenes, and providing an imaginative cast to things if only to familiarize them for Western readers; thus, a gathering of islanders becomes an Irvingesque assemblage about the “the tavern door of a village” (a phrase he much later corrected to “door of a village tavern”). And these easy, perhaps automatic recastings of native life to fit the ideologies of amiable humor led to further, more complex cultural transformations: for example, natives bearing comestibles become in revision a procession of devotees to Ceres.

In due course, such cultural manipulations led to still deeper and more personal self-transformations. The twenty-five-year-old was writing in order to discover what it was the twenty-two-year-old had experienced, and what it all meant then, and what it was all beginning to mean now. Former island acquaintances and lovers were now characters playing roles in the dramatic unfolding of the writer’s being. In revision, Toby, Fayaway, Kory-Kory, and Marnoo began to serve as triggers of the young Melville’s sexual anxiety. Each became a kind of colonial extension of Melville’s previously unquestioned, imperial self: And just as an emergent power tests its national strength by sending its pirates, religionists, speculators, and conquistadors abroad to colonize new worlds, Melville used his pen to venture into new psychological territories. And like other colonizers, who, expecting to dominate, nevertheless find themselves changed, assimilated, and dominated by cultural, social, and sexual doubts triggered by the new world conquered, so, too, did Melville find that his self-colonizations—portraits of himself as lover of mother, brother,
and other; and lover of women, and of men—challenged his sense of self and startled him toward a retrenchment of his sexual identity as safely heterosexual and marriageable.

Ironically, though, Melville’s reactionary self-colonizing revisions ran counter to a more liberal pattern of expansion. Once the writer had “finished” with his first working draft of Typee and discovered he had not quite enough material to make a book, he taxed his memory further, this time elaborating more personal anecdotes and reflections upon the islands and native life, which he inserted in portions sizable enough to make him tear pages out of his manuscript booklets to make room for the expansions and to force him to renumber chapters (Stages II–III). Requiring more material, he resorted to source books by Charles Stewart and David Porter and appropriated from them passages, sometimes word for word (Stages IV–VII). But the sources he plagiarized also angered Melville. These avatars of imperialism, despite their liberal attraction to, even acceptance of, Polynesian life, displayed the intolerance, arrogance, and brutality of Western power, and they became insufferable to the writer. In response, Melville expanded his narrative first by adding digressions against missionaries like Stewart (IV) and then against power merchants like Porter (V–VII). The digressions proved fateful; they were largely cut in the American revised edition (Stage X). But the deeper irony of this stage of revision is that while Melville was revising his text, on the one hand, to assert his personal, imperial dominance over the various colonized sexual identities he projected onto Typee, he was also revising, on the other hand, so as to castigate imperialism in the Pacific, and in particular his imperialistic predecessors.

A final element of this global narrative concerns Melville’s family. From the beginning, he had the support of mother, brothers, and sisters in his writing project, but he also had his future wife and in-laws in mind. Manuscript evidence indicates that perhaps as early as Stage V, Melville submitted the work to his brother Gansevoort, who penciled in suggested revisions of various passages, some of a sexual nature. Later, Gansevoort played a larger role in helping to place Typee with John Murray and making revisions in proof (Stage VIII). Melville’s future family also had a presence in the making of the book. Typee is dedicated first “affectionately” to his father’s best friend Lemuel Shaw, and then “gratefully” to the same man, his soon to be father-in-law. Quite possibly, several of Melville’s own changes to John Wiley’s expurgated edition (Stage X) suggest his toning down of randy implications out of respect for the sensitivities of the author’s future wife, and women readers in general. These revisions in a familial context give an added dimension to the more private political and sexual revisions manifested in earlier stages of composition.

Three Versions: Transcription, Transformation, and Translation

This global revision narrative of Typee also manifests itself in three modes of revision, which for the purposes of this edition shall stand as three inferred versions of Typee. These versions are transcription, transformation, and translation.

In his first version of Typee, Melville set out to transcribe events from memory, but this process inevitably led to (indeed bled into) acts of revision in which Melville essentially transformed remembered events into dramatized scenes. Thus, what began as
a personal narrative version (transcription) evolved into something approaching a fiction or romance version (transformation), and one that would prove to be something of an “arrested romance.” But even before going into print, and especially with the publication of the revised edition, Melville reconceived his personal narrative/romance as a text more directly engaging readers. In this version, Melville essentially translated his radical critique of imperialism into an idiom most readers would be able to accept. This kind of negotiation constitutes a third version (translation) of Typee that involves both manuscript manipulations as well as later print revisions and expurgations.

While distinct evidence of Melville’s transcription, transformation, and translation is located on the “physical version” of the Typee manuscript (that is, the document itself), these modes of revision are, of course, “inferred versions,” or hypothetical designations useful in distinguishing different aspects of the revisionary process. They cannot be seen as rigid separations; indeed, a particular physical revision site might be the locus for two or even all three modes. That is, an early revision correcting an inaccuracy of memory might also involve later, artful transformations of a character or scene as well; and a late revision at the same site might also transcribe remembered events more clearly or add to the narrative’s artistic unity. Despite such obvious overlapping, the three versions correspond to the larger movements of Melville’s growing reconception of Typee. A more detailed understanding of Melville’s revisions through these versions can be achieved when we attend to various kinds of narrative expansions that are evident on the physical document itself.

Notes


4. Laurie Robertson-Lorant flatly assumes that Melville set up shop in his mother’s attic in Lansingburgh and surrounded himself with source books to compose Typee (Melville: A Biography [New York: Clarkson Potter, 1996], pp. 135–36). In Herman Melville: A Biography (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), Hershel Parker places Melville in New York City but more deftly asserts that Melville was sufficiently well-versed in the available Marquesan source books (Langsdorf and others) to be “confident, from the start of his work on Typee, that he would not have to rely on his own unaided memory” (p. 357).

5. This is in fact a pattern Melville followed throughout his writing career and is the assumed pattern scholars have used to account for the composition of other works, in particular Mardi, Moby-Dick, The Confidence-Man, and Billy Budd. See Watson Branch,

6. For further details, see *NN Typee*, pp. 306–14, from which these stages are drawn.

7. Readers can access these documents in person at Harvard University’s Houghton Library, or in photo-reproductions in the *NN The Confidence-Man* as well as in my fluid-text edition of one fragment in the Random House edition of *The Confidence-Man* (2003). The *NN* edition of the published poetry (with manuscript transcriptions) and the *NN* edition of the late manuscripts (including the unpublished poetry and *Billy Budd*) are forthcoming. My fluid-text editions of selected poems in manuscript appear in *Melville’s Tales, Poems, and Other Writings* (Random House, 2001).

8. I call these kinds of writing “phases” in order to distinguish them from stages of composition and modes of revision, or versions, both of which involve a specific time sequencing. That is, stage III follows II, and the translation version follows transformation; however, a proofreading phase can occur at any time in the process, after initial composition or much later after a series of revisions. The word “phase” allows for this useful distinction because it implies patterns of writing behavior within a creative process but does not, in this case, insist upon a determinate sequencing.

9. Parker believes “Melville inserted clear paragraph symbols as he went” (*Herman Melville*, p. 361), but the squeezing of some paragraph symbols beside insertions suggests that Melville added the marks after the manuscript was completed.
Scenes of Revision: Expansion and Collaboration

At the end of June 1851—the same month in which he had confessed his unfoldings to Hawthorne—Melville was still deeply immersed in the final stages of *Moby-Dick*. Now he was writing to Hawthorne to tell him about his building projects on the house and farm, and how he was also building “shanties of chapters and essays” to flesh out *Moby-Dick*. By “shanties,” he at first had in mind something like the modest, improvised additions he was having done at Arrowhead, and this was in keeping with his notion that a book like *Moby-Dick* is always growing and therefore always incomplete, like Cologne’s great unfinished cathedral, an image he would use to conclude his comic chapter on “Cetology.” But discovering a pun, he also meant that the “chapters and essays” he was inserting into his narrative were like the shanties he and his former whaling mates had sung at sea. In all likelihood, Melville was using these chapters to expand the middle of his whale book where Ishmael departs from the action to become a kind of unsighted seer into the nature of whales and whaling. These chapters (what Howard Vincent called the novel’s “cetological center”) are lyrical and meditative yet jaunty and comic, and they allow Ishmael to sing out his presence; they build a voice that can speak for both Ahab and the crew, and make their humanities, failings, and obsessions seem natural. These late insertions into *Moby-Dick* take readers far afield, it would seem, but they serve an important narrative function. They are not just ramshackle shanties; they are songs.

Six years earlier Melville had also found himself wondering what to do about *Typee*. He had reached the end of his personal narrative of about eighteen chapters, and knew he did not not have enough text to market his book beside heftier and more factual Polynesian narratives. To make his slender volume longer, more “factual,” and seemingly more reliable, he would have to add to it more “chapters and essays.” But with *Typee*, his strategy was different from what he would do in expanding *Moby-Dick*. With the beginning, middle, and end of *Typee* already written out, and with Tommo’s voice already well established throughout, his first goal was simply to add filler concerning island life and custom, based initially on more of his personal experiences. But he soon realized his experience would not do the trick, and in researching various Polynesian resources for even more filler and fact, he began to react to what he was reading, and his filler turned into argument and digression. Whether he had intended it or not, his digressions modulated Tommo’s voice to reflect Melville’s own growing awareness of Pacific imperialism.

In the meditative chapters added to *Moby-Dick*, Melville allowed the voice of Ishmael to grow beyond anger and obsession. But in *Typee*, the digressions he inserted later in the process register more of Tommo’s anger and bafflement than meditation and resolution. Once *Typee* was published, reviewers complained of what they took to be the book’s “moral obtuseness,” and within two months Melville issued his revised American edition, which addressed the cause of that reaction by expurgating many of the digressions Melville had previously labored to add. As discussed in *Melville Unfolding*, Melville’s complicity in creating this version is evident in his attempt to convince British publisher John Murray to accept the expurgations for the sake of a smoother flowing narrative. “Such passages are altogether foreign to the adventure,” he wrote to Murray, “. . . I have
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merely removed passages which leave no gap” (Correspondence, 56). Melville’s claim suggests all the more that such “foreign” passages had not been part of the original narrative; they had been imposed on the narrative at some subsequent stage in the composition of the book. As grievous as the expurgations may be for modern readers, they brought Typee closer to the “adventure” Melville had originally written. The expurgated digressions, then, are clues for identifying the “chapters and essays” that Melville added to expand his narrative, and serve along with the manuscript itself as evidence for how Melville built Typee. The fuller story of this expansion process and Melville’s use of sources is related in Melville Unfolding. For our purposes here in constructing a revision narrative of the growth of Typee, it is enough to recount the salient features of Melville’s chapter expansion process as they relate to the stages of composition found in the manuscript.

Certain Hypotheticals: Splitting Chapters

To gain a clearer sense of how Melville converted his original eighteen-chapter personal narrative into the fuller, more digressive text he eventually published, we first need to think of his chapters as a series of more tightly bound anecdotes and vignettes that Melville would have had to cut apart and reposition in order to accommodate the newly inserted material. Some sense of these passages and their sequencing can be gathered from the subheadings for each chapter listed in the table of contents and at the beginning of each chapter in the print version of Typee. Melville may have used similar lists of topics as outlines to assist him in his initial composition, although no such documents have been found. Most certainly, the present subheading lists were devised either after the fact by Melville for his fair copy or by his publisher in preparation for publication. In either case, the contents lists designate segments of text within the printed chapters that may have first appeared in manuscript in a differently configured sequence in different versions of chapters. If we imagine that these text segments are like the tesserae of a mosaic, we can also imagine Melville pulling these pieces of text apart from each other and repositioning them to create new mosaics, or rather new chapters. Although none of the three surviving manuscript chapters reveals this kind of reconfiguring, some hint of it exists in the fact that manuscript chapter 12 exists on loose leaves, which may have been created when Melville began tearing it away from a composition booklet in order to insert a new chapter between chapter 12 and its formerly contiguous following chapter.

As none of these reconfigured chapters survives in manuscript, they are obviously hypothetical, but if such manuscripts were to be found, we could imagine they would necessarily exist in a cut-and-paste format: a combination of loose leaves drawn from the earliest of composed chapters affixed to large, pages-long insertions composed at a later date. What these cut-and-paste chapters might have looked like in manuscript is hinted at in the not-so-seamless texture of the print chapters themselves, which often exhibit abrupt or clumsy transitions from narrative to polemic digression and back again. And to go back further in time to envision the ur-manuscript chapters that preceded these cut-and-paste ensembles requires a further act of imagination in which we extract the digressive
texts from narrative passages and speculatively reassemble the narratives into their earliest hypothetical form.

Stage II

The manipulations Melville made in Stage II of composition demonstrate this process (see the Growth Chart). If we look at the present print chapter 16, we find that it begins with Tommo’s “Melancholy condition” after Toby’s departure but ends with digressions on sewing and shaving. Similarly, print chapter 17 is a jumble of narrative and polemic text combining segments on Tommo’s “Improvement of Health and Spirits”; then a Montaignean complaint comparing “civilized and unenlightened People”; but also a segment on a “Skirmish” among the islanders; and then, too, material lifted from Stewart. Chances are the openings of both 16 and 17 were originally the two halves of an earlier, hypothetical ur-manuscript chapter we might call “manuscript chapter 13A/B.” This would have been a more coherent narrative chapter in which Tommo’s “Melancholy condition” of print chapter 16 (let’s call it segment A) is followed up with “Improvement of Health and Spirits” of print chapter 17 (segment B). Chapter 13A/B was probably followed in manuscript by “manuscript chapter 14” now known as print chapter 18, the famous chapter relating Fayaway’s canoe ride and the appearance of Marnoo, the eventual agent of Tommo’s escape.

Like print chapters 16 and 17, print chapters 19 and 30 also seem to be odd mixtures of narrative and digression, even trivia. The opening to print chapter 19, entitled “Reflections on Marnoo” (segment A), is followed up with digressive anecdotes concerning tappa, popguns, and Marheyo’s shoe fetish; and chapter 30, devoted mostly to “Tattooing” (segment B), also contains seemingly random afterthoughts about taboo. What seems likely is that segments A and B in these chapters were originally conjoined in an ur-manuscript chapter 15 A/B that followed on the heels of ur-manuscript chapter 13A/B and manuscript chapter 14.

In looking at Melville’s text in this way, we begin to conceptualize more precisely the original terrain of the first version of Melville’s composition and the Stage II expansions that he might have been able to make on his own without resorting to outside source materials. Essentially, Melville split both ur-manuscript chapters 13A/B and 15A/B in two, stretched his memory to find material to augment each half, and created four different chapters (which eventually became numbered in print as chapters 16, 17, 19, and 30). This Stage II process increased the chapter count of Melville’s original narrative by two.

The narrative elements in the original configuration of Melville’s ur-manuscript chapters help us understand why Melville might have felt the need to make his preliminary expansions and how he performed them. The sequence of manuscript chapters 13A/B, 14, and 15A/B tightly and swiftly record Tommo’s post-Toby depression, his reversal via Fayaway to happier associations with the island, but then his anxiety over tattooing. In content and narrative arc, they lead directly to Typee’s concluding chapters (or what in Stage II are called ur-manuscript chapters 16, 17, and 18). These chapters, now known as print chapters 32, 33, and 34, relate in equally swift measure Tommo’s escape. Of course, Melville might have expanded his book by inventing conflicts and plot complications
involving Tommo, Fayaway, and Marnoo, but the expectations of the travel genre obliged him to avoid such romancing; he had little recourse except to make Tommo’s stay in the valley seem longer simply by putting textual distance between the three key events in the arc of his already established narrative: Tommo’s feelings of wretchedness at being a captive, his turn for the better, and then his turn for the worse. Essentially, Melville needed to pace his reversals more slowly.

What might have been the sequence of these hypothetical revisions? Manuscript evidence gives some clue, but first let’s consider the most likely sequence of revision. The first preliminary expansion probably involved “ur-manuscript chapter 15A/B.” Originally, this chapter marked the beginning of Tommo’s reversal in his affection for the Typees; it would have begun with (A) Tommo’s continued anxiety over the natives’ desire to keep him (now found in print chapter 19) and moved directly to (B) the natives’ attempt to tattoo him (now found in print chapter 30). But if Melville were to supply his readers with more detail on Typee life, he would have to sustain Tommo’s happier regard for the islanders and forestall his doubts about their keeping him. The problem with ur-manuscript chapter 15 A/B is that it would have rushed Tommo’s increasing wariness of his captors and made further digression on the Typees impossible. To slow things down, Melville would have split “manuscript chapter 15A/B” apart. To segment A, with its “Reflections on Marnoo” and its focus on the natives’ “strangest passions,” he would have added two freshly concocted anecdotes: Tommo’s manufacture of a popgun and Marheyo’s use of Tommo’s shoes as a necklace. He would also have added his description of tappa-making (derived from personal observation) at the end. The result would be the new and fuller chapter that would become print chapter 19. At this time, he would have also turned manuscript chapter 15’s original conclusion on tattooing (segment B) into print chapter 30 by adding various materials including his personal observations on taboo. By writing a separate chapter on Tattoo, he could stress more clearly the central idea that the threat of being tattooed “augmented [his] apprehension” (NN Typee, 220) and that it hastened his desire to leave. In subsequent stages, Melville would also insert more chapters between print chapters 19 and 30 to stall Tommo’s revelation and prolong his reversal even more.

With a similar revision strategy in mind, Melville probably turned next to his “manuscript chapter 13 A/B.” However, in this case his revisions required him also to tinker with one of the extant manuscript chapters. Here, as with “manuscript chapter 15A/B,” Melville would have divided his ur-manuscript chapter in two. To the first half on Tommo’s “Melancholy condition” (13A), he added the digressions on sewing and shaving to create print chapter 16. To the felicitous latter half, which first registers Tommo’s new “elasticity” and “altered frame of mind” (13B), he added the more serious concluding section on the Typees’ “Skirmish,” which while humorous nevertheless hints at troubles in paradise. Perhaps his writing out of the child’s play of the popgun anecdote used to expand “manuscript chapter 15A” into print chapter 19 actually triggered these deeper reflections on tribal militancy in the expansion of 13B into print chapter 17. One replays the other. Material support for this second late addition on warfare comes in the form of an insertion slip that was attached to a leaf of manuscript chapter 10. Like the amusing popgun affair, Melville’s warfare anecdote in print chapter 17 comically reduces Typeean bloodshed to the loss of a thumbnail, but the “Skirmish” also includes three ominous
gunshots and therefore demonstrates that the natives actually possess muskets. For Tommo, these gunshots disrupt the valley’s “general repose” and undermine any naïve notions that the Typees are “lambkins.” But where do these muskets come from? In describing the skirmish, Tommo observes the chiefs running off from the Ti, “grasping the muskets which were ranged against the bamboos” (NN Typee, 128). This print reference refers back to Melville’s earlier chapter describing the Ti, which includes a paragraph that registers, also in print, Tommo’s “surprise” at seeing “six muskets ranged against the bamboo” (92).

But significantly, the manuscript of this chapter makes no reference at all to muskets. Had the muskets been mentioned in manuscript, we could assume that their presence in Typee was a part of Melville’s original narrative and that the skirmish was also part of that original plan. But where the print version of Typee tells us we should find text about musketry in the manuscript, we find no text at all; hence the muskets and indeed the skirmish could not have been a part of Melville’s original narrative. What we do find on page 5 of manuscript chapter 10 are graphic insertion devices indicating that Melville had prepared additional text about musketry for insertion, and that he had put that text on a separate slip of paper (now lost) to be appended on manuscript page 5. (Pinholes in the leaf show where the insertion slip was once fastened.) Without a doubt, the reference to muskets in the skirmish scene of print chapter 15 triggered the addition of muskets to manuscript chapter 10. That is, in adding the skirmish episode, Melville realized that the “surprising” presence of musketry in the Ti could not be surprising at all because Tommo had already visited the Ti in manuscript chapter 10. Writing triggers memory once again, and in recollecting the skirmish Melville recalled the further detail of the Typees’ armory. That is, Melville returned to his earliest description of the Ti and added the muskets that the natives would later fire in the skirmish. Thus, we find traces of one revision (the added section on the skirmish), which no longer exists in a manuscript form, located in a corresponding revision (the insertion slip on muskets) of a manuscript that does exist.5

The expansions of hypothetical ur-manuscript chapters 13 A/B and 15 A/B constitute the main revision events of Stage II, and with these expansions completed, Melville had indeed created a longer book, but not long enough. In the revision process, he had begun to expose more of Typeean belligerence, thus heightening narrative tension and expanding to some extent his political awareness of warfare practices. The former naval seaman never saw action during his service, but a year and a half on a warship had shown him enough of muskets, and writing about the Typees’ armory and their maneuvers gave him an outlet for what he had kept inside about humanity, savage or civilized. At some point in the narrative, Tommo, too, would have to be made to realize that Typeean belligerence is not just an occasion for cultural comparison; it is a threat to his well-being. Even so, the comic treatment of the skirmish suggests that Melville needed to forestall his “apprehensions of evil”; he was not yet ready to give Tommo any real justification for escaping the Typee Valley. Melville’s humor, then, manipulates our reader response by minimizing violence even as it foreshadows worse to come.6
Stage III

With his narrative now more carefully paced and a revision strategy for stretching out the plot, Melville could turn to other forms of expansion, and in Stage III he added two full chapters of filler: a description of breadfruit (print chapter 15), which he inserted between manuscript chapters 12 and our hypothetical “manuscript chapter 13A/B,” and a similar digression (print chapter 28) on eating parties and raw fish, which includes references to the Ti and intimations of future cannibalism. The main argument for Melville’s having made these insertions in this stage is that they, too, seem to exhibit no debts to sources other than Melville’s personal experience. As already noted, we find material evidence of the insertion of the breadfruit chapter in that the manuscript’s loose leaves may have been created—that is, made “loose”—by Melville’s cutting them away from a stitched booklet in order to insert the breadfruit chapter between manuscript chapters 12 and 13 A/B. Melville’s expansions in Stages II and III range from politically, culturally, and narratorially relevant observations to the sexual insinuations of “Raw fish!”? However, with a resulting chapter count of still only twenty-two, Melville’s need to expand further, if only to meet audience expectations of sufficient length, would have been impetus enough for him to search his mind for more material. And with his personal repertoire of anecdotes exhausted, he would have naturally turned at this point to source books. Stewart and Porter were inevitabilities.

Loose Leaves

The Typee manuscript consists of one booklet of ten leaves and six loose leaves, with a seventh (Leaf 12) currently missing. The text of the loose leaves flows directly out of the text that concludes the booklet so that there is no apparent interruption of composition from the booklet to the loose leaves. Moreover, the text in the loose leaves (and presumably the missing Leaf 12) also flows consistently throughout the leaves. In short, there is no break in the textual flow. Naturally, we want to know why, how, and when Melville composed, tore out, and reassembled these leaves.

The question of timing is a matter for speculation. The “neat” explanation might be that Melville created the loose leaves relatively early in the process before going on to make other, later changes, such as his insertion of paragraph marks, or his response to his brother’s editorial pencilings, or even his use of certain insertion slips. However, “messier” sequencings are equally possible. The creation of the loose leaves might have come after or concurrently with the pencilings and insertion slips. That is, the penciled suggestions may have triggered further revisions that eventuated in expansions that hypothetically led to the tearing out of the loose leaves; or the loose leaves might have been part of a process including the Fayaway insertion slip (now lost) on Leaf 14, perhaps as a preparation of the text for fair-copying. Another possibility is that the tearing of the loose leaves may have occurred in Stages II-V preceding the fair-copy stage of composition, a period in which Melville inserted additional chapters throughout his narrative. To my understanding, no material evidence exists to show conclusively when these loose leaves were created.
More, however, may be said about the how and why of their composition. One explanation is that they are the first six (actually seven when we count the missing Leaf 12) consecutive leaves of a second booklet, and that in removing for whatever reasons other later leaves (now lost) in the same booklet, Melville necessarily tore these now loose leaves apart from the second booklet. But while this may account for the first two loose leaves (which do seem to come from a single other booklet), it does not tell the whole story.

To understand that story, we need to recall some rudiments of bookmaking. Melville’s booklet consists of five sheets of folded paper, each inserted one inside the other, and all five stitched together, so that when opened at the middle, five leaves fall to the left of the stitching and five to right. If all six loose leaves were part of one such booklet, Leaves 11 through 15 would fall to the left-hand side of each stitched sheet. Moreover, the tears of the torn edge of each of these left-side loose leaves would match the tears on the edges of the corresponding right-hand leaves to which they were formerly attached (see Fig. 1). That is, like pieces in a puzzle, Leaf 11 would originally have been attached to what we would call “Leaf 20” (if it existed) and these two leaves together in their original untorn state would make up a single folded sheet forming the outermost sheet of this hypothetical single booklet. Similarly, Leaf 12 would have been attached to what we could designate “Leaf 19,” and Leaf 13 to a “Leaf 18.” Of course, leaves 20, 19 and 18 are now lost, but if this hypothetical booklet were real, Leaf 14 would have to have been attached to the actual surviving Leaf 17, and Leaf 15 to Leaf 16 (the two of which would constitute the innermost folded sheet). Accordingly, if the left-hand Leaves 11 through 15 were, in fact, originally attached to Leaves 16, 17, “18,” “19,” and “20,” then the torn edge of each leaf would correspond to the torn edge of its companion leaf. Of course, since the hypothetical “Leaves 18, 19, and 20” do not survive, we cannot explain the full story behind the actual loose Leaves 11 through 17, but we do have enough physical evidence to make one significant determination: the six extant leaves could not have come from a single hypothetical booklet.

Fig. 1. Melville’s manuscript booklets consisted of five sheets of paper folded and stitched in the fold to create ten leaves, for a total of twenty pages per booklet. Pictured here is the arrangement of loose Leaves 11–17 as they would appear in booklet form, if they all came from a single booklet. Note that Leaves 12 and those designated [MS] are missing. If the loose leaves did come from the same booklet, we would expect the torn edges of Leaves
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14 and 15 to correspond to those of Leaves 17 and 16, respectively. Since they do not, nor does any torn edge of the extant loose leaves correspond to any other torn edge, we must conclude that the leaves come from at least two booklets.

This is certain because if these leaves did come from the same five-sheet, ten-leaf booklet, the torn edges of at least one leaf would correspond to the torn edge of one other leaf, but no such correspondence occurs. For instance, Leaves 14 and 15 would have to have interlocking tear marks with Leaves 17 and 16, respectively; but in fact the torn edge profiles of Leaves 14 through 17 are exactly the same rather than interlocking (see Fig. 2). That is, they appear to be consecutive leaves (all falling to the right of the stitching) that were grabbed together and torn from a booklet other than the one originally including leaves 11 through 13.

Fig. 2. Loose Leaves 11 and 13 (Leaf [12] is missing) have unique torn edge profiles and may or may not come from the same booklet as loose Leaves 14–17. (Because Leaf 11’s profile indicates that it is an outermost leaf, it may have come from the same booklet as Leaves 14–17, although it would have to have been attached to a fifth, right-hand side leaf following Leaf 17.) Loose Leaves 14–17 exhibit the same torn edge profile, which indicates they are, in fact, consecutive leaves torn from the same booklet. Since the torn edge appears on the left of each leaf and goes beyond the crease of the original full-length sheets, we can assume that these leaves also came from the right side of each sheet or the latter half of the booklet.

We can deduce this for the following reason. When the loose leaves are laid on the table with their torn edges to the left, we can see that portions of those torn edges fold up (i.e., the tears cross over to the other side of the crease dividing the leaf from its formerly connected other half); thus, we can conclude that these leaves had to have been torn from the right side of a booklet. And since Leaves 11 and 13 do not share this tear profile, nor do they interlock with any of leaves 14 through 17 or with each other, we can also conclude that they were torn from a separate booklet.

Also relevant is the relative amount of revision evident on the loose leaves. On the one hand, two pages (MS 30 and 32) have two of the highest word count in the entire manuscript and hence the most revision per page (see “Writing Typee,” Table 1). On the other hand, the rest of the loose leaves exhibit lower than average word counts, indicating that Melville probably performed more copying and less revision on each of these pages. Taken together, the loose leaves reflect extended passages of copying (suggesting fairly polished material) punctuated by brief but intense areas of fresh composition and subsequent revision. Chances are that Melville had worked over what became his loose-
leaf materials considerably on separate pages, that he eventually copied the material into at least two booklets, that he then (for whatever reason) tore the relatively polished loose leaves away from those booklets, and that he subsequently revised and expanded the text of certain pages on those loose leaves by using insertion slips.

We can entertain at least two hypotheses to explain why Melville tore out his loose leaves: one involves the revisions relating to Fayaway and Toby; the other concerns the possible insertion of a digressive chapter. The two may work separately or together.

**Fayaway and Toby**

As it happens, manuscript chapter 12 (inscribed entirely on loose leaves) contains some of the most emotionally charged and sexually stirring passages in *Typee*. Here we find Tommo’s remorse, indignation, and guilt over the departure of Toby as well as his opening up to the nurturing of Fayaway, his ogling of young girls as they bathe, and his autoerotic description of Kory-Kory making fire. (See *Melville Unfolding*, chapters 7–9.) It is only natural that Melville’s most suggestive chapter is the scene of the kind of massive revision the loose leaves suggest. Indeed, the relative smoothness of composition evident in manuscript chapter 12’s loose leaves indicates that Melville may have performed his heaviest revisions on other loose leaves, which, having been torn away and discarded, were the textual precursors of his surviving loose leaves.

One possible scenario (see Fig. 3) is that Melville completed manuscript chapter 11 at the beginning of a second new booklet at the top of Leaf 11. (The fold and tear patterns on the edge of this particular leaf indicate that it is the left half of the outermost sheet of a booklet.) Having done with chapter 11, he then continued on with “Chapter Twelth” (as he calls it), writing on into this second booklet (which I shall designate B2), and on to a third (let’s call it B3). At this point Melville was most likely composing new text or at least creating considerable new material even as he copied from earlier leaves. In the process he found himself recollecting more clearly the aftermath of Toby’s departure, his own depression, Fayaway’s consolations, and the complex feelings of anger, guilt, despair, and passion he had experienced at that time. Quite possibly, he reached something of a block. Perhaps the words had originally flowed well enough onto booklet B2, but upon rereading he was not satisfied and began to revise. Typically, passages that he had begun to revise, then copy, further inspired him to compose new material, and as the writing block melted, he found himself expanding manuscript chapter 12 so that his drafting actually took him to the end of B2 and into the first half of B3.
narrative so much that he was forced to stop, remove these leaves, and recopy them onto the remainder of B 3. He tore away Leaves 11, 12, and 13 (probably individually) and preserved them. Then he copied text from the leaves marked “MS-A through L” onto blank Leaves 14–17, which he then tore away from his booklet in order to place them next to Leaves 11, 12, and 13. An alternate but not necessarily contradictory theory is that Melville’s manuscript chapter 12 (print chapter 14) was originally followed directly by a manuscript chapter 13, or what is now print chapter 16, and that at some late point in composing Typee, Melville decided to add a digressive chapter on breadfruit between these two manuscript chapters. In order to insert this digressive chapter (now print Ch. 15), Melville would have torn manuscript chapters 12 and 13 away from each other and placed the digression on breadfruit, or what is now print chapter 15, between them.

Of course, we do not know the precise events, but if this hypothesis holds, it follows that the later pages in B2 and the first half of B3 had become so heavily revised and overlong as to be virtually illegible in places. At some point, then, Melville found himself breaking up his booklets, preserving the first three leaves (11 through 13) of B2 and copying revisions of the remaining material from the rest of B2 and the first (left-hand) half of B3 onto the latter (right-hand) half of B3. Once he had completed B3 with his revised material, he tore out the more smoothly inscribed leaves that he wanted to keep, which we now call Leaves 14 through 17, and placed them beside Leaves 11 through 13. The fact that he was copying onto these leaves would account for the relatively small amount of revision we find on them, but the fact that Leaves 14, 15, and 16 bear the marks of insertion slips also attests that Melville had still more revising to do.

An Inserted Chapter

A second hypothesis (see also Fig. 3) proposes that Melville tore Leaves 14 through 17 away from the rest of B3 not in order to unite them with Leaves 11 through 13 but rather to separate them from the chapter that directly followed it. As it presently stands, Typee’s print chapter 14 (manuscript chapter 12) is followed by the digressive print chapter 15, which halts the narrative to discuss breadfruit. Print chapter 16 picks up the narrative, beginning as does chapter 14 with Tommo’s feelings of doubt about the Typees despite their persistent “kindness.” It continues to reflect on his own despondency (mentioned above) and the genial character of the natives. In fact, chapter 16 has more in common with chapter 14 than its present “breadfruit” predecessor, chapter 15. Chances are the digressive chapter 15 on breadfruit was composed and added in a later stage.

It is quite possible, then, that in its early transcription version manuscript chapter 12 (print chapter 14) was originally followed by what is now print chapter 16 (we might designate it the original “manuscript chapter 13”), and that in order to expand his book Melville, at some later point, inserted his chapter on breadfruit. To do this he would have had to tear out Leaves 14 through 17, which conclude MS chapter 12, and thereby separate them from the hypothetically named “manuscript chapter 13” (print chapter 16) in order to insert the new chapter on breadfruit, which we now call print chapter 15.

If this second hypothesis holds, then Melville may have torn his loose leaves apart during the later fair-copy stage of composition when (as discussed in Melville Unfolding,
chapter 13) the writer made other chapter-length insertions into his text, including two chapters’ worth of insertions in the now-lost section of manuscript that precedes the surviving fragment. Of course, unlike our first hypothesis, this explanation by itself does not fully account for how Leaves 11 through 13 were separated from B2. Thus, the two hypotheses are not mutually exclusive, and a third possibility is that the two work together to explain the loose leaves. That is, at the time Melville saw fit to add a chapter on breadfruit, he was also reworking his material on Toby and Fayaway.

Whatever hypothesis works best to explain the loose leaves, Melville’s tearing of them and the texts associated with them was the product of a mode of revision that occurred late in the compositional process, and is a sign of important textual and psychological transformations.

**Two Chapters More**

A seemingly small but nevertheless intriguing fact concerning the *Typee* manuscript is that its chapters numbered “eleven” and “twelfth” correspond to print chapters 13 and 14. This two-chapter discrepancy indicates that at some point after completing his “first draught,” Melville had to have added two chapters, or two chapters’ worth of material, to the first third of his narrative. When did Melville add the material, how did he do it, and why?

Although we do not have manuscripts showing the actual insertion of these two chapters, our observation that they were inserted is not hypothetical. Only a two-chapter insertion would make such a renumbering necessary. Of course, it is possible that in reviewing the early chapters of his narrative—chapters he would have originally numbered one through nine in manuscript—Melville may have found two that were simply too long and mechanically divided them into four shorter ones, thus converting nine original chapters into eleven without adding any new material at all. But the textual condition of the print version—the choppiness of the first chapters and the presence of roughly integrated source appropriations—indicates a far more complex scenario of expansion and revision. Moreover, data derived from the extant manuscript also reveals that Melville had to have inserted a dozen or so pages.

For the moment, however, let’s consider the timing of this stage of composition. My reasons for locating the two-chapter expansion of Stage IV at this particular moment in Melville’s revision process depend first upon the unlikelihood of their being added at any other later time. We know that Melville could not have renumbered his early manuscript chapters 1–9 after sending his fair copy overseas to publisher John Murray because of the circumstances related to a still later renumbering of chapters occasioned by the addition of material appearing in the latter half of *Typee*. In a letter to Murray dated December 6, 1845, Melville’s brother Gansevoort designated the new material as a revision of chapter 20 and two new chapters, 21 and 27. He also supplied Herman’s revised table of contents in which the author renumbered only the late chapters from “Chapter 20 on” (Howard, “Historical Note,” NN *Typee*, 280; *Correspondence* 31). Since these manuscript chapters 20, 21, and 27 correspond in number to their print equivalents, we know that Melville’s fair copy to which these later chapters were added must already have contained the two earlier chapters’ worth of material under discussion here, otherwise Melville would have
had to have labeled his new chapters 20, 21, and 27 as chapters 18, 19, and 25. Thus, Melville did not add these two chapters at any time after Gansevoort handed the fair copy over to Murray in October 1845.

Could the two chapters have been added during the weeks of Gansevoort’s travel to London in August 1845? Evidence for this does not exist. In his surviving correspondence, Gansevoort indicates that around mid-September he had written a now-lost letter about Typee to Herman in response to a letter Herman had written (also lost) that had reached Gansevoort around September 1. Although Gansevoort does not report having received any new chapters in this mailing, this letter could have contained the two additional early chapters. Of course, Herman’s letter, which was sent by steamer, would have been mailed in early or mid-August. Since Melville obviously would not have had the material ready to give to Gansevoort in person before his departure on July 31, he would have had to have prepared the chapters to be added to his fair copy in the first two weeks of August. This would be scant time for such revisions, especially if any of the hypotheses about how these chapters may have been created (about which more later) hold true. Chances are Melville did the messy surgery himself before making a fair copy, and before entrusting that copy, with its two additional chapters, to his brother.

If we can reasonably locate this major two-chapter revision before the fair-copy stage, the next question is how Melville did it, or more specifically what materials he added to trigger a renumbering of his chapters.

Melville might have added two new chapters wholesale, or he might have expanded existing chapters, swelling them to the point that they needed to be cut into smaller consecutive chapters, or he might have performed both kinds of operation, adding a chapter wholesale and expanding another so that it would be divided into two new chapters. Each of these options is a likely scenario for Melville’s conversion of manuscript chapters 1–9 to print chapters 1–11.

To help focus the matter, we can also ask where in the text is Melville most likely to have made his additions? Of the now-existing material preceding the manuscript fragment (i.e., print chapters 1–11), one thing is certain. Chapters 5–11 follow one upon the other in brisk narrative progression. These involve Tommo’s planning with Toby to jump ship, their five-day trek in the mountains, their entrance into the Typee valley, and the introduction of various native characters. Except for the insertion of the vocal telegraph image in print chapter 10 (see Melville Unfolding, chapter 10), there are no digressions on politics or religion in chapters 5–11, and the sequence of episodes is so tight that it seems highly unlikely that the story line could have made sense if any two of these chapters had not been present in Melville’s narrative from the start. The same thinking argues against Melville’s simply augmenting the adventure of print chapters 5–11 by swells certain chapters so as to require new chapter divisions and numbers.

But print chapters 1–4 are quite different. In them we find several digressions on missionaries and Western incursions, a proleptic defense of Tommo’s decision to desert, anecdotes that jump around in time, a significant amount of material borrowed from sources, and even what might be taken as two separate beginnings to the book. In fact, until we meet Toby in chapter 4, there is little sense of a narrative, and a great deal that registers
general discontent with French, British, and American authorities. These opening chapters are so “labored” that Leon Howard speculated long ago that they were “probably written, in their final form, only after a substantial portion of the later chapters had been composed” (Howard, Herman Melville, 94). The manuscript evidence of Melville’s renumbering of chapters (which Howard did not live to see) supports Howard's astute speculation. Exactly how and why Melville added to his first four chapters can be explained by their content. A brief summary of these chapters gives some sense of the odd textual diversity of Melville’s opening section.

Chapter 1 is a kind of grab bag consisting of bawdy religious and political commentary, its jaunty tone bristles with a sense of unjust deprivation and impatience to get ashore. The chapter opens with the stirring words “Six months at sea!” but ends a page later with a line of asterisks. (This section, which we may call 1A, appears in print as NN Typee 3.1–5.9, and takes up 67 print lines.) The narrative in Chapter 1 seems to begin again, with “Hurra, my lads! . . . we shape our course to the Marquesas!” This second opening (1B) is followed by details from “olden voyagers,” presumably Melville’s source books (NN Typee 5.11–6.10; 39 print lines). Chapter 1 ends with two ribald (and eventually expurgated) anecdotes about the islanders’ inspection of the missionary’s wife’s petticoats and their queen’s tattooed derriere (1C). Because these three bumptious, anecdotal, and somewhat polemical sections have no strong narrative interconnection, any of them could have been added to one another in several stages so as to create a new chapter.

Chapter 2 is an anomaly among the opening four chapters: it has a straightforward narrative progression. Beginning with a languorous description of the sea, it moves to a sighting of the island of Nuku Hiva, which the whaling ship Dolly circumnavigates; it describes the French gunboats in Nuku Hiva Bay, which the Dolly enters with the help of a drunken pilot, and it ends with visitations from first male and then female natives, who engage with the sailors in a night of debauchery. It is a coherent progression from an ocean picturesque to scenes of primitive and civilized sexuality. Only about one page of island facts, culled from Stewart, might be a candidate here as a late insertion (NN Typee 11.3–11.39; 36 print lines). Quite possibly, chapter 2 was Melville’s original opener.

Chapter 3 is the smallest chapter in the book and a digression upon French operations in Polynesia, ending with the anecdote of Mrs. Pritchard’s defiant flag-raising against the French invaders. Charles Anderson in Melville in the South Pacific does not indicate any debt here to sources, and Melville may have cobbled these materials together from tales he had gathered from his own experience. Melville may have inserted the chapter in its entirety (197 print lines), and some indication of its narratorial irrelevance is that it was removed wholesale in the American revised edition.

Chapter 4 may be divided into six parts:

A. Tommo's defense of his decision to desert the Dolly (NN Typee 20.1–23.19; 117 print lines);
B. his description of Nuku Hiva Bay, its inlets, and tribes drawn from Stewart (23.20–24.34; 54 print lines);
C. two paragraphs on the Typees as “celebrated warriors,” possibly inspired by Porter (24.35–25.13; 18 print lines);
Scenes of Revision: Expansion and Collaboration

D. a reference to the Katherine incident and other island treacheries, possibly from Olmstead, balanced by Porter’s treacheries as filtered through Stewart (25.14–26.28; 54 print lines);

E. Tommo’s disquisition on the misapplication of the term “savage” inspired by both Stewart and Porter (26.29-27.26; 37 print lines); and

F. a return to the causes of island hostilities and the parodic anecdote of the Glen of Tior (27.27–29.35; 87 print lines).

Melville may have built this chapter by adding any of these sections to any of the others.

It is anybody’s guess which of these text segments found in the four opening print chapters first appeared in Melville’s original narrative, and which were added later (and in what sequence). And we can construct any number of revision narratives to explain what might have happened. For instance, the opening section on the deprivations of sea life (1A) or Melville’s later defense of his apparent self-serving decision to jump ship (4A) may have been primary concerns for the writer and thus a part of the original genesis of his personal narrative; or they may have been afterthoughts and thus part of his Stage IV revision strategy. Conceivably, Melville might have had the materials he drew from sources in chapters 2 and 4 in front of him when he first sat down to write; or, as is more likely the case, he may have inserted those source materials much later. Until such time as the working draft manuscript for these first four chapters is discovered we have no direct material evidence to support any particular revision scenario, and it may seem that this necessarily dark stage in Melville’s revision of Typee is taking us far afield from the immediate applications of the manuscript fragment itself.

Indeed, in trying to build a revision scenario on the basis of the simple fact that Melville added two chapters, I must seem to resemble the scientists in Woody Allen’s Sleeper who upon the assassination of their Leader attempt to clone a new, full-bodied version of their recently exploded führer with that individual’s only surviving body part: his nose. But this should not prohibit us from making reasonable speculations about the growth of Typee, and in fact the manuscript fragment does provide material information that can help us delimit the speculation. This, I am sorry to say, will require some math.

One factor that distinguishes any one revision scenario from another is that each requires Melville to have composed varying amounts of additional text. At present, all we can know of these hypothetical additions is the amount of lines of text they ultimately generate in print. (See print line counts for each text segment mentioned above.) We know this because those print lines actually exist in the print text Melville first published. And we can indirectly measure whatever hypothetical additions a particular revision narrative requires simply by adding up their corresponding print lines.

Let us now assume that Melville composed his additions in the same fashion and at the same rate of writing as he composed the actual three-chapter manuscript fragment we have before us. With this manuscript text in one hand and its corresponding print lines in the other, we can derive a ratio of the amount of text Melville actually generated in manuscript that would yield the corresponding amount of text in the actual print lines he eventually published. That is, if we count all the words inscribed in manuscript chapters 10–12 (including, of course, all cancellations) and compare them to the words they actually
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became in print chapters 12–14, we could develop a formula for determining the probable amount of text Melville would have to have composed in order to add two chapters’ worth of text in his opening narrative, based upon the actual text he ended up printing.

Chances are the one or two mathematicians and theoretical physicists reading this have caught on to this formulation; even so, for the rest of the population whose eyes may be rolling out of exhaustion if not disbelief, consider this: (1) What we write in manuscript is never exactly the same as what appears in print, in terms of either content or quantity of words; (2) in the case of his three-chapter manuscript fragment, Melville inscribed more words than he eventually printed; (3) if that differential can be taken as a constant ratio, then we can reasonably assume in backwards fashion that any specific number of printed words must necessarily have derived from a corresponding larger number of manuscript words. As it turns out, the actual ratio of manuscript to print words is 1.2375. Put more directly, approximately 124 words in manuscript come to 100 words in print. All things being equal, we can also say that 100 print words represent 124 manuscript words. With the print words in chapters 1–4 easily countable before us, we can readily estimate the total number of manuscript words Melville might have inscribed.

But this bit of algebra alone does not solve the problem of what specific content Melville might have added to his initial narrative that caused him to bump up the number of chapters in this section by two. To determine this, we need to consider the material condition of Melville’s existing manuscript, in particular the fact that he inscribed his narrative on composition booklets.

As we know, the chapters in the Typee manuscript numbered 10–12 consist of one ten-page booklet and several loose leaves torn from similar booklets. Let us assume that in Stage I Melville initially inscribed his eighteen-chapter personal narrative on a set of such booklets, and that, accordingly, the original nine chapters preceding the three that we now have in manuscript were also inscribed on a discrete, whole number of booklets. That is, Melville did not at this stage tear apart booklets to reshuffle pages or use fractions of booklets, but filled each booklet with text (revising, of course, as he composed or proofread) and moved to the next booklet, filling it as well, and so on to the end of his narrative. It stands to reason, then, that whatever text Melville added to his first nine chapters to make his narrative grow to eleven would have to be text in excess of what he originally placed in the discrete whole number of booklets.

To clarify, let’s imagine Melville writing Typee. He picks up a booklet and begins to write something called chapter 1 by inscribing text, rereading, and revising a bit as he goes along. In the same booklet, he moves directly on to chapter 2, but filling the booklet before finishing his chapter, he selects a fresh booklet and continues his narrative, again filling each side of each page, again moving on to a new chapter, until a booklet is filled, and so on. And so on, into the booklet containing what he first called chapters 10, 11, and 12, and beyond that into booklets that complete his initial eighteen-chapter narrative. With this in mind, we can more concretely visualize a discrete set of booklets preceding chapters 10–12. And applying our mathematical ratio, we can further determine that this set consisted of five booklets.
Here is how I came up with the number five. From the extant manuscript, we know by direct word count that Melville filled the one surviving booklet with 7706 words. Through whatever acts of revision, these 7706 manuscript words eventually yielded 6227 words in the first British edition, which amounts to 518 print lines in the NN *Typee* edition. This gives us the ratio of manuscript words to print words of, once again, 1.2375. If we take the 518 print lines as a constant print equivalent for any manuscript booklet, and divide this figure into the actual print-line count of the first eleven print chapters, we derive a figure that represents the number of manuscript booklets Melville would have used in writing the text of his original manuscript chapters 1–9, plus the two chapters’ worth of text he added.

Here is how the division works out. Since the text of the print chapters 1–11 amounts to 2886 print lines, the number of booklets Melville would have had to have used in manuscript to write eleven chapters (2886 print lines ÷ 518 print lines per booklet) would have been five booklets, and a remainder of 296 print lines. In this calculation, the five booklets represent the original nine chapters Melville wrote in Stage I and the remainder of 296 print lines represents the additional text Melville would have added to create his two more chapters in Stage IV.

Assuming the constancy of our manuscript-to-print text ratio of 1.2375, we can now use that ratio to calculate an estimated manuscript length for those 296 print lines as being roughly equivalent to 4396 manuscript words. And given that the average word count for a manuscript page is 376, we can also determine that Melville would have composed some twelve additional manuscript pages beyond the five booklets’ worth of material that would constitute his original span of manuscript chapters from 1 to 9.⁹

These twelve manuscript pages, then, represent the amount of text that Melville added to his originally inscribed opening four chapters, the same pages that in turn led him to renumber his chapters. But since these pages do not survive, we must content ourselves by focusing on their 296 print-line equivalents in the first eleven chapters of *Typee*, or more precisely chapters 1–4. The question then becomes, which configuration of the sections in chapter 1–4 we have previously outlined comes within range of the 296 print lines of text?
With the print-line lengths of the dozen or so possible revision segments from the first four chapters in front of us (see Table 3), we can begin to determine the limits of possibility regarding the different revision scenarios that would amount to 296 print-lines that Melville may have added. For instance, the minimalist hypothesis that Melville simply added chapters 1 and 3 wholesale to increase his chapter count by two yields a total of 399 print lines. This is considerably more than the target number of 296 print lines; moreover, this view does not account for digressive segments in chapters 2 and 4 that clearly borrow from or are parallel to the Stewart and Porter sources that by themselves are most certainly the kind of late additions we expect to find in Stage IV.

A more complex set of scenarios requires us to see some of Melville’s original opening chapters as “ur-manuscript chapters” consisting of segments of the present print chapters, similar to those we find in Stage II. With this procedure in mind, one scenario might be that Melville’s first manuscript chapter was originally a combination of the two opener sections of print chapter 1 (1A and 1B) and all of chapter 2. In this case, one hypothesis would be that Melville added his ribald jokes (section 1C) and the Stewart description (2A) to this ur-manuscript chapter, separated the resultant overlong chapter into what are now print chapters 1 and 2, and then added chapter 3 wholesale. This would yield 329 print lines, which comes closer to our target of 296. But this hypothesis presumes that Melville’s original opening had its odd double opener (sections 1A and 1B) from the beginning. A more likely hypothesis is that Melville also added the second opener (1B) at the same time as he added the ribald 1C segment, but these additions (1B, 1C, and chapter 3) bring us to an excessive print-line count of 368.

Another scenario is that Melville originally conceived his ur-manuscript chapters 1 and 2 as they now exist in print, but that sections A, C, D, and E of chapter 4 were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revision Segment</th>
<th>Print Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1: Complete</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A: Opening</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B: Opening</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C: Queen’s Tattoo Joke</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2A: Stewart description</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3: Complete</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4: Complete</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A: Self-defense</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B: Stewart description</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C: Warriors (Porter?)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D: Anti-Porter</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E: Savage/Civilized (Stewart/Porter)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F: Glen of Tior</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Print-line lengths in chapters 1–4
originally affixed to what is now the somewhat short print chapter 5, in which Tommo meets Toby and plans their getaway. We may call this “ur-manuscript chapter 4/5.” With this configuration in mind, we can hypothesize Melville adding the Stewart description (2A) to chapter 2, all of chapter 3, and either section 4B or section 4F to ur-manuscript chapter 4/5. This insertion would have caused Melville to divide the now-unwieldy ur-manuscript chapter 4/5 in two, separating the chapter 4 materials from chapter 5 to give us (along with the added chapter 3) the two extra chapters. The print-line yields for each case would be 287 (with 4B) and 320 (with 4F). These are attractive print-line counts, but the problem with either scenario is that sections 4B and 4F (which both draw from Stewart) would naturally go together, and yet to include both as a single insertion would give us an excessively high print-line yield of 374.

A third scenario draws upon the preceding two. Here, chapters 1 and 2 constitute a hypothetical ur-manuscript chapter 1/2 along with chapter 3 and ur-manuscript chapter 4/5. The number of hypotheses derivable from this configuration is large, and I shall pursue only one of the more promising ones. In this case, the original opener, manuscript chapter 1/2, consisted of two jaunty and ribald segments (1B and 1C) and all but segment 2A of chapter 2; and the manuscript chapter 4/5 combination consisted of Tommo’s self-defense (4A) and all of print chapter 5. Here, Melville would have added his new opener (1A), stressing shipboard deprivation, and the Stewart description (2A) to ur-manuscript chapter 1/2, and created out of this aggregate two separate chapters 1 and 2 to precede the already present chapter 3. Separating the self-defensive section 4A (which also echoes the deprivation theme of the newly added segment 1A) from ur-manuscript chapter 4/5 to create separate chapters 4 and 5, Melville might have added to segment 4A the three segments 4B, 4D, and 4F, which draw from Stewart, to flesh out what would become print chapter 4. This hypothesis has a preternaturally close print-line yield of 298, but it does not account for the two segments (4C and 4E) which draw upon Porter and amount to 55 lines. However, if Melville turned to Porter as a source only after reading Stewart (as seems to be the case), he may have added these Porter-related sections 4C and 4E well after he revised and renumbered his chapter for his fair copy, and as late as Stage VII when he was sending other Porter-related material, chapters 21 and 27, to Murray. (See Melville Unfolding, chapter 15.)

My purpose in subjecting you to this odd mix of speculation, ur-manuscript chapters, print lines, and arithmetic is to ground our thinking about the more plausible revision narratives of Melville’s late “translation version” of Typee in the material realities of the surviving manuscript. This is a good exercise in testing the limits of fluid-text analysis.

**Gansevoort’s Penciled Revisions**

As noted, some time after completing his manuscript (probably during Stage V), Melville submitted his work to a reader (probably his brother Gansevoort) for a vetting. The evidence of this discrete substage of revision is a set of faint pencilings on the manuscript so light as to be irreproducible on photocopy or microfilm and even unnoticeable on high-quality photographs. They can be seen in digital pictures but are best inspected directly on the manuscript itself. Most consist of nothing more than an elaborated dot placed in
either the right or left margin. In some cases, words in the adjacent manuscript lines are underlined in pencil; and in two instances actual words are penciled in.

It is conceivable that Melville inscribed these markings himself. If so, he would have sat down to proofread, not at a writing desk with inkstand but in a comfortable armchair perhaps, and lightly marked in pencil certain problematic passages to be considered for a more thorough revision in ink at a later time. However, the light and tentative nature of these dots, lines, and words seems rather to indicate that they are the markings of someone licensed only to suggest, not make, changes. Thus, if Melville had made the pencilings himself, one might expect more forceful markings and more spontaneous insertions of words than we do in fact find. And since most of the suggestions are of a grammatical or mechanical nature, Melville would have most likely made the changes on the spot if he were vetting himself. But several factors strongly suggest instead that Melville gave his manuscript to a trusted family member to indicate problems he had with Herman’s text.

Gansevoort Melville is the most likely member. During the first half of 1845, Gansevoort was living at Astor House, the fashionable Manhattan hotel located on the site of the present Woolworth building just north of Greenwich Village. Herman was staying nearby with his other brother Allan at 7 Greenwich Street. Cooling his heels while eagerly awaiting a political appointment in the Polk administration for which he had vigorously campaigned, Gansevoort would have had time in his otherwise busy life to provide his editorial services. Since their father’s untimely death in 1832, Gansevoort had been a mentor to his siblings, and editing their writing was a function he had often performed before.

In the papers of Herman Melville’s sister Augusta Melville, we find several school composition books filled with essays on such varied topics as Washington, Robert Fulton and other heroes, “Mrs. [Felicia] Heman’s poetry,” the Sabbath, and the execution of Lady Jane Grey, all of which she wrote from January to June in 1836 while attending the Albany Female Academy. On one of her composition booklets she later wrote: “My composition with dear Gansevoort’s corrections (Albany),” and on her “Lady Jane” essay we find in Gansevoort’s hand the words “Corrected by GM,” with these final initials inscribed as an ornate circular seal. In 1836, Gansevoort was himself an exuberant stylist developing his own rhetorical skills; Augusta, a clearly talented but inexperienced writer in need of (and grateful for) fraternal “correction.” He was twenty years old, and she fifteen. Gansevoort’s markings of Augusta’s work are, therefore, far more extensive than the tentative pencilings he made nine years later on Herman’s draft of Typee. On Augusta’s drafts, Gansevoort confidently cancels her lines at will, supplying alternative wording for her. On the Typee draft, we find only three suggested words at two places, a small amount of intense cancellation, and the previously mentioned set of suggestive dots. Obviously, the twenty-five-year-old Herman did not require the kind of help the younger Augusta had needed and appreciated when she was fifteen; and Gansevoort, himself older and busier in 1845, would have had less time and less to correct in his brother’s more mature prose. Gansevoort could use his marginal dots (which do not appear on Augusta’s compositions) to signal problem areas that his talented younger brother could recognize and correct himself, once they were called to his attention.
Despite the absence of such dots on Augusta’s works, enough similarities exist between Gansevoort’s corrections of Augusta and the penciled corrections on Typee to identify Gansevoort as the one who vetted the Typee draft. In both cases we find wavy and looping cross-out lines to cancel multiple-line passages; in both, numerals (1, 2, etc.) are used to indicate the proper sequence of transposed words; and on Augusta’s essay, the penciled words “the” and “life” in Gansevoort’s hand resemble two of the three penciled words found on the Typee manuscript: “the” and “like” (RS10ms43 and RS11ms19).

There is good reason, then, to believe that Herman used Gansevoort as a collaborative reader of his manuscript. The twenty-eight marginal pencilings are invariably associated with a deliberate, responsive revision either in pencil or ink directly on the manuscript or with a change found in the first print editions. They fall into three categories relating to diction, sex, and Polynesia.

Diction

Seven revision sites involve a marginal dot with no further indication of what is to be revised, and yet a revision of some sort to an adjacent passage can be found in the first British edition. In most cases these nearly invisible penciled dots correspond to fairly mundane problems. For example, marginal dots appear beside lines containing the phrases “luxurious vegetation around” and “columnar rocks.” These words, unaltered in manuscript, later appear in the British edition as “luxuriant vegetation” and simply “rocks,” respectively (see RS10ms30e24 and RS10ms31e25). Presumably, Gansevoort was calling for more precise diction and image. The most curious instance of this kind of penciled-dot revision site occurs at RS11ms3, in which a still-undeciphered manuscript word (currently read as “chasten”) is underlined in pencil. Since the entire passage in which the word appears is absent from the British edition, we cannot be sure what Melville meant to say here, and apparently the pencil marking indicates that his brother could not make sense of it either.

Twelve of the sites with penciled dots in the margins do have written revisions in the adjacent manuscript line, some appearing in pencil and then finalized in ink, but most appearing in ink only. (Revisions of this sort appear most frequently on the loose-leaf pages of the manuscript.) One example demonstrates all three features in this category.

1. My companion … did not appear by any means to relish it. [RS11ms191]
2. My companion … did not appear by any means to relish […] this expression of my wishes.
3. My companion … did not appear […] to relish the idea. [pencil revision]
4. My companion … did not appear […] to relish idea. [ink revision]
5. My companion … did not appear to relish the idea. [RS11e31]

Discussing Toby’s reaction to his plan for Toby to fetch medical supplies, Tommo initially states that his companion “at first did not appear by any means to relish it” (step 1). In an early proofreading phase of revision, Melville had canceled “it” in ink, replacing it with “this expression of my wishes” (step 2). But later, Gansevoort scribbled over “by any means to relish” and Melville’s inserted phrase “this expression of my wishes,” and then wrote below the scribbling near the previously canceled word “it” the replacement words
“the idea,” also in pencil. He also placed a dot in the margin to indicate his suggested revision (step 3). Later, Melville returned to this revision site and in ink also canceled what his brother had earlier canceled in pencil, and inserted in ink the incomplete phrasing “to relish idea” to give “he did not appear to relish idea” (step 4). Presumably, in accepting his brother’s suggestion, Melville failed to notice his dropping of “the” in the intended phrase “to relish the idea.” But eventually, the phrase was corrected for the British edition (step 5).

A revision site such as this, with Gansevoort’s penciled dot and revision as well as Melville’s inked-over revision, is rare. Most of the eleven other revisions in this category are nothing more than a dot in the margin next to a line containing Melville’s inked revisions. The assumption is that Gansevoort did not feel the need to pencil in any specific revisions, and that his dot was enough to draw attention to an infelicity that his brother could fix in his own way. Or, perhaps, that the dot signaled a “talking point” for Gansevoort to remind him in a later conversation of what was needed. In one case, Melville has Toby say: “When the first stunning effect had subsided & left me restored to consciousness I perceived the three savages” (RS11ms93e126). Here, Gansevoort’s dot signals the problem of “left me restored to consciousness.” On the one hand, the phrasing, which would have us conceive of the subsidence of an effect as both a leaving and a restoring, is too abstract and finally inept. At the same time, this kind of convolution is not characteristic of Toby nor appropriate for the exciting narrative he is telling. One of Melville’s principal revision strategies was to clarify Toby’s voice (see Melville Unfolding, chapter 8), and in this site we see Gansevoort abetting that endeavor. And Melville’s later inked revision “corrects” the problem. He canceled “left me restored to consciousness” and inserted a new sentence down the left margin: “As soon as I regained my consciousness I perceived the three savages.” While typical revision, playing tentatively upon the margins of consciousness, is primarily grammatical, two other revisions involve sexual content.

Sex

In the highly sexualized passages that follow Toby’s second and successful attempt to leave, Melville had originally elaborated upon the native girls’ consoling body massage of Tommo by alluding to John Gay’s The Beggar’s Opera (1728). Gansevoort, however, felt the passage’s salacious details required censoring:

With Captain Macheath in the opera I could have sung “Thus I lay like a Turk with my doxies around,” for never certainly did effeminate ottoman in the innermost shrine of his sergio attended by lovlier hours with more excess of devotion than happened to me on these occasions I have mentioned. (MS12ms142e197)

Without supplying any marginal dot, Gansevoort marked out the clause referring to Macheath and his doxies with insistent looping lines. He also canceled the conjunction “for,” and capitalized the n in “never” to make the “ottoman” clause a sentence of
its own. Presumably a misspelled “serglio” was more acceptable to Gansevoort than Macheath’s prostitutes. Melville finalized his brother’s censoring of the one and not the other by inscribing his cancellation in ink over his brother’s in pencil. In due course, the “ottoman” line and the subsequent reference to the mad, wife-killing Sardanapalus were also censored, by whom we cannot be certain, before *Typee* reached print. Perhaps Herman thought better of it as he prepared his fair copy; perhaps John Murray’s copy editor, Henry Milton, excised the line before sending the text to a printer; perhaps Gansevoort in London made the cut while he read page proofs.

A second instance of penciled sexual censorship occurs with Melville’s “college of Vestals” joke following Kory-Kory’s fire-lighting scene (RS12ms179). As discussed in *Melville Unfolding* (chapter 8), the joke is that there are no virgins on the island to supply such a “college.” Initially, Melville had winkingly masked his punch line by vociferously refraining from discussing the implied “slanderous aspersion” on the native girls; it is something, he says, that “I courtiously beg I may be excused from more distinctly pointing out.” A penciled dot in the left margin calls attention to the phrasing, and Melville tinkered with it at a later point changing “I may be excused” to “to be excused.” Still later in the British edition, the entire sentence was drastically revised to obscure the joke even more.

The sexual nature of the pencil revision sites involving MacHeath and the vestal joke reveal the consequences of Melville’s development beyond the audience within himself to actual audiences represented by his brother’s sensibility. In recollecting the sensual scenes that in his later revisions became compensations for his despondent guilt over Toby, Melville had expanded his sexual self-awareness about as far as his own sense of decorum would allow. But with their mother and family in mind (and the reading public as well), Gansevoort insisted—his looping lines seem particularly intense—that his brother rein in his sexual self-exposure. The partial censorings indicate that Gansevoort was no prude; he could take oriental sensuality but not John Gay. Herman’s straightforward cancellation in ink indicates full and unambiguous agreement. Thus in a stroke of the quill, Melville was acknowledging his brother’s collaboration and through him negotiating his sexuality with a palpable, representative audience.

Equally important here is the amount of energy a set of men—two American brothers and two British editors—were willing to expend, seriatim and probably not in direct consultation but nevertheless collaboratively, in order to preserve a joke (no matter how obscured) about Polynesian women for Victorian readers, male and female. At any stage of the process, an editor (including Melville himself) could have deleted the punch line altogether, but Melville and his revisers retained the joke through incremental editorial mutilations. The repeated gendered revising amounts to a kind of male fetishizing of the joke. More than a winking acknowledgment of the comic impossibility of virginity, the strategy of preservation through obscuration expresses a deeper cultural anxiety over sexual promiscuity, and perhaps the nineteenth-century system of brothels and prostitution.

---

from “Herman Melville’s TYPEE,” ed. John Bryant. © 2006 by the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia
Polynesia

Nine revision sites involve a marginal pencil mark connected to penciled revision instructions, but no inked revision. And yet, these pencil revisions do appear in the first British edition of Typee. For example, Melville first described a native crowd as “a group of gossiping idlers gathered about the tavern door of a village” (RS10ms3e3). Later, Gansevoort penciled the numbers 1, 2, and 3 over “door,” “village,” and “tavern,” respectively, to indicate a reordering of the phrase to “door of a village tavern,” but no finalized ink revisions were made in manuscript. The first edition version of the phrase, however, appears with its properly revised sequencing. In another instance, Gansevoort inserted the word “like” in pencil between the words “cathedral gloom” to give the phrase “cathedral like gloom” (RS10ms43). Although no change is made in ink, this pencil revision does appear in print.

Most likely, Melville assumed that these more specific pencil markings could stand as a revision to be adopted, without his inking over them, when the fair copy was prepared; and his confidence that this would happen argues for the relative lateness of the pencil revisions in the composition process, perhaps as late as Stage VI, after he had consulted his source books, made significant expansions to his text, and was about to prepare his fair copy.

Pencil revision sites of this kind dealing with Polynesian language support this late dating. Gansevoort placed a penciled dot in the margin near Melville’s rendering of the Polynesian word “kikino” with the alternative “keekeeno” placed (uncharacteristically) below the baseline (RS11ms135). Gansevoort’s intended focus in this line is not entirely clear. If Herman had actually inscribed two alternative spellings at this site and left them hanging for a later decision, then Gansevoort’s penciled dot would simply call Melville’s attention to his need to make a choice. But on the same line, Melville also has Kory-Kory saying “Tipi kikino” instead of what the context requires, “Happa kikino,” and his point may be that Melville needed to correct the erroneous designation. In fact, the manuscript shows that Melville inscribed “Hapa” over “Tipi.” But if Melville had already made that correction before submitting the manuscript to Gansevoort and if he had not yet supplied an alternative to “kikino,” a third revision scenario at this site would be that Gansevoort’s dot refers to Melville’s need to clarify the sound of the Polynesian word “kikino.” If so, Melville would have at that time then inscribed the alternative “keekeeno” below “kikino” and left his choice between the two for another day. Only in the first British edition do we find his decision to follow “keekeeno.”

These and other possibilities are elaborated in the revision narrative for this site, but for our purposes here, these odd dots and scribblings in pencil and ink record a moment of both decision and indecision over what to do about the Polynesian language he had been using. Most urgently he needed to regularize the orthography. But what was not entirely clear to him was how to do that and for whose ears. Should he render the Polynesian in a format found in books he had consulted, or render it in a style that would approach the sounds familiar to an English speaker?

One revision site indicates Gansevoort’s active participation in solving the problem. Originally, in the scene in which Toby’s limp body is brought into the village, Herman
has the women announce, “‘Awa! Awa! Toby mucke moe!’—(Alas, Alas, Toby is killed!)” (RS11ms63). Gansevoort placed a dot to the left of the line and underscored “mucke moe,” perhaps to call attention to how the phrase might be pronounced. In response, Melville squeezed an additional “e” at the end of each word to render “muckee moee,” a less ambiguous spelling and a transliteration of the Polynesian more consistent with the double e’s in “keekeeno.” Also, in this manuscript line, h’s have been inserted in “Awa! Awa!” to give “Awha! Awha!” Here, Melville uses the English wh orthography for the aspirated hw vocable to familiarize and westernize the Polynesian sound. This revision probably occurred to Melville as he was altering “mucke moe.” The decisiveness of the transliteration of “muckee moee” alongside the indecision of “kikino / keekeeno” only enhances our sense of Melville’s indeterminacy, at this particular compositional moment, over the language he would translate for readers.

Gansevoort’s apparent tinkerings with “keekeeno” and “muckee moee” indicate that he may have collaborated with Herman on the problem of Polynesian sounds. Before the discovery of the Typee manuscript, readers and scholars had doubted the authenticity of Melville’s engagement with the Marquesan language because his Polynesian transcriptions in print did not seem to conform to what later visitors to Nuku Hiva thought they were hearing. But the Typee manuscript reveals that Melville understood more than we had been previously allowed.

Although Marquesan grammars and word lists appeared as early as 1842, Melville claims in Omoo not to have seen them and says that his word usage “has been mostly governed by the bare recollection of sounds” (NN Omoo, xiv). And the numerous variant spellings of Polynesian words (like Tai pi and Nuku Hiva in particular) suggest that Melville was indeed experimenting with spelling as he wrote to render sounds that could match his “bare recollection.” Even so, the word “mostly” suggests, as Harrison Hayford believes, that Melville also borrowed spellings from his Polynesian sources. This view applies to Typee as well, although it is clear from the author’s preface to Typee (written well after the manuscript stage of composition) that certain aesthetic and rhetorical considerations also “governed” his orthography. Here, Melville relates that he has adopted spellings “which might be supposed most easily to convey their sound to a stranger.” He notes that in other books about the South Seas (presumably sources like William Ellis, Stewart, and David Potter), “the most beautiful combinations of vocal sounds have been altogether lost to the ear of the reader by an over-attention to the ordinary rules of spelling” (NN Typee, xiv), and goes on to imply that he will counter that tradition by departing from overly precise phonetic transliterations to help the reader hear the beauty of Marquesan more directly, through regular English orthography. Presumably, we will hear better (and more accurately) if the words we read more closely resemble familiar English spelling conventions. The manuscript bears out this strategy: Melville’s original “Tipii” (which we might mispronounce as “tippy” or “tie pie”) becomes “Typee,” and we now read the romanticized “Fayaway” and more familiar “Happar” rather than the odd but more precisely spelled “Faaua” and “Happaa” found in manuscript.

Max Radiguet, who published his account of Du Petit-Thouars’s Polynesian exploits some years after Typee, found Melville’s title to be “bizarrement orthographié.” And Robert Louis Stevenson, a late admirer of Melville in most respects, seemed to have
missed Melville’s point in the preface altogether when he remarked that Melville “had no ear for language whatever: his Hapar tribe should be Hapaa.” Modern scholars, such as Anderson, translator Jacqueline Fouque, Harrison Hayford, and Walter Blair, have defended Melville’s spelling from various angles, all of which are treated in Hayford and Blair’s thorough note on the matter in his and Blair’s 1969 Hendricks House edition of Omoo. Hayford contributes the idea that Melville may have also altered spellings to conform to his own Northeast American dialect in which the syllable ar would be pronounced “ah”; hence, his “Happar” would actually be pronounced “Happah,” and therefore more closely resemble the Polynesian sound he was aiming to reproduce.

This is compelling logic, although it is clear that in this particular transmutation of the word, Melville does not come any closer to the actuality of Polynesian but rather is moving away from the original, double ah ending of Happaa. To be sure, the doubling and tripling of vowels in Oceanic languages is, especially to modern Western “strangers,” the least familiar aspect of Polynesian pronunciation, as is evident in the word Faaa (meaning airport and pronounced “Fah-ah-ah”), which is almost comically exhausting for English speakers to reproduce. Melville’s ar substitution in Hapar (presumably pronounced “Happah” in his accent) would have certainly eased the burden for many readers from having to pronounce “Happah-ah,” but, again, at the expense of what a Polynesian would consider was a beautiful vocal sound in its own right. Melville’s word “Tior” for the place name “Taioa” (pronounced “Ti-o-ah”) is another case in point, for the or ending here again conflates two repeated syllables into one. Further complicating Hayford’s thesis is that Melville’s eastern pronunciation of or (unlike his ar for “ah”) would not be heard as a more Polynesian “ah” sound in his dialect.

To a certain limited degree, then, Radiguet and Stevenson were right: Melville’s Polynesian, in print, is off the mark, even if we take his eastern accent into account. But Melville’s manuscript renderings of Polynesian spelling indicate (contra Stevenson) that he heard Polynesian well and initially transcribed the sounds with an informed (although not always consistent) sense of the conventional transliteration of Polynesian printed in Melville’s day. But as he was getting ready to make his fair copy, he liberalized his literal renderings of Polynesian to familiarize the oddly beautiful sounds for Western ears. His transliterations were most decidedly a conscious translation.

Initially, Melville did use the “ordinary rules of spelling” in rendering his Polynesian, at least as much of those rules as were evident in what he would have absorbed through reading, and he did not seem immediately concerned with modifying his own experimental spellings to suit his or anyone else’s ear. Throughout the manuscript we find Melville always opting for what might be called the more typical-looking Polynesian spellings. Contrary to Stevenson’s specific example, Melville uses “Happaa” consistently. Initially, he uses “Maheyo” instead of “Marheyo” and “Kori-Kori” instead of “Kory-Kory.” He spells Typee without the anglicizing y, writing instead the word “Tipii” or “Tipii.” Chances are he picked up his final spelling of Typee from Porter, a source he did not have at hand until late in the process. In addition, Melville spells Nuku Hiva in so many different ways that it seems likely that he had not, in the initial stages of composition, seen it written in any source book but was indeed operating under his own “recollection” of the

Gansevoort’s pencilings have led us to surmise that Melville did not consider standardizing his spellings until late in the compositional process, just before Melville prepared his fair copy. And the appearance of Melville’s use of Porter’s spelling of Typee, not in manuscript but in print only, not only confirms the idea that Melville composed his personal narrative first without source books but also leads us to believe that his decision to Westernize his spellings came quite late in the process and only after he did in fact resort to certain source books. Additional evidence involving Fayaway and Marheyo corroborate this idea.

Originally, Melville consistently named Tommo’s lover using the thoroughly Polynesian spelling of “Faaua” (pronounced Fah-ah-oo-ah). The word “Fayaway” appears only once in manuscript (RS12ms56), the product of a curious revision. Here, letters have been squeezed within and around “Faaua” to create “Fayaway.” Since this careful over-inscription occurs on the same leaf on which Melville straight-pinned the insertion slip that dramatizes Fayaway’s gaze (discussed in Melville Unfolding, chapter 9), we might conclude that the shift to the Westernized spelling was part of Melville’s late-stage sentimentalization of the young girl. That is, once Melville had decided to elaborate upon his lover’s sympathetic glance→gaze, he also considered romanticizing her name: Faaua→Fayaway.

Thus, in creating out of the guttural Polynesian an English word romantically evoking (let’s say) “departing faith or fairies” (fay away), Melville was quite clearly giving his Faaua a wistful Western presence designed to familiarize her gaze, just as Melville had Tommo succumb to those eyes.

A final bit of altered Polynesian spelling indicates a still later dating of Melville’s Westernizing translations. On the inside of the cover folder Melville made to contain his manuscript, the writer tinkered with spellings for Fayaway’s eccentric father, “Maheyo.” Arranged in a column, the trial names are “Marheyo,” “Marheeyo,” and “Marheyo.” Presumably, Melville was experimenting with sound variations in the old man’s name to evoke certain comic associations: the come hither of “Hey you” in Marheyo, the braying of “Hee yo” in Marheeyo, and the more genial “Heigh O” of Marheyo. Since “Maheyo” appears throughout the manuscript and since the revised “Marheyo” appears only once on the cover but then consistently throughout the print version, we can deduce that Melville composed this list either just before or during his fair-copy stage.

Gansevoort’s precise participation in Melville’s revisions of his Polynesian cannot be fully determined. At the very least his pencilings suggest a need for his brother to standardize spelling, and to the degree that the double e’s in “keekeeno” and “muckee moee” create in Western ears a more familiar sound, we can argue that Gansevoort was also urging his brother to consider the needs of his audience. Gansevoort may not have been the one to suggest the “Fayaway” revision but his penciled suggestions elsewhere may very well have sustained or even initiated a discourse that led to the change. With some help from his brother, Melville was beginning to resolve his quandary over his “interpretation” of the Polynesian speech that gave Tommo rheumatic pains and the headache. He was beginning to liberalize the literal—not to demean Polynesian language, but to make it more accessible.
Overall, the twenty-eight penciled revision sites offer an intriguing view of the kinds of issues that concerned Melville at a late moment in the creative process when he had reason to feel that he had reached a certain degree of completion. They are striking material evidence of Melville’s translation version of Typee, for they show the writer responding to the behest of a third reader representing readers to come by revising to achieve the more fluid expression of an idea, the more restrained exposure of sexuality, or a more liberal rather than literal treatment of language.

Notes


2. In completing The Confidence-Man, Melville compiled a list of chapter titles, and we might be tempted to use this document to suggest that Melville compiled a similar list of subheadings for Typee. But The Confidence-Man was the last prose work Melville would prepare for publication in his lifetime, and he had most certainly developed procedures at that point in his career which he would not necessarily have followed in preparing Typee.

3. These added materials are largely comic and demeaning in their insistence upon the infantile nature of the natives in both warfare and dress. One can speculate, then, that these additions were made before the revisions we find in manuscript that reduce this kind of comic stereotyping in Kory-Kory (see Melville Unfolding, chap. 11).

4. As noted in Melville Unfolding (chap. 5, n. 4), Charles Anderson contends that Melville drew his description of tappa-making from William Ellis’s Polynesian Researches, but there are virtually no textual similarities between Melville and Ellis in the passages Anderson cites; see Melville in the South Seas (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939), p. 749. In fact, tappa-making was something anyone in Polynesia was likely to witness.

5. While the insertion slip itself does not survive, the text written on that document, and intended for insertion at a place marked on a surviving manuscript page, does exist in print at the designated place.

6. Anderson, assuming that Melville consulted sources before writing his narrative, suggests that Melville’s reading of David Porter’s Journal may have influenced his writing of the skirmish in print chapter 17 (Melville in the South Seas, p. 135). But the passages Anderson cites are a general depiction of warfare with no verbal echoes of Porter in Melville’s description; moreover, Porter does not mention any musketry. In my view, Melville had not yet read Porter when he wrote up the skirmish, and whether or not he witnessed any actual skirmish during his island stay, the muskets seem to be derived from his personal experience. As discussed in Melville Unfolding (chap. 15), Melville did add specific appropriations from Porter’s Journal to chapter 17 after he had finally read that notorious text in Stage VI.

8. Leon Howard argues that Melville sent these additional materials at Murray’s request (NN Typee, pp. 279–80), but according to Hershel Parker, shipping schedules would not have allowed Melville enough time to receive the request and comply, and it is more likely that Melville himself initiated the addition of these three chapters. See “Evidence for ‘Late Insertions’ in Melville’s Works,” Studies in the Novel 7 (Fall 1975): 409–13.

9. From the outset, we need to recognize that this backward-projecting, arithmetical procedure, although rooted in material facts, cannot be conclusive. The deductions assume that Melville did, in fact, use booklets from the beginning and that he used them in a consistent way, mixing into them from the beginning the same writing phases he applied to the one surviving booklet. Moreover, the assumption is that the ratio of manuscript production to print yield is a constant throughout the unrecovered manuscript, and that the one surviving booklet with its particular yield can be applied to the entire production. And even if these assumptions could be proven true, there is always the possibility that a factor utterly unaccounted for entered the process. Any line of deduction is open to counterclaims, so that these calculations bear a remarkable resemblance to a house of cards. Nevertheless, we have enough data to speculate responsibly, if not definitively, upon various combinations of material Melville might have added. The 296 print-line limit cannot prove the greater likelihood of one revision scenario over another but only offers one manuscript-based way to fine-tune such speculation.

10. Parker, Herman Melville, p. 373.

11. New York Public Library, Gansevoort-Lansing Collection Box 308/2 and 4. Most of Augusta’s essays appear on quarto-size composition booklets, shorter but similar in paper stock to Melville’s manuscript booklet. A typed note accompanying one booklet (which is closer in size to Melville’s Typee manuscript booklet) erroneously identifies the material as Allan Melville’s composition corrected by Peter Gansevoort. However, a second note by Melville scholar Henry Murray gives the proper attribution of Gansevoort correcting Augusta, which is evident from Augusta’s own attributions on the document itself.

12. David Ketterer was the first to discuss the passage in print; see his “Censorship and Symbolism in Typee Revisited: The New Manuscript Evidence,” Melville Society Extracts, no. 69 (February 1987): 6–8.


14. Parker (Herman Melville, p. 361) asserts that Melville first considered “Kori” as the name for Kory-Kory, and while the name “KoKori” (obviously an uncorrected misspelling made in haste) exists on one manuscript leaf, I have found no evidence to support his assertion. Elizabeth Renker’s reading of one instance of “Kori Kori” as “Kiri

15. In transcribing the only manuscript leaf available to them before the 1983 discovery of the larger manuscript fragment, the NN editors misread “Faaua” as “Faawai” because the original word had been obscured by inserted letters and over-inscribed markings so as to transform “Faaua” to “Fayaway.” The misreading “Faawai” was a good guess under the circumstances, but it does not appear elsewhere in the manuscript fragment, which consistently gives “Faaua.” In this spelling, *faaua* does not appear in any Marquesan word books I have inspected and its meaning is not clear. It may be a combination of *faa* (*Pandanus*) and *au* (leaf), i.e., pandanus leaf, but this is just another guess. The Marquesan dialect, however, is linked to Tongan, and John Martin’s Tongan “Grammar and Vocabulary” defines “Feáooagi” as “mistress lover or sweetheart” (see William Mariner, *An Account of the Natives of the Tonga Islands of the South Pacific Ocean with an Original Grammar and Vocabulary of their Language*. Compiled and arranged by Dr. John Martin. Edinburgh, 1827, p. lviii).

16. This singular conversion to Fayaway is the only evidence of orthographic tinkering on this particular manuscript page. That is, other Marquesan names (Kori Kori, Maheyo) have not been Westernized. Interestingly, the loose leaf on which the Fayaway revision occurs has a provenance independent of the rest of the manuscript. This single leaf had been part of the Paltsits donation to the New York Public Library decades before the 1983 discovery of the larger *Typee* manuscript with its other loose leaves and booklet. It is not known how or why the Paltsits leaf was separated from the other loose leaves. One remote possibility is that after the publication of *Typee*, Melville (or someone else) gave the single manuscript leaf away as a souvenir and at that time altered “Faaua” to “Fayaway” to provide the more familiar spelling of the name made famous through its publication.