

Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia

A Sample Bibliographical Description with Commentary

Author(s): G. Thomas Tanselle

Source: *Studies in Bibliography*, Vol. 40 (1987), pp. 1-30

Published by: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40371854>

Accessed: 23-10-2015 03:14 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Studies in Bibliography*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

A Sample Bibliographical Description With Commentary

by

G. THOMAS TANSELLE

IN 1949 FREDSON BOWERS's *Principles of Bibliographical Description* provided a new point of departure for descriptive bibliography by consolidating what had gone before, subjecting it to critical scrutiny, adding new points when necessary, and offering a detailed and carefully reasoned codification of procedure. He included in his book several examples of bibliographical descriptions, demonstrating his various recommendations in concrete form. In the nearly four decades since, a number of theoretical discussions of descriptive bibliography have been published, often extending or modifying the arguments of the *Principles*, though in no way detracting from its stature as the one indispensable statement in the field. They are in the nature of footnotes or postscripts to it. The extensions have had largely to do with the description of paper, type, and binding; and the modifications, especially in regard to the concepts of *issue* and *state*, result at least in part from taking more fully into account the conditions and products of nineteenth- and twentieth-century publishing. I think it may be a good idea at this time to bring together in one place references to these scattered discussions and to offer a new exemplary description that illustrates many of the points that have been made.

I present below a bibliographical description of Melville's *Redburn* that attempts to show not only how a single edition might be described but also how one might combine with that description, as one ought to do in an author bibliography, the description of later editions, in order to form a complete publishing history of the work, down to the present. Previous sample descriptions have not gone beyond a single printing, but recent commentary has dealt not only with the techniques of description but also with those of classification and arrangement. Of course, one does have actual published bibliographies at hand as examples, and there are now many of them that make considerable advances over all but

a few earlier efforts; but in the nature of things they all have their deficiencies. Although my own effort here inevitably has its deficiencies, too, it is accompanied (as an actual description is not likely to be) by a commentary that suggests, from time to time, other possible approaches. I have chosen Melville largely because I have a Melville bibliography in progress (in conjunction with the work on the Northwestern-Newberry Edition) but also in part because he is a nineteenth-century author (whose books therefore appeared in publishers' bindings) with numerous twentieth-century editions (and thus can illustrate some of the recent discussions particularly well). I do not think of this description as a contribution to Melville studies, though in fact it does place on record some points not previously published; it is primarily a sample of descriptive techniques, and therefore I have abridged the sample at many points, whenever I thought that no additional technique—not already illustrated—would be shown by providing the whole description.

What I am particularly concerned to demonstrate is that descriptive bibliography is a form of biographical, and thus historical, scholarship. One can no more prescribe a single form for it than one can for any other historical work. Each bibliographer-historian's choice of detail and manner of presentation will create one version of the past, and that is all that any historian can accomplish. Nevertheless, there are responsible ways of setting forth the evidence of past events and ways less responsible. What I show here seems to me responsible, but I have no wish to suggest that it is the only responsible approach. It is a sample, nothing more; but I hope it, with its commentary, can help to suggest a general way of thinking that will be of use to others, even if in various details of presentation they decide to follow another form. I also hope that it can demonstrate the integral place of textual history in the story a bibliography has to tell. That a bibliography is one kind of literary and publishing history is suggested by the fact that much of the same research underlies a literary biography, a scholarly edition, and a descriptive bibliography. Ideally a bibliography and an edition at least, if not a biography, emerge as products of the same research, and I am fortunate to be able to present facts in this description that have been turned up in the course of research for the Northwestern-Newberry Edition. I acknowledge here the assistance of Harrison Hayford, Richard Colles Johnson, and the others who have played a role (or are still playing one) in the great Newberry Library Melville Collection and in the Northwestern-Newberry Melville Project.

In the commentary, running along the bottom of the pages of description presented here, I have referred in a shorthand form to Bowers's *Principles* and a number of essays written since his book. The list below

identifies these references and provides in the process a core listing of the theoretical literature of descriptive bibliography from 1949 on:

BOWERS, FREDSON

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| <i>Principles</i> | <i>Principles of Bibliographical Description</i> (1949). |
| 1953 | "Purposes of Descriptive Bibliography, with Some Remarks on Methods," <i>Library</i> , 5th ser., 8 (1953), 1-22. Reprinted in <i>Readings in Descriptive Bibliography</i> , ed. John Bush Jones (1974), pp. 12-41; and in Bowers's <i>Essays in Bibliography, Text, and Editing</i> (1975), pp. 111-134. |
| 1966 | "Bibliography and Restoration Drama," in Bowers and Lyle H. Wright, <i>Bibliography: Papers Read at a Clark Library Seminar</i> (1966), pp. 1-25. Reprinted in <i>Essays in Bibliography, Text, and Editing</i> (1975), pp. 135-150. |
| 1969 | "Bibliography Revisited," <i>Library</i> , 5th ser., 24 (1969), 89-128. Reprinted in <i>Essays in Bibliography, Text, and Editing</i> (1975), pp. 151-195. |

BRIDSON, GAVIN D. R.

- | | |
|------|--|
| 1976 | "The Treatment of Plates in Bibliographical Description," <i>Journal of the Society for the Bibliography of Natural History</i> , 7, part 4 (1976), 469-488. |
|------|--|

GASKELL, PHILIP

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| <i>New Introduction</i> | <i>A New Introduction to Bibliography</i> (1972; corrected 2nd printing, 1974). |
|-------------------------|---|

GREG, W. W.

- | | |
|------|--|
| 1959 | "Introduction," in <i>A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration</i> , 4 (1959), i-clxxiv, esp. cxxxii-clviii. |
|------|--|

MARGADANT, WILLEM DANIEL

- | | |
|------|--|
| 1968 | "Descriptive Bibliography Applied to Botany," in <i>Early Bryological Literature</i> (1968), pp. 1-33. |
|------|--|

STEVENSON, ALLAN

- | | |
|------|--|
| 1949 | "New Uses of Watermarks as Bibliographical Evidence," <i>Studies in Bibliography</i> , 1 (1948-49), 151-182. |
| 1952 | "Watermarks Are Twins," <i>Studies in Bibliography</i> , 4 (1951-52), 57-91. |
| 1954 | "Chain-Indentations in Paper as Evidence," <i>Studies in Bibliography</i> , 6 (1954), 181-195. |

- 1961 "A Bibliographical Method for the Description of Botanical Books," in *Catalogue of Botanical Books in the Collection of Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt*, 2 (1961), cxli–ccxliv.
- 1962 "Paper as Bibliographical Evidence," *Library*, 5th ser., 17 (1962), 197–212. Reprinted, with excisions, in *Readings in Descriptive Bibliography*, ed. John Bush Jones (1974), pp. 128–147.

TANSELLE, G. THOMAS

- 1966(1) "The Identification of Type Faces in Bibliographical Description," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 60 (1966), 185–202. Reprinted, with a "Postscript," in *Journal of Typographic Research*, 1 (1967), 427–447.
- 1966(2) "The Recording of Press Figures," *Library*, 5th ser., 21 (1966), 318–325. Reprinted in *Readings in Descriptive Bibliography*, ed. John Bush Jones (1974), pp. 173–183.
- 1967 "A System of Color Identification for Bibliographical Description," *Studies in Bibliography*, 20 (1967), 203–234. Reprinted in Tanselle's *Selected Studies in Bibliography* (1979), pp. 139–170.
- 1968(1) "Tolerances in Bibliographical Description," *Library*, 5th ser., 23 (1968), 1–12. Reprinted in *Readings in Descriptive Bibliography*, ed. John Bush Jones (1974), pp. 42–56.
- 1968(2) "The Use of Type Damage as Evidence in Bibliographical Description," *Library*, 5th ser., 23 (1968), 328–351 [with corrigendum, 24 (1969), 251]. Reprinted in part, with an added "Note" and illustrations, in *Journal of Typographic Research*, 3 (1969), 259–276.
- 1969 "Copyright Records and the Bibliographer," *Studies in Bibliography*, 22 (1969), 77–124. Reprinted in *Selected Studies in Bibliography* (1979), pp. 93–138.
- 1970 "The Bibliographical Description of Patterns," *Studies in Bibliography*, 23 (1970), 71–102. Reprinted in *Selected Studies in Bibliography* (1979), pp. 171–202.
- 1971(1) "The Bibliographical Description of Paper," *Studies in Bibliography*, 24 (1971), 27–67. Reprinted in *Readings in Descriptive Bibliography*, ed. John Bush Jones (1974), pp. 71–115; and in *Selected Studies in Bibliography* (1979), pp. 203–243.
- 1971(2) "Book-Jackets, Blurbs, and Bibliographers," *Library*, 5th ser., 26 (1971), 91–134.
- 1975 "The Bibliographical Concepts of Issue and State," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 69 (1975), 17–66.

-
- 1977 "Descriptive Bibliography and Library Cataloguing," *Studies in Bibliography*, 30 (1977), 1-56. Reprinted in *Selected Studies in Bibliography* (1979), pp. 37-92.
- 1980 "The Concept of *Ideal Copy*," *Studies in Bibliography*, 33 (1980), 18-53.
- 1982 "The Description of Non-Letterpress Material in Books," *Studies in Bibliography*, 35 (1982), 1-42.
- 1984 "The Arrangement of Descriptive Bibliographies," *Studies in Bibliography*, 37 (1984), 1-38.
- 1985 "Title-Page Transcription and Signature Collation Reconsidered," *Studies in Bibliography*, 38 (1985), 45-81.

VANDER MEULEN, DAVID L.

- 1984 "The Identification of Paper without Watermarks: The Example of Pope's *Dunciad*," *Studies in Bibliography*, 37 (1984), 58-81.
- 1985 "The History and Future of Bowers's *Principles*," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 79 (1985), 197-219. Reprinted in *Fredson Bowers at Eighty* (1985), pp. 25-47.

Many other relevant pieces are cited in the documentation to these articles and therefore need not be cited here. I should perhaps note that Gaskell is listed here not for his chapter on descriptive bibliography but for the historical chapters that make up the bulk of his book and that provide essential background for any bibliographer. And I should point out that in some small details the sample below does not always match the precise form set forth in my essays: what I am concerned to maintain is the approach to descriptive bibliography on which they rest, not (as I hope they make clear) an inflexible manner of presentation for every detail, even though a degree of uniformity is of course desirable. I should also perhaps mention, for the record, the most significant discussions of descriptive bibliography that preceded Bowers, for the list can reasonably be limited to five:

- A. W. Pollard and W. W. Greg, "Some Points in Bibliographical Descriptions," *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, 9 (1906-08), 31-52. [Followed by Falconer Madan, "Degressive Bibliography," pp. 53-65.] Reprinted in *Alfred William Pollard: A Selection of His Essays*, ed. Fred W. Roper (1976), pp. 116-129.
- A. W. Pollard, "The Objects and Methods of Bibliographical Collations and Descriptions," *Library*, 2nd ser., 8 (1907), 193-217. Reprinted in *Alfred William Pollard: A Selection of His Essays*, ed. Fred W. Roper (1976), pp. 98-115.

Falconer Madan, E. Gordon Duff, and S. Gibson, "Standard Descriptions of Printed Books," *Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings and Papers*, 1 (1922-26), 55-64.

Ronald B. McKerrow, *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students* (1927).

W. W. Greg, "A Formulary of Collation," *Library*, 4th ser., 14 (1933-34), 365-382. Reprinted in Greg's *Collected Papers*, ed. J. C. Maxwell (1966), pp. 298-313.

These lists leave out actual examples of bibliographies (except those by Greg and Stevenson, cited for their introductions), but there are several recent ones that repay study, as well as such earlier classic works as Michael Sadleir's *Trollope* (1928), Frederick A. Pottle's *Boswell* (1929), A. T. Hazen's *Strawberry Hill* (1942) and *Walpole* (1948), and Richard L. Purdy's *Hardy* (1954). If I were to add some post-Bowers bibliographies to my list, the first one to go on would be David L. Vander Meulen's 1981 dissertation, *A Descriptive Bibliography of Alexander Pope's Dun-ciad, 1728-1751*, an extraordinary piece of work that makes several innovations in descriptive technique. Among the other bibliographies that next deserve to be noted are David Gilson's *Jane Austen* (1982), for its unusually thorough notes on paper, typography, and binding (those on typography by Nicolas Barker); and James L. W. West III's *William Styron* (1977) and Stuart Wright's *Randall Jarrell* (1986), for their attention to textual variants (and the Styron for its concern with platings as well). There are many other recent bibliographies, with excellences in one or another feature, that one can profit from examining, such as William B. Todd's *Burke* (1964), Warner Barnes's *E. B. Browning* (1967), Daniel Heartz's *Pierre Attaignant* (1969), B. C. Bloomfield and Edward Mendelson's *Auden* (rev. 1972), Joan St. C. Crane's *Robert Frost* (1974), C. William Miller's *Benjamin Franklin's Philadelphia Printing* (1974), James A. Grimshaw's *Robert Penn Warren* (1981), William S. Peterson's *Kelmscott Press* (1984), and the volumes in the Pittsburgh Series in Bibliography (1972-). For a record of bibliographies, one can consult T. H. Howard-Hill's *Bibliography of British Literary Bibliographies* (1969; supplemented by his *Shakespearian Bibliography and Textual Criticism: A Bibliography*, 1971, pp. 179-322) and G. T. Tanselle's *Guide to the Study of United States Imprints* (1971). The pages of the *Library*, the *Book Collector*, and the *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* will keep one abreast of new bibliographies through critical reviews. Three examples of particularly good reviews, all from *PBSA*, are James B. Meriwether's review of Frederick Woods's *Churchill* (60 [1966], 114-122), Hugh Amory's of Sidney L. Gulick's *Chesterfield*

(74 [1980], 286–294), and David L. Vander Meulen's of David Gilson's *Jane Austen* (79 [1985], 435–442). I have attempted to provide an assessment of the bibliographies in American literature (*Studies in Bibliography*, 21 [1968], 1–24) and in eighteenth-century English literature (*Eighteenth-Century English Books Considered by Librarians and Booksellers, Bibliographers and Collectors* [1976], pp. 22–33), as well as to place the development of descriptive bibliography in the larger setting of bibliographical history ("Physical Bibliography in the Twentieth Century," in *Books, Manuscripts, and the History of Medicine*, ed. Philip M. Teigen [1982], pp. 55–79; "The Evolving Role of Bibliography, 1884–1984," in *Books and Prints, Past and Future* [1984], pp. 15–31). It is in the context of all this work that the following sample should be viewed.

* * * * *

D. REDBURN (1849)

The publication history of Melville's fourth book follows the pattern of the two immediately preceding books: the American publisher had the work set in type from the manuscript furnished by Melville, and the British publisher used corrected proof sheets of the American edition as printer's copy; but the British edition was published six weeks earlier than the American in an attempt to establish copyright for the English publisher. Thus the edition that was first released to the public contained a text that was derived from the edition released later. The American edition, being a step closer to the manuscript (which is not known to survive) than is the British edition, is therefore the proper basis for new editions that hope to reflect Melville's intentions, though the differences between the two are relatively small in number and not of major significance. The original British edition, published by Richard Bentley, consists of a single printing, which appeared in at least three issues: the original two-volume issue dated 1849, a one-volume issue with cancel title leaves dated 1853, and an issue (two-volume?) of undetermined date with the spine imprint of T. C. Newby. Various states of individual sheets exist as a result of the movement of type dur-

Heading (D). The approach to reference numbers and letters reflected here is set forth in Tanselle 1984, pp. 28–38. Underlying it is the idea that bibliographers should think independently about what will be most efficient in a given situation and not automatically assume, for example, that all the separate publications by an author must go into a section labeled "A"—a system that produces unnecessarily cumbersome references, since a typical "A" section is likely to require more complex reference numbers than the rest of the bibliography anyway, and attaching "A" to every one of them only complicates matters. One solution, as here, is to use letters to stand for an author's successive separate publications: *Redburn*, Melville's fourth book, is therefore taken up in a section labeled "D." This system works well with Melville, for the treatment of his book-length works would require the letters (skipping I) through about T, leaving the remaining letters to be employed in the more conventional way, designating sections recording multiple works (in this case, such categories as shorter works, collected sets, collected volumes, and appearances in anthologies). Of course, an author who wrote more books than Melville did would have to be handled differently, either by going into a doubled alphabet or (probably better) using numbers instead of letters (and then using letters instead of numbers for the next digit—e.g., "4A" instead of "D1"). In the heading illustrated here, the presence of the year 1849 is not meant to suggest that the section deals only with the first edition; this heading stands at the beginning of the entire section on *Redburn*, and the year is present only to aid the reader by showing the date of first publication and therefore the basis for the ordering of the sections. (In the present instance, one might wish to use "September 1849" instead, since Melville's preceding book, *Mardi*, had also appeared in 1849.) See also the comments on the D1 heading below.

Introduction to the section. Because each section dealing with the entire publishing history—from original publication to the present day—of one of Melville's

ing printing; and the binding of the original Bentley issue exhibits small variations in stamping and two styles of endpapers. The American edition, published by Harper & Brothers, went through six printings between 1849 and 1875; the last four (1850, 1855, 1863, 1875) can be identified by their title-page dates, but the first two (both dated 1849) must be distinguished by noting whether gathering R has ten leaves (its first printing) or twelve leaves (its second)—though copies are not likely to be of first- or second-printing sheets throughout. Copies with either printing of R are found in printed paper wrappers as well as cloth of two varieties. Only one other edition of *Redburn* appeared during Melville's lifetime, an unauthorized edition published in Paris in 1850 by A. & W. Galignani and Jules Baudry as part of Baudry's "British Library"; its text, derived from the Bentley edition, is somewhat shortened.

The number of copies in the Galignani-Baudry edition has not been ascertained, but the total number printed in the two authorized editions was only 5,468 (750 in the single Bentley printing and 4,718 in the six Harper printings), earning Melville a lifetime total for this book of only \$1,167.57 (\$484 in a single payment from Bentley and \$683.57 in half-profits from the Harpers over a period of almost four decades). At the time of Melville's death, *Redburn* had not been available in England for nearly forty years; and it was virtually out of print in the United States, for the Harpers' last account to Melville, on 4 March 1887, reported eighteen copies still on hand (from the printing of 147 twelve years earlier), and their 1892 catalogue did not include the title. *Redburn* was not one of the books revived in the years just after Melville's death, and thirty more years would pass before it came into print again—in the Constable "Standard Edition" of 1922. Since then it has been set in type eight times—three more times in the 1920s (Page, Boni, Pickwick) and once in 1937 (Cape), 1957 (Anchor), 1969 (Northwestern-Newberry), 1976 (Penguin), and 1983 (Library of America)—and some of these editions have appeared under different imprints in later or transatlantic printings (bringing the total number of twentieth-century

books is fairly extensive, it seems useful to have an introduction to each section, providing the reader with a concise summary of that publishing history. This introduction may, but need not, contain information not present in the actual description; its function is to draw together in one place the salient facts established elsewhere and thus to assist readers by providing them, in effect, with a general outline of what is to follow. By combining facts from individual descriptions, it can give an overview that will help readers to place particular editions and printings in a larger context. Textual relationships among editions are an important aspect of publishing history and should be covered, along with key physical points and facts drawn from external sources. (Identification of sources used is unnecessary here if the descriptions that follow do, in one way or another, provide it.)

publishers' or series imprints associated with *Redburn* to nineteen). One test to distinguish whether an edition follows the original American or British text is to note whether the third sentence of Chapter 49 contains the phrase "large and womanly" (American) or "quick, small, and glittering" (British). All the twentieth-century editions are based (with greater or lesser fidelity) on the American text, but only the three most recent ones offer any comment on their textual policy. The Northwestern-Newberry edition (published 120 years after the first edition) is by far the most detailed in its presentation of textual evidence, and its critical text is faithfully reset in the widely distributed Library of America edition.

D1. Original British Edition (London: Bentley, 1849)

Melville's earliest known reference to *Redburn* occurs in a letter of 5 June 1849 to Richard Bentley, who had published the British edition of *Mardi* and was to publish *White-Jacket* and *The Whale*. In view of the slow sales of *Mardi*, Melville took pains to emphasize that the new book would be "a thing of a widely different cast": "a plain, straightforward, amusing narrative of personal experience—the son of a gentleman on his first voyage to sea as a sailor—no metaphysics, no conic-sections, nothing but cakes & ale." Nevertheless, Bentley's reply, on 20 June, was disappointing: alluding to the sales of *Mardi* and the uncertain copyright situation, he felt that he could offer only £100 as an advance against half-profits (not the £150 that Melville wanted, much less the £210 paid for *Mardi*). By the time Melville wrote to Bentley on 20 July, Harper & Brothers had accepted the work and given it to the printer, and Melville assured Bentley that proof sheets could be sent "in the course of three weeks or so." Apparently they were sent fairly promptly, for Bentley published his edition (750 copies, two volumes each, at a guinea per set) on 29 September, in advance of American publication,

Heading (D1). Following the system in Tanselle 1984, esp. p. 37, the arabic number following the letter designates the edition number. The rest of the heading is meant to offer a convenient shorthand designation in words for the edition under discussion. To say "First Edition" here would add no information to what is already conveyed by "D1," and it seems sensible to convey additional information in such headings whenever possible. Moreover, the phrases "original British" here and "original American" later emphasize a more important point than the simple priority in publication, by a few weeks, of the former over the latter.

Introductory discussion (following the D1 heading). For each edition treated in detail, one may wish to begin with some introductory commentary, partly to serve the

as the agreement stipulated. (See Bentley Papers, Add. 46637, ff.72^v-73, where the official publication date is recorded as 29 September—although Melville, in a letter to Lemuel Shaw on 6 October, stated that the book had been published “on the 25th of last month.”) The book was entered in the *Publishers’ Circular* for 1 October, in the list of new publications for the period 14–29 September; it was advertised as available on 28 September in the *Athenaeum* for 22 September and listed in that journal and the *Literary Gazette* on 29 September; and it was included in an advertisement for “Mr. Bentley’s New Publications for the Month of October” in the 1 November number of *Publishers’ Circular*.

Melville had read and marked the Harper proof sheets before sending a set to Bentley; but he had no opportunity to go over proofs of Bentley’s edition, which, as it turned out, differed from the Harper edition in wording at 79 points (and at many more, of course, in spelling and punctuation). Only one of those differences, however, poses any question of textual authority, for all the others fall into one of three

same function for the edition that the earlier paragraphs did for the work, but also to assemble into a coherent narrative such evidence as there is regarding contracts, publication and copyright dates, the author’s relations with the publisher, and the like. (On copyright, see Tanselle 1969.) In effect, all the kinds of details that come from sources outside the copies of the edition themselves can be gathered here, leaving the descriptions that follow to concentrate on the physical evidence. Many bibliographical descriptions in the past have placed such information in one or more sections called “Notes,” following the treatment of physical details, and sometimes these sections are not narrative in form but are simply enumerations of relevant facts. This approach remains one possibility, of course, but I show here a different approach, which reflects more directly the concept of a bibliography as a work of historical scholarship. The crucial point is not the manner of presentation of the material but the underlying conception of the work: a bibliography is not a listing of points for identification but a historical account, partly biography and partly a segment of publishing history (which itself encompasses the history of the arts of book-making as well as economic and intellectual history). This view of bibliography underlies Bowers’s *Principles* and his 1953, 1966, and 1969 essays; see also Tanselle 1984 (*passim*, but esp. pp. 2–3 and the references in footnote 3) and Tanselle 1985 (esp. pp. 46–61), as well as Vander Meulen 1985. Providing narrative introductions of the kind I illustrate here does serve to drive home the point—both to authors of bibliographies and to their readers—that bibliographies are histories and that, like all histories, they attempt to offer coherent readings of the past.

Different bibliographers will make different selections of details; what I show here seems to me one reasonable selection, but there are always more details that can be included. One point naturally to be kept in mind is what kind of scholarly coverage already exists. In the case of Melville, the existence of the Northwestern-Newberry Edition, with its historical and textual essays and records of variant readings, would make redundant in a bibliography an extensive account of the composition and reception of Melville’s books or lists of variant readings. The research underlying a scholarly edition and that underlying a scholarly bibliography are complementary, and the published results can be complementary, too. Thus when, in the present introduction, I refer to the 79 substantive variants between the Harper and Bentley

classes—obvious errors, the correction of obvious errors, and other alterations of the kind ordinarily made in Bentley's office (e.g., the substitution of British idioms). The one difference that may be a revision of Melville's is the substitution of "quick, small, and glittering" for "large and womanly" as the description of Harry Bolton's eyes in the third sentence of Chapter 18 in Volume 2 (Chapter 49 of the Harper edition). If both readings are Melville's, the Bentley reading is not necessarily the later one, for Melville could have made a late revision on the Harper proofs after sending one set to Bentley. (The Northwestern-Newberry editors conclude that, whoever wrote "quick, small, and glittering," it was the other wording that Melville wanted.)

Redburn had been alluded to in the London press a month before publication, in the *Literary Gazette* of 25 August (p. 630). During the autumn, Bentley advertised the book in the usual prominent journals—in the *Athenaeum*, for example, on 8, 15, and 22 September and 13 and 27 October, and in the *Spectator* on 29 September and 20 October. The earliest known review appeared in the *Literary Gazette* for 20 October (pp. 776–778), and a half-dozen more reviews came out before the end

editions of *Redburn*, there is no need to record them, for they are already available in the Northwestern-Newberry volume, and readers of the bibliography would have been told in the general introduction to the whole work that for complete lists of variants they should turn to the Northwestern-Newberry Edition. I am free to be selective in my use of variants, and I have decided here that only one deserves mention, given the scale on which the bibliography is being written. (However, variants between copies of a single printing—such as those created by stop-press alterations or by type or plate wear—demand fuller treatment somewhere in the description, even if they have been reported in another work; see the paragraph on typography below.) Similarly, documentation of frequently used sources need not be repeated in each of these introductions; instead, the general introduction can explain, for example, that quotations from Melville's letters always come (unless otherwise specified) from Merrell R. Davis and William H. Gilman's edition (1960) or that certain kinds of detail always come (unless otherwise specified) from the Northwestern-Newberry Edition. Documentation would then be supplied only for unusual sources or for sources inconvenient to refer to without specific references (hence the citations here of particular pages in the volumes of Bentley Papers at the British Library). For those details repeated in this introduction from one of the later descriptions, documentation—if needed—would come at that later point, where the matter is likely to be more fully treated. I do not find any awkwardness in the shift from narrative in these introductions to the more formulaic style of the physical descriptions: the two parts deal with very different material. A formulaic rendering of dates, quotations, sums of money, and the like seems to resemble undigested raw material and is not the most effective way of conveying what is in fact a narrative. On the other hand, the formulaic style is generally more efficient in laying physical details out clearly and more convenient for readers who wish to check copies against the description. (Cf. Tanselle 1984, footnote 6.) I ought to add, however, that one should never hesitate to use sequential prose within a physical description when it seems to offer a clearer way to make certain statements.

of the month. Although the long review in the November number of *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (66:567–580) was unfavorable, most of the British reviews were laudatory; but even so the book did not sell well, for in an accounting two and a half years later (on 4 March 1852) Bentley reported that he still had on hand 415 of the 750 copies. The profit on the book at that time he reckoned at £23.12.6; and since he had paid Melville £100 (when Melville visited his London office on November 12: see Melville's journal; the payment is also recorded in the Bentley Papers, Add. 46676A, f.3), he incurred a deficit of £76.7.6. In an effort to reduce that deficit, he had some of the remaining sheets bound as single volumes and issued them with cancel title leaves dated 1853. At some point he also sold sheets to the remainder publisher T. C. Newby, who issued them (in two-volume sets?) with his own name on the spines. Bentley had no more reason to be pleased with the sales of *Redburn* than with those of *Mardi*.

First Bentley Issue (London, 1849)

REDBURN: | HIS FIRST VOYAGE. | BEING | THE SAILOR-BOY
CONFESSIONS | AND REMINISCENCES OF THE SON-OF-A-GEN-
TLEMAN, | IN THE MERCHANT SERVICE. | BY HERMAN MEL-

Heading for first Bentley issue. No entry number is assigned here, in the belief that descriptions of issues should not be regarded as separate entries but rather as subsections of the entry for the printing of which they are a part. It should also be recognized that furnishing entry numbers for issues would complicate any system considerably and thus perhaps make it less efficient: this Bentley issue would have to be numbered—in the system I am using, which is essentially a very simple one—D1.1a. It could not be labeled “D1a,” for lower-case letters attached to edition numbers ought to refer to subeditions, so that numbers could be attached, following a decimal point, to signify printings. Clearly an issue designator has to be associated with the number referring to printing, but since this Bentley edition consists of only a single printing, it seems unnecessary (indeed, illogical) to call it a first printing. On this general matter, see Tanselle 1984, esp. p. 37 and footnote 64. The concepts lying behind the terms “edition,” “subedition,” “printing” (or “impression”), “issue,” and “state” are set forth in Bowers’s *Principles*, pp. 37–113, 371–426, supplemented (and somewhat modified) in Tanselle 1975. When separate platings (e.g., duplicate relief plates made from the type, or offset plates made photographically from a copy of a printed book) can be identified they should be noted (perhaps in the heading); but, contrary to the argument of James L. W. West III (“The Bibliographical Concept of Plating,” *Studies in Bibliography*, 36 [1983], 252–266), it seems advisable to use *subedition* (i.e., any printing or sequence of printings with a different publisher’s or series imprint) rather than *plating* as the classification between *edition* and *printing* (for an explanation, see Tanselle 1984, pp. 10–20).

Title-page transcription. The dominant system of quasi-facsimile transcription, as developed over the years, is the one codified, extended, and thoroughly explained

VILLE, | AUTHOR OF "TYPEE," "OMOO," AND "MARDI." | IN
TWO VOLUMES. | VOL. I. [II.] | LONDON: | RICHARD BENT-
LEY, NEW BURLINGTON STREET. | 1849.

COLLATION. 12° : Vol. 1. A⁴ B–O¹² P², 162 leaves, pp. i–v vi–viii 1 2–316.
Vol. 2. A⁴ B–O¹² P¹, 161 leaves, pp. i–v vi–viii 1 2–314. Signatures. \$1,2,5
(–A_{1,2} in both volumes); \$1 (–A₁) also carries the designation 'VOL. I'
or 'VOL. II', and \$5 is signed '\$3'.

in Bowers's *Principles*, pp. 135–184, 427–429. It attempts to report more typographic features (such as line endings) than does ordinary quoting, but it does not suggest relative sizes of type, except when both large and small capitals appear in the same line. (However, David Vander Meulen's 1981 dissertation, a descriptive bibliography of Pope's *Dunciad* to 1751, shows that a type-face measurement can be easily and unobtrusively added in brackets at the end of each line of the transcription.) That such transcriptions are not superseded by photographic facsimiles is touched on in the *Principles*, pp. 135–137, and in Bowers 1953, esp. pp. 9–15; and the argument is most fully set forth in Tanselle 1985, pp. 46–61. One should assume that the description of *Redburn* presented here would in the actual bibliography be accompanied by appropriate reproductions of title-pages, but their presence would not affect the transcriptions. Photographic facsimiles are illustrations that supplement the verbal account but do not substitute for it. It is also important to remember that title-pages are not the only parts of books that may usefully be transcribed in quasi-facsimile (and not necessarily the most important ones).

Collation. The system of signature collation that has evolved in the English-speaking world since the late nineteenth century received its classic treatment (superseding several earlier landmark discussions) in Bowers's *Principles*, pp. 196–268, 332–339, 431–434, 487–499 (with "A Digest of the Formulary" on pp. 457–461), now supplemented and somewhat revised in Tanselle 1985, pp. 61–80. (See also Greg 1959, Stevenson 1961, and Margadant 1968.) The principal function of the collation is to show the physical structure of books, and the collation is therefore the indispensable heart of any description (more important than the title-page transcription), though some bibliographers of twentieth-century books have attempted to argue otherwise. (*Redburn* contains no inserted plates; but when they are present, they obviously complicate the task of recording structure—see the *Principles*, pp. 287–289, Stevenson 1961, Bridson 1976, and Tanselle 1982.) A record of where the signatures appear and in what form is a separate (and lesser) matter, but it should be provided as a supplementary statement to the collation. The signature statement in this sample follows the form in Tanselle 1985, pp. 78–80, which only slightly modifies the form suggested by Bowers (*Principles*, pp. 269–271). (On the use of the dollar sign to stand for a signature and thus to refer to every gathering, see the *Principles*, pp. 266–268.) In the collation given here, I have assumed the 23-letter alphabet (without J, either U or V, and W) traditionally used by printers, and this fact would be explained in the introduction to the bibliography; but for books of this period some bibliographers might prefer to be more explicit and write "B–I¹² K–O¹²" instead. Indication of format (here " 12° ") must be included when it can be ascertained, since the regular number of leaves in gatherings does not necessarily reveal the format (the number of times each sheet was folded); when (as in many twentieth-century books) the format cannot be determined, measurement of the leaf size can be substituted, as Bowers suggests. A helpful assemblage of imposition diagrams for various formats is found in

CONTENTS. *Vol. 1.* *i* title. *ii* printer's imprint at foot: 'LONDON: | R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.' *iii* dedication: 'TO | MY YOUNGER BROTHER, | THOMAS MELVILLE, | NOW A SAILOR ON A VOYAGE TO CHINA, | This Volume is Inscribed.' *iv* blank. *v-viii* 'CONTENTS | OF | THE FIRST VOLUME. | [swelled rule, 10 mm]'. *1-316* text (foot of 316: 'END OF VOL. I.'). *Vol. 2.* *i* half-title: 'REDBURN: | HIS FIRST VOYAGE. | [rule, 8 mm] | VOL. II.' *ii* printer's imprint as in Vol. 1. *iii* title. *iv* blank. *v-viii* 'CONTENTS | OF | THE SECOND VOLUME. | [swelled rule, 10 mm]'. *1-314* text (middle of 314: 'THE END.'; foot of 314: '[rule, 43 mm] | R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.').

PAPER. *Sheets.* White wove unwatermarked; thickness .133 mm, bulking .142 mm. *Leaves.* 197 × 125 mm; total bulk (each volume) 23 mm.

Gaskell's *New Introduction*, pp. 84–107. On the rules for recording pagination (and the crucial one of not combining unnumbered and numbered pages with a dash, as in "i–viii"), see the *Principles*, pp. 271–284, 435–438, 462 (but numbered and unnumbered pages can be combined in the contents paragraph or elsewhere, the facts having been put on record here).

Contents. The basic rules are in Bowers's *Principles*, pp. 289–299, 438–444. In a book made up of numerous short pieces, such as stories or poems, one should not simply have an entry for "text" but should enumerate the contents (either in this paragraph or in a separate paragraph below, where references to their original appearances in periodicals, for example, could also be included, perhaps in columnar form). Any words that one wishes to quote might as well be quoted in quasi-facsimile, since it conveys more information and scarcely takes up any more space; and one should wish to quote instead of paraphrase whenever feasible (e.g., quoting the form of the heading to the table of contents instead of simply referring to "table of contents"). I show here the convention of using single quotation marks to signal quasi-facsimile transcription and double quotation marks to indicate ordinary quoting. Punctuation supplied by the bibliographer must therefore go outside the single quotation marks but may—if the American system of punctuation is being followed—go inside the double ones.

Paper. The system followed here and the considerations underlying it are set forth in Tanselle 1971(1), where references to much of the relevant literature also appear. Anyone attempting to describe paper should be acquainted with at least as much historical background as is provided in Gaskell's *New Introduction*, pp. 57–77, 214–230, before beginning to examine the relevant specialized works. Those dealing with pre-nineteenth-century paper should certainly know the great series of essays by Allan Stevenson (1949, 1952, 1954, 1962) and Vander Meulen's important 1984 article (a worthy successor to that series). Vander Meulen's own descriptions of paper in his bibliography of *The Dunciad* (his 1981 dissertation) are exemplary, showing an orderly way to set forth mixtures of papers (e.g., pp. 72–77). Measurements here (and throughout) are in millimeters, though one need not use the metric system; it is extremely convenient, however, and Vander Meulen notes its particular convenience for paper measurement (pp. 60–61). My measurements of paper thickness (made by

TYPGRAPHY. *Text.* 25 lines (with some pages in Vol. 1, e.g. 273–274, of 26 lines and many in Vol. 2, e.g. 84–92, of 24 lines), 133 (141) × 76 mm; 10 lines = 54 mm; modern face, 3.33 (1.67x) mm. *Running titles.* 1.67 mm face, centered 5 mm above text and with no rule beneath: 'REDBURN:' (versos), 'HIS FIRST VOYAGE.' (rectos). *Head titles.* 4 mm face, dropped 32 mm in Vol. 1 and 36 mm in Vol. 2 from headline position (the headline does not appear): 'REDBURN. | [swelled rule, 10 mm]' (p. 1 of both volumes). *Chapter openings.* Chapter numbers (e.g., 'CHAPTER IV.') 2.33 mm face, chapter titles 1.33 mm face, dropped varying distances from the headline (e.g., 37 and 45 mm respectively on p. 43 of Vol. 1 and 42 and 52 mm on p. 197). Chapters begin on new pages, with running titles and pagination continuing. *Pagination.* 2 mm

micrometer) are to the nearest thousandth of a millimeter, and the leaf and total-bulk measurements to the nearest third of a millimeter. (The bulking thickness of each sheet is of course arrived at by dividing the total bulk by the number of leaves—and rounding off to the nearest thousandth of a millimeter.) The tolerances I have set for myself would be specified in the general introduction to the bibliography. On the importance of stating tolerances, see Tanselle 1968(1). The present description represents a moderate level of detail, which I have tried to adhere to in other paragraphs of the description as well. More details could be given, but more would probably then have to be given in other paragraphs, so that the proportions of the whole description would remain balanced.

Typography. The approach illustrated here is essentially that advocated in Tanselle 1966 (1), where the value of recording these details in a description is explained. Bowers's *Principles* includes a brief treatment of typography (pp. 300–306, 344–347, 444–446); and, as with paper, Gaskell's *New Introduction* gives the basic background (pp. 9–56, 201–213; but see Vander Meulen 1985, p. 215). The goal in this sample, with a moderate amount of detail, is to suggest the principal characteristics both of the type faces used and of the typographic layout. Even at this modest level of detail, the identification of the text type might well be carried further: for a rare example of meticulous attention to typography in post-1800 books, see Nicolas Barker's notes on types in David Gilson's *A Bibliography of Jane Austen* (1982). The paragraph on typography is the place to draw together comments on all aspects of what is printed on the sheets, and when there is a great deal to record regarding running titles and catchwords, as often in pre-1800 books, it may be necessary for ease of reference to provide special subsections, separated by spaces from the main paragraph, to cover these matters. A splendid treatment of such problems (but one that is unfortunately not very accessible) is Vander Meulen's 1981 dissertation, his bibliography of *The Dunciad* to 1751, where the sections on typography are sometimes the longest in a description because they include subsections recording running titles, catchwords, signatures (which may be regarded as an aspect of typography and need not be recorded in the collation paragraph), and ornaments (sometimes with tables to show patterns of recurrence). He also sensibly offers a section on presswork, where he records first-forme impressions (whether the inner or the outer of each sheet), point holes, and press figures (the latter in the form suggested in Tanselle 1966(2)). What I have here labeled "Typographical variation" might better be placed in a paragraph on presswork, for these variations are certainly not part of the planned typography

face, at outer margins of headlines. *Typographical variation.* As a result of the movement of types during printing, a number of sheets exist in variant states. Among the more prominent instances of shifted types, at points where some copies print properly, are the following: Vol. I. 34.16 's[u]weetmeats' (as in copies 4, 5, 8, 9; second issue, copies 2, 3); 203.0 '2[u]o[u]3' (9), '2[u]03' (second issue, 2), and '20[u]3' (second issue, 3); 218.5 'hand[u]ing' (1, 2, 4, 8; second issue, 1-3) and 'han[u]ding' (5); 293.14 'sp[u]rit' (2, 5; second issue, 2, 3) and 'sp[u]r[u]it' (1, 8; second issue, 1). Vol. 2 123.23 'ga[u]y' (2); 225.0 '22⁵' (2) and '22[u]' (3, 7).

BINDING. *Material.* Cord cloth (306), dark blue (183). *Front and back.* Blind thick-thin-thick rule frame with scrolls in the corners (Bentley 2). *Spine.* Lettering in gold, decoration in blind: '[scalloped rule, then decorative band] | REDBURN | BY | HERMAN MELVILLE | [decorative band] | VOL. I. [II.] | [two decorative bands, then scalloped rule] | LONDON | BENTLEY. | [scalloped rule]'. There is minor variation in the decorative stamping (e.g., copy 9 has straight rules at the head of the spine and above and below the spine imprint) and in the size of the lettering (cf. the imprint on the two volumes of copy 8). *Edges.* Un-

of the book. On the other hand, they are a characteristic feature of the typographic impressions that appear on the sheets being described. In the case of *Redburn* these variations consist only of unimportant shifting of type during the course of printing; the principal examples are noted (by page and line, with empty brackets to show where space exists as a result of shifting type and with each instance documented by reference to individual copies—see the paragraph on copies examined below); but they do not need to be reported in full or given the prominence of a separate paragraph. (On the general use of type damage, see Tanselle 1968(2).) However, stop-press textual alterations are indeed important and deserve to be reported in full (or perhaps selectively, if already reported in an edition) and keyed to individual copies; therefore they may, if extensive, require a paragraph of their own. The important theoretical point here concerns the treatment of states. Typographical variations create states of individual sheets; but such states—and states of all kinds—refer only to particular parts of books, not copies of books as wholes (cf. Tanselle 1975). Thus states do not call for separate entries (indeed, could not be handled clearly by separate entries) but instead should be described under whatever heading (paper, typography, binding) encompasses the particular variation involved.

Binding. The term "binding" is used here to refer to any covering of the sheets that was supplied by the publisher, whether paper wrappers or a casing of cloth over boards. But a more purist usage would not allow "binding" to be used when "casing" is meant. The overall form of the description is based on Tanselle 1970 (the illustrations in which are referred to by the cloth-grain citation numbers), with colors specified in reference to the Centroid charts, as recommended in Tanselle 1967. Publishers' binding is discussed briefly in Bowers's *Principles*, pp. 446-450, and in Gaskell's *New Introduction*, pp. 231-250. (Dust jackets, when they exist, would be described either in the binding paragraph or, more appropriately, in a separate

trimmed. *Endpapers.* Two varieties of endpapers have been discovered: (A) white paper printed in deep blue (179) with a circular pattern and with advertisements listing works of "History and Biography" (beginning with "Correspondence of Schiller") on the front pastedown and "Voyages and Travels" (beginning with "Mackay's Western World") on the back pastedown (all copies but 9); (B) pale yellow (89) coated paper printed with two pages of advertisements listing works of "History and Biography" (beginning with "Memoirs of the House of Orleans") on the front pastedown and recto of the front free endpaper, and two pages listing "Voyages and Travels" (beginning with "Wayside Pictures") on the verso of the back free endpaper and the back pastedown (copy 9). *Binder's ticket.* Some copies (e.g., 1-3, 5, 6) have the label of Remnant & Edmonds, London, at the lower inner corner of the back pastedown of Vol. 1.

COPIES EXAMINED. *Ireland.* 1. DT. Gall.QQ.24.9,10. *United Kingdom.* 2. C. Rom.72.83,84. 3. E. Hall.187.f.3. 4. L. 12704.f.20 (rebound). 5. O. 49.1216,1217.

United States. 6. ICN. Gift.M67-14 (rebacked and lacking front free endpaper). 7. —. M67-722-3. 8. MH. *AC85.M4977.849r. 9. NN. Berg (with presentation inscription to Maria G. Melville, January 1852).

paragraph following it—see Tanselle 1971(2), where several samples are provided on p. 114. Descriptions of the endpapers and of the treatment of the edges of the leaves, along with an account of any advertisements or other leaves inserted during the binding process, do clearly belong in the paragraph on binding.) The reference here to "Bentley 2" illustrates how one can incorporate citations of illustrations into verbal descriptions. The actual Melville bibliography would include a section of photographs showing the various stampings used on the cloth casings of Melville's books; the citation here of the second such Bentley pattern does not lessen the bibliographer's obligation to describe it in words. Variations here in spine stamping and in endpapers again illustrate the treatment of states. The concept of *state* does not refer to whole copies of books but only to their parts, and these variations only result in states of the binding and endpapers; they are therefore properly taken up in this paragraph and do not necessitate separate entries. Every variant state must be documented by citation of specific copies from among those listed in the record of copies examined (see the next paragraph of the description).

Copies examined. The importance of a paragraph identifying the copies that provided the evidence for the bibliographical account that precedes it cannot be overestimated. But I am tempted to belabor its importance because so often it has been disregarded. A description that does not record copies examined is simply incomplete and unscholarly. Readers must know what copies were looked at, so that they will know when they are looking at additional copies and so that they can locate, when they wish, copies that display any of the features described. As set up here, the record of copies examined is organized by country, with copies arranged alphabetically under each country according to library abbreviations (those of the

Second Bentley Issue (London, 1853)

REDBURN: | HIS FIRST VOYAGE. | BEING | THE CONFESSIONS
OF A SAILOR-BOY. | BY HERMAN MELVILLE, | AUTHOR OF
“WHITE JACKET,” “THE WHALE,” &C. | IN TWO VOLUMES. |
VOL. I. [II.] | LONDON: | RICHARD BENTLEY, NEW BURLING-
TON-STREET. | [rule, 5 mm] | 1853.

COLLATION. The only difference from the first issue is that the two title leaves (*A*1 of Vol. 1 and *A*2 of Vol. 2) are cancels and that the half-title of Vol. 2 (*A*1) is excised.

CONTENTS. The only differences are that the verso of the title leaf of Vol. 1 is blank, having no printer's imprint, and that there is no half-title leaf for Vol. 2.

BINDING. The sheets are bound as a single volume. *Material.* Cord cloth (306), deep red (13). *Front and back.* Blind frame and centerpiece (Bent-

National Union Catalog for the United States and Canada and those of the *British Union Catalogue of Periodicals* for Britain, with additional ones constructed on the same pattern). Following each library identification is the shelfmark or call number, followed in turn by a reference to any post-publication alterations to the copy (such as rebinding, the excision of leaves, or the insertion of a bookplate or inscription). The much misunderstood concept of “ideal copy” simply refers to all those characteristics that copies possessed when they left the control of the publisher, as opposed to those characteristics that individual copies have subsequently acquired at the hands of their owners. The bibliographer’s task is to record the former: “ideal copy” does not necessarily mean a single copy but rather encompasses all the variations of the book as published. Bowers has commented on the concept in the *Principles*, pp. 113–123, 404–406; the fullest analysis is in Tanselle 1980 (and cf. Tanselle 1977). The record of copies examined must note post-publication alterations of copies, at least when they result in the elimination of parts of the originals, so that readers will know exactly which copies did, and which did not, contribute to the body of evidence on which each element of the description was based. If the roster of copies is sequentially numbered, individual copies can then be referred to concisely in the body of the description. References to copy numbers in the paragraphs on typography and binding above show how variant features of the copies as published can be conveniently documented. The division should be clear between variations that are part of a book’s publication history (they are taken up in the description, with references made to particular copies) and variations that occurred subsequently (they form no part of the description but are noted in the record of copies examined as peculiarities of particular copies).

Second Bentley issue. This section shows how subsequent descriptions under the heading of a single edition can be made to relate to the first description. The cancel title of the 1853 issue exhibits enough differences from the 1849 title that it seems easier to provide a new transcription, whereas the differences in collation and contents are slight enough that they can be best handled by simple statements setting forth what the differences are.

ley 5). *Spine*. Lettering in gold, decoration in blind: '[decorative band] | REDBURN | BY | HERMAN MELVILLE | [decorative band] | [pendant] | [decorative band]'. *Edges*. Untrimmed. *Endpapers*. Light yellow (86) coated paper.

COPIES EXAMINED. *United Kingdom*. 1. BrP. 11272 (C5483) (rebound).
2. L. 12627.r.1. *United States*. 3. ICN. M67-722-16.

Newby Issue (London, after 1853?)

Apparently Bentley sold some sheets to T. C. Newby, who had them bound (as two-volume sets?) with his imprint on the spines. Michael Sadleir (*Excursions*, p. 226, and Constable edition, 12:349) reports having seen such a copy, but I have not been able to locate one. (Of course, Newby may also have been the distributor of some copies with the Bentley bindings, if Bentley sold him bound copies, as well as sheets, at a reduced price.)

D2. Original American Edition (New York: Harper, 1849)

... [introductory account]

D2.1. First Harper Printing (New York, 1849)

... [transcription of title page]

Newby issue. Sometimes an extensive search for copies fails to produce an example of some form that has been previously referred to in print. In many instances such references can be dismissed as bibliographical ghosts (though they should normally be mentioned and explicitly dismissed). At other times one may judge the reference to be trustworthy and deserving of a place in the bibliography. Michael Sadleir's assertion that he had seen a copy of the Newby issue seems to me to fall into the latter class. (His *Excursions in Victorian Bibliography* of 1922 and his 1923 bibliography in the Constable edition, referred to here in short form, are among the basic works that would be identified in the general introduction to the bibliography.)

D2. Original American Edition. Beginning here I shall abridge the sample (using the three-dot ellipsis mark), to avoid repetition of procedures already displayed, and shall print only those parts that illustrate something new.

COLLATION. 12°: A–Q¹² R¹⁰, 202 leaves, pp. i–v vi–xi xii 13 14–390 391–394 1 2–10 (but without numbers on the 61 pages with chapter openings). Signatures. \$1,5 (–A₁, R₅), with \$5 signed ‘\$*’.

CONTENTS. . . . 391–394 advertisements for *Typee*, *Mardi*, *Omoo*, and Charles Lyell's *A Second Visit to the United States*. 1–10 “Book List of the Present Season,” dated October 1849.

PAPER. . . .

TYPOGRAPHY. . . . *Typographical variation*. Several sheets occur in variant states as a result of plate damage. Four of the most prominent instances of damage, at points where some copies print properly, occur in the following words: 37.4,5 ‘stationery’ / ‘her’ (as in copies 3, 11); 153.35,36 ‘might’ / ‘of’ (10); 275.32,34 ‘with’ / ‘him’ (4); 290.33,34 ‘pictures’ / ‘leading’ (1–3, 11). Whether these instances of damage serve to distinguish second printings of the sheets in which they appear is not clear, for all examined copies contain sheets in both undamaged and damaged states. Thus if there was indeed a second 1849 printing (see D2.2 below), it occurred when some sheets of the first remained unbound, and sheets of the two printings were used indiscriminately in making up copies.

Collation. This collation is shown to illustrate a problem posed by the pagination here that did not arise with the Bentley edition: there are no running titles or page numbers on the pages that begin new chapters. This fact would be reported in the paragraph on typography, but it also needs to be taken into account in the register of pagination here. For this book, it seems sufficient to insert a parenthetical explanation rather than to enumerate the 61 affected pages, but for another book (particularly from an earlier period and with irregular pagination) the decision might be different. In any case, the sequence “14–390” should not be interrupted 61 times—a procedure that would require the reader to look carefully through the entire series of numbers. If the numbers are to be recorded, they should be brought together in the appended parenthesis.

Contents. Only the end of the contents paragraph is shown here to make the point that advertisements on integral leaves must be reported in this paragraph, because they constitute part of the contents of the sheets. (But advertisements that form a separate gathering and were inserted by the binder are not included in the collation or contents paragraphs but only in the binding description.)

Typography. The section on typographical variation is given here because it raises a different problem from the shifting type in the Bentley edition. Here there is some question whether two 1849 printings in fact occurred, and the uncertainty must be explained (with a cross-reference to the fuller comment at D2.2) so that readers have a basis for judging for themselves the status of copies they examine.

Bindings. Here the heading is in the plural and the paragraph divided into two subsections, since the Harpers made *Redburn* available in both cloth and paper.

BINDINGS. Published simultaneously in both cloth casing and paper wrappers.

Casing. Two casings have been noted, presumably reflecting successive bindings-up, but the order is not known. (A) *Material.* Cord cloth (306), dark reddish purple (242) or dark grayish purple (229). Some copies exhibit what seem to be other colors, such as very dark bluish green (166) on copy 3, very dark greenish blue (175) on copy 10, and grayish brown (61) on copy 11; these colors, however, may be the result of fading and may not represent actual variants. . . . *Endpapers.* Light yellow (86) coated paper, accompanied at front and back by a binder's gathering of four leaves (one stuck under the pastedown, one stuck to the free endpaper, and two as flyleaves). (B) . . .

Wrappers. . . .

COPIES EXAMINED. . . .

D2.2. *Second Harper Printing (New York, 1849)*

The title page is unchanged, but gathering R consists of twelve integral leaves (the four additional pages of advertisements being numbered 11 14 1 2—the last two are the beginning of a list of "Standard Illustrated

The description of the wrappers would conform to the same plan as that of cloth bindings: description of the material (whether paper or some other material, and its style, thickness, and color) would be followed by an account of the front cover, the spine, the back cover, and the edges (and, when there is printing on them, the inside covers). Because wrappers are generally of paper and contain a considerable amount of printed text, the problems they pose for description are analogous to those offered by dust jackets—see Tanselle 1971(2), which includes sample descriptions (p. 114). The subsection on wrappers would of course identify (by copy number) which copies examined are in wrappers—just as any other feature not identical in all copies is documented by reference to specific copies. I have treated the wrappers here as a variant binding, not as a feature indicative of a separate issue, although one could argue that they represent a discrete (if simultaneous) marketing effort. In an instance of this kind (as opposed to the Bentley situation above), it is a matter of little moment whether or not one introduces the *issue* classification: to do so would make the arrangement of material under D2.1 somewhat less convenient and would produce no compensating advantage (conceptual or practical). One should in general be conservative in the designation of issues, and when there is no compelling need for the classification it probably should be avoided. For an exposition of the view that such decisions ought to be a matter of reasoned judgment, not of mechanical rule, see Tanselle 1975, esp. pp. 42–56, which also develops a working definition of *issue*.

Later Harper printings. The entries for D2.2 through D2.6 show how descriptions of later printings can build on the full description of the first printing and on

Works"). Because R¹² required reimposition, it presumably is a second printing. Whether there was a second printing of all the other sheets is less easy to form an opinion about, because copies with R¹² contain mixtures of sheets with and without damage at three of the four points listed above (e.g., the damage on p. 37 can be found in copies 1-9, 11, 13-17; on p. 153 in 6-8, 11-13, 17; and on p. 290 in 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13-17), and at the fourth point (p. 275) all examined copies are without damage. There is perhaps even a third printing of R, because R¹² has been found to vary at two points: some copies (e.g., 5) are without damage at 387.26,28 ('I' / 'my'), where most copies contain it; in some copies (e.g., 5) the price of Wallis in line 13 of the first p. 1 in the advertisements is 87½¢, whereas in other copies (e.g., 1, 2, 11, 17) it is \$1.00. Without further evidence, however, only the reimposition that made R¹⁰ into R¹² is taken here to indicate a new printing. But one should recognize that a copy with R¹² is not likely to contain second-printing sheets throughout.

BINDINGS. Both cloth casing and paper wrappers.

Casing. Three casings have been seen on copies with R¹². (A) The same as casing A described above for copies with R¹⁰ (as on copies 1-8, 14, 17; the color on copy 10 appears as dark bluish green [165]). (B) . . . (C) . . .

Wrappers. . . .

COPIES EXAMINED. . . .

D2.3. *Third Harper Printing (New York, 1850)*

Besides the change of the title-page date to 1850, the most obvious alteration in the third printing occurs in the advertisements: R continues

each other, variously using prose paragraphs or more formulaic statements as the occasion warrants. In D2.2 a discussion of the problematical status of the second printing must come first, and since it explains the difference in collation and contents and draws on the typographical evidence, no separate paragraphs on those matters are called for. Bindings, however, are a separable matter and are best described here in a conventional binding paragraph. In the succeeding entries, D2.3 through D2.6, typographical variations play no role in identifying printings, and they are not taken up in the opening statements, which in these cases only need to be concerned with questions of title-page wording and dates, collation, and contents; typography as well as binding therefore has its own paragraph in these entries. And all entries must have a record of copies examined. The entries for these later printings, by drawing on prior entries, can be relatively concise, and yet the later printings are described no less fully than the first printing. (On the question of when to give less full descriptions, see the comments below on D4a.)

to have twelve integral leaves, but the order of the advertisements for *Omoo* and *Mardi* is reversed (that for *Omoo* now falls on p. 392, preceding that for *Mardi*) and the twelve-page catalogue is a different one (now headed "Harper & Brothers' List of New Works," with *Redburn* the second entry on the first page). The pagination of the advertisements is therefore as before, but without the misnumbering of the last page of the twelve-page catalogue (i.e., 391–394 1 2–12 1 2).

TYPOGRAPHY. All copies exhibit several new instances of plate damage, including a few that alter the punctuation of the text: at 59.30 ('icebergs'), 170.14 ('Bob'), and 375.20 ('ladies') semicolons print as commas; at 72.5 ('around') a comma is missing; and at 202.35 ('earls') a comma prints as a period. The only prominent variation noted between copies of the 1850 printing is a gradual deterioration of the comma after 'MELVILLE' in the dedication: in some copies (e.g., 1, 6, 7, 11–14, 16) it prints as a damaged comma, in others (e.g., 2) it appears as a period, and in others (e.g., 4, 5, 8–10, 17) it does not print at all.

BINDING. . . .

COPIES EXAMINED. . . .

D2.4. *Fourth Harper Printing (New York, 1855)*

In place of the last two lines of the original title page, the following three lines appear: '329 & 331 PEARL STREET, | FRANKLIN SQUARE. | 1855.' The 1855 printing contains no advertising, and gathering R therefore consists of four leaves, the last one blank: A–Q¹² R⁴, 196 leaves, pp. i–v vi–xi xii 13 14–390 391–392.

TYPOGRAPHY. . . .

BINDING. . . .

COPIES EXAMINED. . . .

D2.5. *Fifth Harper Printing (New York, 1863)*

The title page and collation are the same as in the 1855 printing, except for the change of the title-page date to 1863.

TYPOGRAPHY. . . .

BINDING. . . .

COPIES EXAMINED. . . .

D2.6. *Sixth Harper Printing (New York, 1875)*

The title page and collation remain the same as in the 1855 printing, except for the change of the title-page date to 1875. In addition p. 391 now contains advertising, headed "Harper's Catalogue" (with 392 still blank).

TYPOGRAPHY. . . .

BINDING. . . .

COPIES EXAMINED. . . .

D3. "British Library" Edition (Paris: Galignani and Baudry, 1850)

... [full description, as in D1]

D4. "Standard Edition" (London: Constable, 1922)

Redburn constitutes Vol. 5 of the Constable "Standard Edition" of 1922–24. For an account of this edition and its subeditions, see V1. The Constable setting of *Redburn* has been reprinted not only in the two re-

D3. "British Library" edition. Because the Galignani-Baudry edition was pirated, it is of no textual significance for the scholars wishing to establish Melville's intended text. But its text was the one most readily available to readers on the continent in the 1850s, and its very existence is an important fact of Melville's nineteenth-century publishing history. It was the only edition of *Redburn* in English, other than the two authorized ones, to appear in the nineteenth century, and it was one of only five unauthorized editions in English of Melville's works during the century. I would give it full bibliographical treatment—as I would all editions and printings of Melville's books (in the original language, that is) during his lifetime. Others might wish to draw the line differently (this question is further discussed below, at D4a).

D4. "Standard Edition." Whether to describe a collected set at a single location, or to take up each volume separately at the point where it would have been described if it had not been connected with a set, is a question that should be decided individually for each bibliography. More important is the recognition that the individual

printings of the entire set (D_{4c}, D_{4d}) but separately from the collected set as No. 36 in the series "Constable's Miscellany" (D_{4a}) and in an American subedition of it published by Richard R. Smith (D_{4b}).

D_{4a}. "Constable's Miscellany" Subedition (London, 1929)

[within rule frame] CONSTABLE'S MISCELLANY | OF ORIGINAL & SELECTED | PUBLICATIONS ["Constable's Miscellany" device] IN LITERATURE | REDBURN | HIS FIRST | VOYAGE | BY | HERMAN | MELVILLE | CONSTABLE • AND • CO • LIMITED • LONDON [iii]

(177 × 108 mm): r⁶ 2–13¹⁶ 14¹⁰, 208 leaves, pp. [2] i–vii viii–x 1 2–403 404. (Signatures of the original Constable printing—imposed for gathering in eights—are present.) Table of contents, vii–x; text, 1–403. White wove unwatermarked paper; total bulk 16 mm. Medium yellow green (120) cloth, stamped in gold on the spine. Dust jacket printed on white in strong red (12) and medium yellow green (120), the front flap identifying this title as No. 36 in "Constable's Miscellany" and indicating the price as 3 s. 6 d. Copies: 1. ICN. M66–2757–196. 2. —. M70–195 (lacking first leaf).

Entered PC 20 April 1929.

volumes of sets must be entered at two places, once with a primary entry and once with a cross-reference. Because some economy, and perhaps clarity as well, results from treating an entire set at one place, I have chosen here simply to make a reference to the place—in section V, devoted to collected sets—where the Constable edition is described. The same treatment is accorded two subeditions (i.e., printings bearing another publisher's imprint or series designation) of the entire set (D_{4c}, D_{4d}). But the two subeditions of *Redburn* alone (D_{4a}, D_{4b}) are best treated here. On the arrangement and numbering of entries for subeditions, see Tanselle 1984, esp. pp. 9–20, 37. (Some might argue—and they would have a point—that the original printing, with the Constable imprint, should be numbered "D_{4a}," allowing "D₄" to refer unambiguously to the entire edition, encompassing all its subeditions. On the other side is the awkwardness of making the originating publisher's printings appear to be a subedition. Neither solution is entirely happy, and both of them can be defended.)

D_{4a}. "Constable's Miscellany" subedition. This entry is an example of a condensed form of description that I suggest might be used for all editions of Melville's works after 1891, the year of his death. The idea of shifting, at some point in a bibliography, to a less detailed form of description—a concept sometimes called, following Falconer Madan, "the degressive principle"—has been much debated. By far the most thoughtful treatment of it is to be found in Bowers 1969 (supplemented by Tanselle 1984, pp. 20–28). The decision where to curtail description (if full description throughout is not deemed feasible) involves thinking through the primary

D4b. Richard R. Smith Subedition (New York, 1930)

REDBURN | HIS FIRST VOYAGE | BY | HERMAN MELVILLE | [publisher's device] | RICHARD R. SMITH INC. | NEW YORK [iii]

The same as the "Constable's Miscellany" subedition (D4a), except that (1) p. *iv* reads '*First American Edition 1930*' and identifies the printer as Lowe & Brydone Printers Ltd., London, and (2) the binding is medium blue (182) cloth, printed in yellow on the spine. Dust jacket not seen.
Copy: 1. ICN. M67-3824-7.

Announced *PW* 8 March 1930.

D4c. Russell & Russell Subedition (New York, 1963). See V1a.**D4d.** Meicho Fukyu Kai Subedition (Tokyo, 1983). See V1b.

purpose of the bibliography: the line would be drawn at one point if the focus is on textually important editions, at another if the aim is to write a biography in bibliographical form, and at still another if the emphasis is on how printers and publishers have handled the work of a classic author. But wherever the line is drawn, one must understand that shorter descriptions do not necessarily mean less research: one is still trying to establish and report certain facts, and the space finally given to them does not necessarily reflect the amount of time required to establish them. Furthermore, the condensed descriptions should still have logic and balance of their own. In the form proposed here some attention is paid to paper and to binding (nothing need be said about typography in an entry for a subedition, unless the typography is altered photographically, electronically, or by means of a Monotype roll); the recording of contents is selective, but the signature and pagination collations, being indispensable, are treated no less fully than they would be for a nineteenth-century edition. No precise form for condensed descriptions can, or should, be prescribed; the description I offer here is intended only as one example of a highly condensed and yet relatively well-rounded bibliographical account.

D4b. Richard R. Smith subedition. This entry, on the transatlantic counterpart to the preceding subedition, illustrates how one condensed description builds on another. (If the Smith publication were an issue of the "Constable's Miscellany" printing and not a separate printing, it would not receive an entry number and would be described in a subsection of D4a—following the principle of treating printings as entities, explained in Tanselle 1984, p. 18.)

D5. L. C. Page Edition (Boston, January 1924)

For discussion of the connection between L. C. Page & Co. and the St. Botolph Society's series of "Famous Sea Stories by Herman Melville," see A5. As with other volumes of this series, subeditions by Jonathan Cape ("The Library Edition of Herman Melville's Works") and David D. Nickerson followed.

... [condensed description, patterned on D4a]

D5a. St. Botolph Society Subedition (Boston, 1924)

... [condensed description]

D5b. Jonathan Cape Subedition (London, 1924)

... [condensed description]

For a later Cape edition, see D8.

D5c. D. D. Nickerson Subedition (Boston, 1927 [?])

... [condensed description]

D5. L. C. Page edition. A month is included in the heading here to show why the Page edition is discussed before the Boni edition, both of which were published in 1924. The Page parent edition and some of its subeditions went through more than one printing; in conformity with the style of the condensed descriptions, an enumeration of the printings of each subedition (with identifying numbers, such as "D5a.2," attached and with significant differences noted, including an indication of whether title-page dates are altered and whether printings are identified on title-leaf versos or somewhere in the books themselves) could be run on in paragraph form (constituting a second paragraph of the entry). Because the entry for the later Cape "New Library" edition is some distance from this entry, a cross-reference linking the two Cape imprints is useful (they would also be linked in the index, of course).

D6. Albert & Charles Boni Edition (New York, May 1924)

For a discussion of the Boni series "The Pequod Edition of Herman Melville's Collected Works" (and the larger series, "The American Library," of which it was a part), see C4.

... [condensed description]

D6a. Jarrolds Subedition (London, 1925)

... [condensed description]

D7. Pickwick Edition (New York, 1928)

Redburn was included, along with six other book-length works of Melville, in the volume entitled *Romances of Herman Melville*, published by Pickwick Publishers in 1928 (*Redburn* on pp. 1465–1660). For an account of this volume and its subeditions, see W3.

D7a. Tudor Subedition (New York, 1931). See W3a.

D8. Jonathan Cape "New Library" Edition (London, 1937)

... [condensed description]

For an earlier association of the Cape imprint with *Redburn*, see D5b.

D7. Pickwick edition. A collected volume poses some of the same questions as a collected set (see the discussion of D4 above), but the matter is more easily decided. Wherever this volume is described, there will have to be seven cross-references to it, and it makes more sense to have the main entry in the section devoted to collected volumes than in the section dealing with any one of the works included in it. The presence of a cross-reference here is important, even though this edition of *Redburn* does not constitute an independent volume, for the goal is not simply to record separate volumes but to convey the publication history of the work. The inclusion of an edition of *Redburn* within the *Romances* volume is a significant part of that history (as is the inclusion of another edition within a "Library of America" volume, recorded here at D12).

D9. Doubleday Anchor Edition (Garden City, N.Y., 1957)

... [condensed description]

D9a. Mayflower Subedition (London, 1958)

... [condensed description]

D10. Northwestern-Newberry Edition (Evanston and Chicago, 1969)

Redburn constitutes Vol. 4 of the Northwestern-Newberry Edition of "The Writings of Herman Melville." For an account of this edition, see V3.

D10a. "Rinehart Editions" Subedition (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971)

... [condensed description]

D11. Penguin Edition (Harmondsworth, 1976)

... [condensed description]

D12. "Library of America" Edition (New York, 1983)

Redburn occupies the first 340 pages of the second "Library of America" volume devoted to Melville. For an account of the "Library of America" edition, see V4.