

Abstract

The proposed grant will fund a three-year project to launch the Melville Electronic Library (MEL), a born-digital “critical archive” that will, when completed, provide students, critics, scholars, and general readers access to reliable, searchable, and interlinked digital versions of Melville’s manuscript and print texts as well as other Melville-related research materials. MEL will also be located in an interactive environment allowing for managed user collaboration in further editing, annotation, and critical analysis. If funded, MEL will become the primary online resource for Melville studies. The focus of the project is on developing the technical groundwork and editorial protocols for assembling documents, generating transcriptions, and establishing MEL’s “textual core.” This core will be a set of scholarly editions featuring all meaningful versions of each of Melville’s work in manuscript and print. During the proposed grant period, scholars will lay the foundations of three editions—*Moby-Dick*, *Battle-Pieces*, and *Billy Budd*—that will serve as models for future editing, linking, and annotation in MEL.

The conception of MEL and the present proposal build upon work funded by a 2008-09 NEH Digital Start-Up grant (designated as a *We The People* project). The goal of that Start-Up is to develop a proof of concept for TextLab, an innovative open-source software tool that will enable editors to perform mark-up directly on digital images of Melville’s print and manuscript works and generate TEI-compliant XML transcriptions, revision sites, sequences, and narratives, in a wiki environment allowing for editorial collaboration. The Start-Up grant also funded a Melville “camp,” which met on October 24, 2008 to establish time commitments from those who will participate in the proposed building of MEL. As of this writing the development of TextLab is on schedule.

As a “critical archive,” and with its focus on the multiple versions (or “fluid texts”) of Melville works, MEL’s online edition will complement and extend earlier editorial projects, including the “eclectic” critical editions of the Northwestern-Newberry *Writings of Herman Melville*. In fact, MEL’s digital collection of the significant historical and modern scholarly versions of all of Melville’s work, in print and in manuscript, and its mark-up and transcription tool TextLab (when completed) will enable a broad range of users to track Melville’s creative and revision processes in ways that more fully realize the scholarly editorial goals that the traditional “critical edition” could only aspire toward in print.

Over the proposed three-year grant period, technical teams at Hofstra’s Faculty Computing Service will continue to develop and test TextLab, design TEI-XML and metadata schemas, and create an interface for MEL. At the same time, MEL’s editorial teams will supervise the transcribing and mark-up of the versions of the three featured Melville works; they will edit diplomatic transcriptions (in the case of manuscripts) and a base version (for manuscript and print texts) for each work. Using TEI’s P5 guidelines, they will locate revision sites on the base versions and provide corresponding revision sequences and narratives for each site. The grant’s three, stand-alone editions—*Versions of Moby-Dick*, *Versions of Battle-Pieces*, and *Versions of Billy Budd*—will make their timely appearance as the Civil War sesquicentennial approaches. Melville’s work remains a vital touchstone in the humanities for readers everywhere; and MEL’s online editions will serve as models for the further editing of versions, revision, and creative process not only in Melville’s manuscript and print but in other writers’ works as well.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS	II
PROJECT PARTICIPANTS	III
THE MELVILLE ELECTRONIC LIBRARY	1
NARRATIVE	1
Substance and Context: The Versions of Melville	1
The Critical Archive	3
History and Duration of Edition	10
Staff	15
Scope and Editorial Method	18
Final Product and Dissemination	22
Work Plan	24
PROJECT BUDGET	26
APPENDICES	42
Appendix A.	42
Schedule of Future Scanning of Melville's Works	42
Appendices B, C, and D.	43
B. TEI-XML Primary Coding of Manuscript	43
C. Draft Transcription of <i>Billy Budd</i> MS Leaves 345 & 346	45
D. TEI-XML Secondary Coding of Manuscript	46
Appendices E and F.	47
E. Sample of Original Document (manuscript)	47
F. Sample of Original Document (print)	48
Appendix G and H.	49
G. Participant Letters	49
H. Participant Resumés	57
Appendix I	65
Figures	65
Statement of Grant History	76

Project Participants

MEL PROJECT STAFF

John Bryant, Project Director and General Editor, Hofstra University; **Wyn Kelley**, Associate Editor, MIT; **Judith Tabron**, Project Manager, Hofstra Faculty Computing Services; **Robert Khatami**, Project Assistant, HFCS; **Adeel Raja**, Project Assistant, HFCS; and Programmer to be announced.

MEL EDITORIAL AND TESTING TEAMS. TextLab: Les Harrison (Virginia Commonwealth) and Wesley Raabe (Kent State). **Battle-Pieces:** Robert Madison (USNA) and Robert Sandberg (Charter College of Education, Cal State). **Moby-Dick:** Mary K. Bercaw Edwards (UConn) and Les Harrison. **Billy Budd:** Gerard McGowan (West Point), Robert Sandberg, and John Wenke (Salisbury State). **Melville's Gallery:** Dennis Berthold (Texas A&M) and Robert K. Wallace (Northern Kentucky).

EDITORIAL BOARD

Dennis Berthold (Texas A&M), Patrick Bryant (Ind. Scholar), Mary K. Bercaw Edwards (Connecticut), Pawel Jedrzejko (University of Katowice, PL), Wyn Kelley (MIT), Robert Levine (Maryland), Robert Madison (USNA), Dennis Marnon (Houghton Library), Timothy Marr (Chapel Hill), Tony McGowan (USMA), Peter Norberg (St. Joseph), Steven Olsen-Smith (Boise State), Samuel Otter (Berkeley), Robert Sandberg (Charter College of Education, Cal State), Christopher Sten (George Washington), Robert K. Wallace (Northern Kentucky), John Wenke (Salisbury State), and Marta Werner (D'Youville).

EDITORIAL CONSULTANTS: Les Harrison (Richmond), Robert Levine (Maryland), Joel Myerson (South Carolina), Kenneth Price (Nebraska), Wesley Raabe (Kent State), Stephen Railton (Virginia), and Martha Nell Smith (Maryland), Peter Shillingsburg (Loyola, Chicago), Haskell Springer (Kansas), and G. Thomas Tanselle (Guggenheim, emeritus),

LIBRARY CONSULTANTS: Daniel Rubey (Dean, Hofstra Library), Ann Grafstein (Reference), and Alan Bailin (Reference).

TECHNICAL CONSULTANTS: Syd Bauman (Brown), Julia Flanders (Brown), Nick Laiacona (Performant Software), Laura Mandell (Miami of Ohio), Jerome J. McGann (Virginia), Bethany Nowvickie (Virginia), Daniel Pitti (IATH Virginia), and Dana Wheelles (NINES, Virginia).

The Melville Electronic Library

Narrative

Substance and Context: The Versions of Melville

Herman Melville's contribution to American and world literature is uncontested, but access to his work is problematic. Often, when people refer to "Melville," they really mean *Moby-Dick*. This single masterpiece looms so large in our personal and collective imaginations that it sometimes eclipses even Melville's popular, shorter classics: *Typee*, "Bartleby, the Scrivener," "Benito Cereno," or *Billy Budd*. Another impediment to accessing all of Melville is that his achievements in prose overshadow his extensive life as a poet. Melville published more lines than Whitman, experimenting in genres ranging from the epigram ("Pebbles") to the epic (*Clarel*), and taking on such topics as aesthetics and politics, religion and evolution, betrayal and oppression, sexual repression, belief, art, and civil war. Though some of his poems have been anthologized, Melville's full poetic work remains largely hidden.

But there is another Melville we do not know. Much of Melville's work—in both print and manuscript—exists in multiple, critically meaningful variant versions, or what John Bryant has called "fluid texts." *Moby-Dick*, for instance, appeared in two substantially different first editions, both in turn significantly different from today's standard scholarly text. Moreover, Melville's working draft manuscripts (including *Typee*, *Billy Budd*, and scores of poems) conceal hundreds of other hidden Melvilles, layered one atop the other, most still unread because the "revision texts" inscribed on these documents have yet to be fully edited. In short, numerous versions of Melville are waiting to be discovered, read, taught, and enjoyed. But to give readers access to these versions—and hence a fuller awareness of Melville—we need to rethink our editorial strategies, and we need an archive wherein editing and access can happen.

In creating the Melville Electronic Library (MEL), a born digital “critical archive,” we will offer readers access to all meaningful textual versions of Melville’s prose and poetic works, in print and working draft manuscript. MEL’s scholarly edition will also present modern scholarly versions, such as the texts generated by the Northwestern-Newberry (NN) edition of *The Writings of Herman Melville*. Although our electronic edition will, by necessity, adopt different editorial principles from this admirable scholarly achievement, we will not “un-edit” the editorial Melvilles of previous generations. As emended texts, these scholarly works represent various critical assumptions of the modern age and grow richer in our estimation when viewed in the context of earlier historical versions. Thus, in addition to providing reliable and searchable electronic texts of Melville’s work, we will facilitate readers in navigating the changes made to Melville’s text by the author and his various historical and modern editors. And in order to heighten readers’ awareness of the critical nature of editing, we will provide tools enabling users, working on historical and scholarly versions in a controlled collaborative environment, to construct reliable editions of their own. In its purely editorial function, MEL will become the standard text center for Melville editing and research; and as we populate its eight “rooms” with additional, hyperlinked, primary and secondary materials, it will become an arena for scholarly discourse among critics, instructors, students, and general readers.

In this proposal, we conceive of MEL as a “critical archive.” Our principal goal is to establish the scholarly and technical groundwork for the site’s textual core by delivering at the end of the grant period three editions—titled *Versions of Moby-Dick*, *Versions of Battle-Pieces*, and *Versions of Billy Budd*—each a stand-alone model for the editing of the rest of Melville’s work. We will also continue to develop our image mark-up and transcription tool, TextLab, funded by a 2008-09 NEH Digital Humanities Start-Up grant. The following sections discuss the “critical archive” as an extension of modern scholarly editing and provide an overview of

MEL's rooms as well as the history, staffing, method, final product, and work plan of our editorial project.

The Critical Archive

A “critical archive,” sometimes referred to as a “thematic research collection,” is both a textual storehouse, in which scholarly editions of versions are maintained and generated, and an arena for independent study and interactive discourse. The storehouse—in this case, a collection of images and critically edited transcriptions of Melville and Melville-related texts—is the fundamental groundwork, or “textual core,” for the critical activities that users may perform in the archive’s projected rooms. Users will be able to navigate the core and create links between it and other digitized documents: biographical materials, Melville’s sourcebooks and annotations, a gallery of Melville’s collection of art prints, primary and secondary bibliography, even the GPS tracking of Melville’s journeys to the Pacific, England and Europe, the Mediterranean, and Middle East. Moreover, with TextLab, users will be able to enter a collaborative but carefully managed environment to edit (or in time “re-edit”) Melville’s works. In this regard, the “critical archive” is a fuller realization of the ever-valid notion of the “critical edition” of modern textual scholarship.

In modern textual editing, a project’s end product—the critical edition itself—is “critical” because its copy-text is emended to represent the editors’ conception of the writer’s final intentions. The “reading text” of the critical edition (apart from its textual apparatus) is the site of hundreds of meaningful editorial changes, each the product of significant critical discourse, both within the editorial team and with broader interpretive communities. Because editors cannot avoid interpretation in making their textual emendations, they are obliged to elucidate their underlying critical discourse, including their editorial principles and methodology as well as their discussions of the historical versions consulted, copy-text, variants, and editorial

emendations. In the standard format, most critical editions provide a “clear reading text” (devoid of discursive footnotes so as to be suitable for reprinting) and an apparatus containing historical and textual notes, related documents, and lists of variants. In short, the critical edition as a genre segregates reading text from editorial discourse. But this approach has a downside.

Generally speaking, the reader perceives the critical edition primarily as the reading text alone, and rarely consults the edition’s alienating, highly compressed, and heavily encoded textual apparatus. However, for the textual scholar, these lists of variants are an abbreviated archive of the featured work’s historical versions and the editors’ always debatable changes. Indeed, they validate the edition’s reading text. Because the clear reading text does not display any of the editorial debates on its pages, and because the evidence of its having been edited is encrypted in the back of the book, most readers (including many scholars and critics) never bother to decode the textual history hidden in the apparatus. Assuming the apparatus’s heft alone validates the reading text, they ignore its material evidence of historical versions and modern editorial intervention. A certain textual amnesia sets in. And when publishers reprint the reading text for popular and classroom circulation, the text is erroneously called “definitive” and the validating apparatus is invariably dropped. The result of these editorial and publishing practices is that readers experience the reading text in isolation from its textual history; they have less rather than more understanding of the critical and interpretive nature of textual editing, and of textuality itself; and there is less knowledge of, hence less demand for, the versions of a work. A professional consequence is that editors are perceived as merely textual custodians, and their critical work is seen as occupying a separate sphere only remotely attached to the sphere of literary criticism, when, in fact, textual editing is an elemental process in the construction of canons and the shaping of knowledge.

But how much do versions matter in literary studies? The historical and modern editing of *Moby-Dick* provides a telling response. In preparing his novel for American publication, Melville also sent revised proofs to British editor Richard Bentley who, in publishing *The Whale*, further altered Melville's wording to conform to British idiom, but in doing so, he also expurgated hundreds of passages for sexual, political, and religious reasons. Thus, *Moby-Dick* exists in two critically and culturally different versions issued in the fall of 1851. For instance, when Ahab appears in Ch. 28 with a "crucifixion in his face" in the American version, he merges in the British *Whale* with an "apparently eternal anguish in his face." References to Ishmael and Queequeg's "matrimonial" relationship are expunged from the British version, as well as numerous biblical and anti-monarchical passages. One might assume there is little relevance to a censored version of *Moby-Dick*, but, of course, commingled with the British expurgations are changes attributable to Melville; and it is a matter of debate in these and hundreds of variant readings as to whether Bentley revised Melville or Melville censored himself. From a literary and cultural perspective, both expurgations and revisions, if readers can witness them, provide concrete evidence—existing solely in the hidden differences between versions—of the transnational negotiations that occasioned the debut of Melville's masterwork.

However, to get any sense of the intentional but also coerced and yet collaborative changes hiding out in the British version, readers require not only access to the British text but a way to navigate the differences between it and the fuller American edition. In short, the changes to, or rather "rewriting" of, *Moby-Dick* has to be edited into existence. Unfortunately, the "eclectic" reading text of the modern NN *Moby-Dick* (1988) conflates British and American versions. Following the American version as copy-text, it adds British wordings, if they can be deduced to be Melville's authorized revision. The editors also make emendations of their own, reflecting their understanding of what Melville might have meant. Thus, the "eclectic" approach

constructs a modern reading that approximates the editors' conception of the Melville's intentions. It is not a representation of the authentic historical versions the writer and his transatlantic audiences actually experienced. To be sure, the textual apparatus for the NN *Moby-Dick* records all British variants and modern emendations, but by itself the emended, clear reading text—which Melville never witnessed—appears without any on-page links to the apparatus; and because this modern text is often reprinted without its validating apparatus, our modern reading text and the archive of versions it is based on are separated, as if lost at sea.

Another problem undermines a principal goal of the eclectic edition. An edition's apparatus is also intended to enable future editors to "re-edit" the work. That is, any critic or editor, with different critical assumptions or a different editorial approach, may use the variant lists—in effect, decompress the compressed, encoded mini-archive of versions—to reconstruct the work's original editions. However, in consulting the apparatus of the NN *Moby-Dick* to establish the text for their Longman Critical Edition of *Moby-Dick* (2006), Bryant and Springer ran into difficulties. Their goal was to generate a reliable text of the American version of *Moby-Dick* and (with a different font) "map" onto this textual terrain the authorial, editorial, and scholarly revisions made to *Moby-Dick*. Of course, the NN apparatus lists these mappable revision sites as variants, but responsible editorial practice still required the Longman editors to inspect the NN apparatus against of the historical documents it represents. The five-year process, which confirmed the reliability of the NN collations, nevertheless underscored the cultural relevance of each textual change and the debatability of editorial emendation.

In short, the modern eclectic edition's invitation to re-edit—either to generate a new edition or simply to gain access to versions for critical analysis—is appealing in theory but daunting in practice. Moreover, the stolid lists of the traditional apparatus are a barrier rather than portal to textual studies, literary criticism, and cultural analysis: they signal to readers that

editing is a mechanical not critical endeavor and that reconstructing versions from an apparatus is not practicable for the faint of heart or the untenured. What is lost in the disconnect between literary and textual criticism is the understanding of how historical and scholarly editors construct the texts that shape our knowledge of a literary work and culture itself. To some degree, then, when instructors assign cheap reprints lacking scholarly validation, it is not entirely because of economy; it is also because the function and impact of scholarly editing are a mystery to most readers. Critics and students do not perceive themselves as having any ownership in the editorial process; instructors do not participate in the critical discourse that valorizes scholarly editions; therefore, they do not assign them. MEL's proposed scholarly edition will give more readers more of a stake in the processes of critical editing.

The fluid-text approach to critical editing, which provides fuller access to a work's authentic historical versions, is a useful alternative to eclectic editing. In *The Fluid Text* (Michigan 2002), Bryant theorizes on the nature of versions and proposes practical methods for editing revisions found in manuscript or print. That method was realized in his electronic edition of the working draft manuscript of *Typee*, titled *Herman Melville's Typee: A Fluid-Text Edition* (Rotunda 2006; see Fig. 1). A selected print version of the edition appears in Bryant's critical study, *Melville Unfolding: Sexuality, Politics and the Versions of Typee* (Michigan 2008). In the electronic edition, readers can view manuscript *images* and a *diplomatic transcription* side-by-side in synchronously scrolling frames (Fig. 2). (The provided screen shots feature Melville's revision of "favored valley" to "paradise abode," one of many revision sites that reveals evolutions of cultural and religious thought.) A final reading text of the manuscript, i.e. the text remaining after Melville's deletions are removed and his insertions added, serves as the *base version* of the edition (Fig. 3). Highlighted text on this base version records each of Melville's *Revision Sites* (Fig. 4). When readers click on a hyperlinked revision site, a corresponding

Revision Sequence pops-up, providing step-by-step the different wordings Melville might or must have considered as he revised (Fig. 5). Each step of the sequence represents a heretofore hidden “revision text,” previously buried within Melville’s revision codes in manuscript. In addition, linked to each sequence is a *Revision Narrative* that explains each step in the sequence, thereby providing an argument for the necessarily debatable revision sequence (Fig. 6). This approach to the editing of revision is effective in making the invisible text of revision visible, thus supplying us with more versions of Melville than we might have imagined. And it is an effective model for the editing of revision in MEL’s version-based edition of Melville.

However, in its current state, the electronic *Typee* manuscript edition does not allow for expansion, changes to sequences and narratives, or reader interaction within the site. That is, editors and other users cannot respond to or participate in the editorial process of modifying or generating different revision sequences and narratives as new information and insight emerge. To make the fluid-text editorial approach more interactive, Hofstra’s Faculty Computing Service (HFCS) received a 2008-09 NEH Digital Humanities Start-Up grant to develop a “proof of concept” for TextLab, an image mark-up and transcription tool that will digitize the process of editing revision in print and manuscript, as modeled in the Rotunda *Typee* edition. When up and running, TextLab will let users select a revision site marked on a print or manuscript image, transcribe the site in TEI-compliant XML, and generate a revision sequence and its validating revision narrative. Because the tool will operate within a Wiki, dispersed users can work together on a revision site and compare their editorial work, developing their separate hypotheses in a controlled discourse environment. The Wiki also preserves all revision sequence versions as a record of the team’s collaborative editorial work. The value of TextLab’s collaborative feature is that it heightens discourse but also places needed controls on the editorial process.

As we conceive it, the scholarly edition located in a digital Melville “critical archive” would be the fuller realization of what the print “critical edition” strives in principle to be: a place where readers can discover the critically significant versions of a writer’s work, trace the revision process, and, in a controlled collaborative environment, engage in the interpretive judgments necessary in any editorial activity. By opening the editorial process to a wider range of readers, we argue that readers will gain a fuller understanding of how editors and cultures change texts and a deeper appreciation of the critical nature of editing. Unlike a critical edition in print, MEL’s scholarly edition will store digitized simulations of all relevant versions of a work—both images and transcriptions—as well as texts selected as base versions. Moreover, with a collation tool like Juxta, versions can be inspected automatically for variants, and revision sites can be marked up on base versions for further critical analysis. Related documents—such as manuscripts, journals, sources, and Melville’s marginalia—would also be stored in or linked to the archive and linked to the base versions of MEL’s textual core.

Melville’s working draft manuscripts are particularly in need of editing from the ground up. Like the *Typee* manuscript, the *Billy Budd* manuscript (for instance) exhibits overlapping layers of revision and versions on each leaf. The Hayford-Sealts edition describes the stages of growth (from a poem with head note to novella); however, its genetic transcription attempts to describe Melville’s revisions in what has proved to be an inaccessible editorial code. But with NEH funding, we propose to mark-up the *Billy Budd* manuscript and generate a diplomatic transcription and base version. Moreover, when MEL’s TextLab is operational, users would be able to add to the base version corresponding revision sequences and narratives, thus editing Melville’s otherwise “invisible” texts of revision into existence and thereby supplying the raw material for studying Melville’s creative process. And because TextLab is being built on the platform of a Java-based Wiki which records all changes including editorial ones, a team of users

and MEL editors would be able to vet each other's proposed editorial decision or annotation. Thus, with fuller access to versions and the tools for witnessing textual variants, revision, and versions, the critical archive we propose will be a far more effective place for editing, learning, and critical thinking than its print predecessor, the critical edition.

Of course, the idea that a critical archive might allow anyone to enter its Wiki environment, compare versions, delineate variants, and construct new editions is both exhilarating and fearful. The immediate worry for anyone concerned with good editorial practice and textual accuracy is that allowing any user to edit Melville may lead to "bad texts" on the internet. Indeed, we plan to build into MEL the kinds of editorial protocols and safeguards that will supervise editorial discourse and textual dissemination. At the same time, the exciting heuristics of a critical archive like MEL is that by putting the editorial process online, we demystify critical editing. By facilitating users in their attempts to edit a text, we enable them to experience the critical and interpretive nature of editing: they will consider what constitutes a version and ask whether certain variants are indeed evidence of a version or not; they will consider what and who caused a variant to happen, how, and why. By asking these questions, they will gain a sharper understanding of what Peter Shillingsburg calls the "interpretive consequences" of constructing an edition and thereby bring the heretofore separate spheres of editing and literary and cultural criticism closer together.

History and Duration of Edition

The idea of the Melville Electronic Library grew out of conversations in the late 1990s among John Bryant, Haskell Springer, and John Unsworth, then-director of Virginia's Institute for Advancement of Technology in the Humanities (IATH), IATH's Daniel Pitti, and Virginia's Jerome McGann. At this time, Bryant (with Rotunda editor David Sewell) began work on his

electronic edition of *Typee*, completed in 2006. Starting in 2001, Bryant and Springer collaborated on their fluid-text print edition of *Moby-Dick* (Longman 2007).

After consultation with McGann, Bethany Nowviskie (UVa Library), NINES associate director Laura Mandell (Miami University), and Julia Flanders (Brown), and in collaboration with HFCS director Judith Tabron, Bryant applied for and received a \$23,000 NEH Digital Start-Up grant (designated as a *We The People* project) to employ open-source technology and open-standards to create TextLab and to hold a meeting at Hofstra of Melville scholars (“MELville Camp 2008”) to discuss the future of MEL. In spring 2007, Bryant and MEL associate editor Wyn Kelley, met with Houghton Library’s manuscript curator Leslie Morris and researcher Dennis Marnon to arrange for the digitization of the Melville manuscripts and print items that will serve as model images and texts for the TextLab prototype. Houghton also agreed to provide images for all of *Billy Budd*, at no charge to MEL. In the summer of 2008 and with travel funds provided by Hofstra, Bryant and HFCS instructional technologist Robert Khatami attended a ten-day, NEH and NINES-supported digital workshop, headed by Mandell, that included three days of intensive work with Flanders and Syd Bauman on TEI-XML mark-up.

At MEL’s first “MELville Camp” held on October 24, 2008, Tabron, Khatami, and programmer Marshall Flax demonstrated a prototype for TextLab. If fully realized, it will make an enormous contribution to digital and collaborative editing. As of Fall, 2008, the production of the proof of concept for TextLab by Flax and HFCS instructional technologist Robert Khatami is on schedule for completion in May 2009. It will be ready for testing and continued development with input from MEL associates and the broader IT community.

At the core of this prototype TextLab implementation, we will have a MySQL database containing images, TEI-XML (P5) transcriptions, metadata, stylesheets, displayable HTML, and other artifacts. (See Fig. 7, for storyboard.) This database acts as a bridge between the two

primary current development efforts. On the “internal” side of the database, we use (1) Oxygen to construct TEI transcriptions, (2) a custom graphical tool to enhance the TEI with polygon coordinates indicating regions of interest on the manuscript image, and (3) XSLT stylesheets to transform the XML into HTML suitable for viewing. On the “external” side of the database we will use a next-generation “application wiki” (Xwiki) to present these artifacts to end-users for inspection. Modern application wikis allow properly-permissioned remote processes to programmatically create and maintain wiki pages, and we will copy artifacts from the MySQL database to the public wiki without any manual work and structure the wiki pages in a consistent fashion. For example, a wiki page for a manuscript leaf might have an image attachment, a TEI attachment, an HTML attachment, a metadata attachment, and links to other wiki pages such as a master page for the manuscript as a whole. Each wiki page calls a template to load Google Web Toolkit-compiled javascript that provides a high degree of interactivity to the end-user. For instance, clicking on text within the HTML presentation of a transcription causes the corresponding polygon to be overlaid onto the manuscript image. At the same time, the same wiki page can be commented-upon and exist as a full member of a usual wiki web of references.

Also during the all-day MELville Camp, participants discussed broader scholarly, critical, and pedagogical applications of MEL’s proposed textual core, including links to envisioned sites relating Melville to fine arts, popular culture, Melville’s print collection, and the Civil War. Bryant also secured commitments from Melville and digital scholars to join the *Moby-Dick*, *Battle-Pieces*, *Billy Budd*, TextLab, and Melville Gallery teams (see Staff below). Throughout the grant period and at future MELville Camps, Bryant and Kelley will continue to consult with MEL associates and the editorial board to develop database categories, linking strategies, and TEI-schema as its textual core and various rooms grow.

When fully realized, MEL will be the primary online site for Melville studies. MEL's projected eight rooms will archive images and searchable texts representing a full range of Melville-related research materials (see Fig. 8). MEL's proposed scholarly edition, located in the Manuscripts and Published Work rooms, will, in an estimated fifteen years, contain images of all of Melville's literary manuscripts and of the significant historical and scholarly editions of Melville's publications (see Appendix A), searchable base versions for each work, and software tools for collation, transcription, and annotation. The principal goal of the proposed grant is to establish the groundwork for MEL's textual core by launching three stand-alone editions that will serve as models for generating the rest of MEL's scholarly editions.

In addition to structuring its textual core during its crucial first years, MEL's special interest teams will plan MEL's other rooms. For instance, the grant's secondary initiative is the MEL Gallery. Throughout his life, Melville collected over 400 art prints, now located in the Berkshire Athenaeum and several private collections. MEL associate Robert K. Wallace has catalogued Melville's prints in various articles. In time, MEL's Gallery room will acquire digital images of each print and link them to the textual core and to a searchable unified catalogue of prints based on Wallace's work. In addition, Melville's works have been richly illustrated and have inspired the work of artists in virtually all media. Wallace, MEL associate Dennis Berthold, and others have recorded and critiqued these visual images, in separate publications, and our Gallery will include as many images of these illustrations and art works as permissions and funding will allow. The Gallery will also include images of Melville and his family members, located mostly in Houghton Library and the New York Public Library. Where applicable, all Gallery images will be linked to the proposed scholarly edition. During the proposed grant period, Wallace and Berthold will work on the Gallery team to arrange for the assembling of images of Melville's print collection and other visuals.

In order to fully populate MEL's rooms, we would apply for continued support from appropriate NEH programs including Scholarly Editions (for the textual core), Preservation and Access (for print collection images and additional manuscripts), Digital Humanities Start-Up (for projects listed below), and challenge grants (for future maintenance). We will also pursue funding from other agencies such as Mellon and ACLS.

Fundamental to Melville research is the study of his library, sources, reading practices, and marginalia, as represented by the Melville's Reading and Sources rooms. Currently, MEL associates Steven Olsen-Smith and Peter Norberg have launched an online version of Olsen-Smith's continuous updating of Merton M. Sealts's catalog of books owned by Melville, titled *Melville's Reading*, and their collaborative work (with Dennis Marnon) on Melville's marginal annotations. Already these scholars are planning to adapt their site, *Melville's Marginalia Online*, to TEI-compliant XML standards, and make it fully interoperable with the images and transcriptions in the proposed MEL scholarly edition. In consultation with Bryant, they will consider applying for suitable grant funding, perhaps through NEH's Digital Start-Up program.

MEL's Secondary Works room will include a finding aid to major Melville collections (to parallel the catalogue of Melville's prints) and, building on the work of MEL associate G. Thomas Tanselle, a descriptive bibliography of Melville's works, linked to the proposed scholarly edition. Also to be included will be secondary bibliography, linked where applicable to a collection of Melville reviews and selected modern criticism. We will also include links to digitized versions of Melville reference tools such as Bryant's *Melville Dissertations* and Mary K. Bercaw Edwards's *Melville's Sources*. Also the focus for funding beyond the present proposed grant is the Life room which will assemble primary biographical materials. The principal feature of this room will be a Melville Timeline linking biographical events to texts. In time, MEL will use GPS technology and map overlays to chart Melville's travels as described in

his journals also to be included in the scholarly edition. MEL's Adaptation room will collect texts of versions of Melville created for abridgments (for children, students, and general readers), translations, screenplays and radio scripts (with film and audio clips, where possible), musical adaptations, and breachings of Melville in popular culture.

We estimate that mounting our three featured works will require the acquisition of roughly 360 manuscript leaves and 2650 images of print works. All images will be 24-bit color scans taken from the originals at 600 dpi and delivered as TIFF files for archiving, with accompanying JPEGs for transcription and display. As noted, we have arranged with Morris and Marnon at Houghton Library (which holds most of Melville's literary manuscripts) for the digital reproduction, without charge, of *Billy Budd* and the late poems. These will be delivered over the three year grant period. As of Fall, 2008, Bryant has also begun negotiations with the University of Virginia Library for securing the images of the necessary print works: the 1851 and 1892 American editions of *Moby-Dick*, the 1851 British *Whale*, the first American and Constable editions of *Battle-Pieces*, as well as the three modern transcriptions of *Billy Budd*. Bryant is also negotiating with Aptara Corporation for the keyboarding and basic mark-up of the 2650 print text images. Throughout the grant period, MEL's Gallery team will work on securing digital reproductions of Melville's art print collection, residing largely at the Berkshire Athenaeum.

Staff

General Editor John Bryant (Hofstra) has published several books and articles on Melville—most recently *Melville Unfolding* (Michigan)—and is editor of the Longman Critical Edition of *Moby-Dick* and *Herman Melville's Typee* (Rotunda, CSE seal pending); he has been editor of the Melville Society since 1990. Bryant has also served on MLA's Committee on Scholarly Editions (2004-08), serves on the Executive Council of NINES, and was the NINES Americanist

co-editor with Kenneth Price. Associate Editor Wyn Kelley (MIT) is editor of the Blackwell *Companion to Melville* and author of *Herman Melville: An Introduction* and MIT's *Teachers' Strategy Guide for Reading in a Participatory Culture*, a curriculum on *Moby-Dick* and new media literacies. Bryant and Kelley have worked together editing *Leviathan* since its inception in 1998. He will devote his regular research time throughout the academic year to the project and one salaried summer month for each year of the project. She will receive a yearly stipend. Together they will supervise the work of the MEL teams in document acquisition and all editorial work including transcription and mark-up; they will also coordinate annual MELville camps. Bryant will write grant proposals for future funding.

Judith Tabron holds a PhD in English and is Director of Hofstra Faculty Computing Services, which provides all instructional and research computing support to Hofstra's faculty. She is the principal supervisor of the development of TextLab, and will commit 5% of her time to overseeing MEL-related activities conducted by her staff and to making two hires for the duration of the three-year grant: an individual (TBD) who will serve as Project Manager (at 15% of load) and a free-lance programmer (for 250 hours at \$60 per hour). The PM will facilitate the MEL editors and teams in technical matters, including their decision-making processes related to TEI-XML and metadata schema and digitization, their editorial interaction via wiki and teleconferencing, and the use of Oxygen. The project programmer will assist in the further development of TextLab from proof of concept to alpha and beta versions. And to gain the attention and possible support of the broader, open-source tool-building community, the project will support travel to IT and digital humanities conferences like Educause.

Database specialist Robert Khatami (HFCS), formerly the owner of a successful software business that developed a Point of Sales / Inventory tracking systems, has worked for Solomon Smith Barney, MetLife, and Mount Sinai Hospital, and is co-developer of TextLab. He will

devote 5% of his HFCS time to TextLab development. Instructional technologist Adeel Raja (HFCS) will devote 10% of his time to coordinating workflow and web interface design.

The project's editorial work will be divided among five designated teams. These scholars will devote research time throughout the grant period to work with Bryant and Kelley directly and supervise work related to the transcribing and mark-up of the grant's three featured texts, the location and acquisition of art images related to Melville's print collection, and the testing of TextLab. These scholars are listed by team as follows.

TextLab: Les Harrison (Virginia Commonwealth), author of *The Temple and the Forum* (Alabama), is working on the development of a digital Poe archive. Wesley Raabe (Kent State) specializes in textual editing and digital humanities and is working on an electronic edition of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. **Battle-Pieces:** Robert Madison (USNA) is the Associate General Editor of the NN *Writings of Herman Melville* and Textual Editor / Board Member for *The Writings of James Fenimore Cooper*. Robert Sandberg (Charter College of Education, Cal State) teaches information technology and develops online courses using open source PHP and MySQL based software, including Wordpress, Joomla, WebCT, Blackboard, and Moodle. **Moby-Dick:** Mary K. Bercaw Edwards (UConn) specializes in Melville's time at sea, especially aboard whaling ships, and his use of written and oral sources. Les Harrison (see above). **Billy Budd:** Gerard McGowan (West Point) is currently working on Melville's career-long meditation on war and violence. Robert Sandberg (see above). John Wenke (Salisbury State) is the author of *Melville's Muse* (Kent State) and is working on a book on Charles Brockden Brown. **Melville's Gallery:** Dennis Berthold (Texas A&M) is author of *American Risorgimento: Herman Melville and the Cultural Politics of Italy* (Ohio State). Robert K. Wallace (Regents Professor, Northern Kentucky) has authored works on Douglass and Melville as well as in Melville and the arts.

Scope and Editorial Method

In his 1991 Melville Centennial address, Melville editor G. Thomas Tanselle predicted that the task of the twenty-first century would be to establish reliable editions of the versions of Melville's works. When fully completed, MEL's scholarly edition will provide a model for the realization of that vision. During the proposed grant period, NEH would fund the development of the TEI-compliant XML schema for MEL's scholarly edition and metadata for digital images of book and manuscript texts. It would also support the initial populating of MEL's textual core with stand-alone editions of *Moby-Dick*, *Battle-Pieces*, and *Billy Budd*. For each work, we will assemble images of all print versions (e.g. the American and British *Moby-Dick* or the three modern print versions of *Billy Budd*) and have them double keyboarded with minimal XML mark-up, machine proofed, and human proofed against the original images. We will select a base version for each work. For *Billy Budd*, we will first create a diplomatic transcription of the manuscript (proofed against original leaves) and, following the practice established for *Typee* (discussed above), generate a base version from the manuscript transcription's final reading text. With NINES's open-source collation tool Juxta (see Fig. 9; <http://www.juxtaoftware.org/>), we will then compare variant versions of each work to locate all revision sites. Following the TEI-XML schema developed for MEL, we will then mark-up the revision sites on each work's base version, thus enabling future editors (using TextLab) to generate revision sequences from the marked-up variants that provide the steps Melville or an editor made in revising the text, and revision narratives that explain the step-by-step process. The base version for each work will also be used for linking critical annotations to other materials.

Featured Works

The three works were selected because of the editorial challenges they pose for the digital editing of the versions of Melville's prose and poetry, in manuscript, magazine, and book formats. In

terms of content they also represent Melville's major statements about democracy and authority before and after the Civil War. Together, these editions will serve as models for future editions of Melville's remaining works, and for any writer's work existing in multiple versions. (See Appendices E and F, for sample primary documents.)

Versions of *Moby-Dick*. As already noted *Moby-Dick* exists in three significant historical versions: the 1851 American and British editions and the 1892 edition supervised by Melville's literary executor Arthur Stedman. In addition, a *Harper's Magazine* version of "The Town-Ho's Story" (Ch. 54) appeared in advance of the first editions. These differ significantly from each other and from the 1988 eclectic NN *Moby-Dick*. Because no manuscripts have been located, the editing of *Moby-Dick* involves only print texts. For *Moby-Dick*, Bryant has already located revision sites and prepared sequences and narratives for them. Once linked to the (American) base version, they will be modified and proofed. As a world classic and an exemplary nineteenth-century fluid text, *Moby-Dick* will serve our project as a model for the coding and linking of Melville's prose as well as the transcribing of authorial and editorial revisions.

Versions of *Battle-Pieces*. Although Melville had written poems throughout his early years and prepared a never-published volume of poetry in 1860, he did not stake his claim as a poet until after the Civil War, and in doing so, he dropped prose-writing altogether to devote his creative energies almost entirely to poetry. Melville composed most of his 70 or so war poems in *Battle-Pieces* (1866) soon after Appomattox. Five of the poems appeared in *Harper's Magazine* in advance of publication with meaningful differences. According to biographer Stanton Garner, Melville was the only American writer of his stature to venture behind enemy lines (a two-week expedition in Virginia as recorded in his poem "The Scout toward Aldie"), but *Battle-Pieces* was savaged by critics who condemned Melville's unpolished style and conciliatory post-war vision. The apparent lack of polish was, in fact, the result of a refusal to

write the same poem twice, in terms of tone, voice, rhyme, and meter. An inveterate reviser, Melville tinkered with his poems after publication, as is evident in his own revised copy of *Battle-Pieces*. This first book of poetry is a crucial fulcrum in Melville's life as a writer, signaling both his creative turn to poetry and the end of his career as a public professional. As critics are beginning to see, the experimental poems of *Battle-Pieces* are a fascinating contrast to popular Civil War poems of the day and, of course, Whitman's equally brilliant contribution in *Drum-Taps*. For our purposes, the work allows us to develop protocols for marking and transcribing any given Melville poem. We will digitize, keyboard, and transcribe Melville's revised copy of the 1866 edition, the five magazine poems, and the first modern version in the 1924 Constable edition, which established Melville's poetic contribution for modern audiences, locate and mark-up revision sites, and record sequences and narratives.

Versions of *Billy Budd*. After twenty years of service in the Customs office and having published, in small numbers, two more volumes of poetry (*Clarel* and *John Marr*), Melville began a poem with a small prose head note that grew to become a novella with a poem appended at the end: *Billy Budd*. This remarkable prose-and-poem work, which spurred the revival of Melville's popularity in the 1920s, exists as a working draft manuscript that has been transcribed three times in the twentieth century by Raymond Weaver (Constable 1924), F. Barron Freeman (Harvard 1948), and Hayford-Sealts (Chicago 1962). Editorially and digitally, *Billy Budd* presents the greatest challenge of the three featured works as its heavily-revised manuscript represents several stages of composition in poetry and prose. MEL associates will spread out the work on *Billy Budd* over the three-year grant period to generate from the manuscript a diplomatic transcription, derive from it a base version representing a final reading of each manuscript page, and locate revision sites on the base version. To record variant modern readings of the manuscript, they will also collate the three print versions of *Billy Budd*, select a base version, and

encode its revision sites. In future grant cycles, editors will generate revision sequences and narratives and link them and the print and manuscript revision sites to the diplomatic transcription and manuscript page images. In time, the project will be able to render a digital simulation of the growth of *Billy Budd* in manuscript and its modern reception in print.

Schema, Metadata, and Server. If our grant is awarded, the editors, MEL associates, and technical team will devote the grant's first year to developing MEL's TEI-XML and metadata schemas. Consultants Daniel Pitti (IATH) and Julia Flanders (Brown) will assist in general project design and the use of Roma, TEI's P5 Guidelines, and the XML editor Oxygen to develop MEL's XML schema. Consultant Nick Laiacona (NINES) will assist by optimizing Juxta usage for MEL editing purposes. In consultation with Hofstra's library staff, the editors will also develop administrative and descriptive metadata for all images, following the XML-compliant protocols established by the Metadata Encoding and Transmission Standard (METS; (<http://www.loc.gov/standards/mets/>) and Encoded Archival Description (EAD, version 2002; <http://www.loc.gov/ead/>). To affiliate with NINES, Bryant will confer with Andrew Stauffer and Dana Wheelles at NINES for applying XML-encoded Resource Description Format metadata (RDF; <http://www.nines.org/join/rdf.html>), which categorizes genres and types of digital objects thus enhancing MEL's interoperability. MEL will be housed on a web host such as BlueHost and RootBSD, arranged by HFCS director Judith Tabron.

Editorial Protocols and TextLab. The editorial project will follow best-practice protocols of transcription, collation, annotation, and proofing in guidelines established by the Association of Documentary Editing (ADE), as outlined in Mary-Jo Kline's *A Guide to Documentary Editing*, 3rd ed. (2008), and by the Modern Language Association (MLA), as outlined in *Guidelines for Scholarly Editions*, http://www.mla.org/cse_guidelines. We will also follow practices for editing revision as outlined in Bryant's *The Fluid Text* and mentioned above.

Graduate students (at Hofstra and elsewhere) under the supervision of MEL associates will proof keyboarded texts against digital images of print texts. Bryant and other MEL associates will proof manuscript transcriptions against images and original documents. With the 2008-09 Start-Up grant, Bryant is preparing protocols for editing of revision sites and revision sequences in TEI-XML to be incorporated into TextLab. (See Appendices B, C, and D, for an explanation of our “stand-off” mark-up strategies and for current sketches of TEI-XML mark-up for transcription, revision site, and sequence.) As already noted, the grant-funded development of the proof of concept for TextLab is on schedule for completion in May, 2009. The proposed grant would facilitate testing of the tool and its further development toward production levels.

Final Product and Dissemination

Because they will be based on open-source technology and standards, the editions of MEL’s three featured works will be made available, without charge, to students, instructors, scholars, and general readers through a variety of browsers. They will be expandable so that other versions as well as critical and pedagogical features may be added, and it will be interoperable with other sites such as the *Walt Whitman Archive*, the *Emily Dickinson Archives*, and NINES’s ever-expanding research index.

In the works for several years, MEL is now ready for development and launching. Hofstra’s Faculty Computing Service is highly committed to this unusual digital humanities project, as is evident in its ongoing work on TextLab. MEL’s editorial teams, consisting of renowned Melville scholars and digital humanists in allied fields, are eager to get Melville online in innovative yet reliable ways, and the project’s leadership has a proven track record in editing and digital scholarship. Even so, recognizing the difficulty of mounting any born-digital site, we have scheduled the output of our editions carefully. Our plan for Year One is to focus on *Battle-*

Pieces because, as a moderate-size volume with few variants, it poses the fewest textual problems and only minor workflow issues so that the editors can adjust their time to focus on schema and metadata design. At the same time, the scheduled launch of *Versions of Battle-Pieces* in Fall, 2010 will anticipate the sesquicentennial of the Civil War by only a few months, thus stimulating interest in Melville and the war, a topic to be examined in our MELville Camp that fall. Because the relevant print texts of *Moby-Dick* are few, and because Bryant's scholarship on the work is complete, the editing of this famously long prose work will involve mark-up of already prepared revision sites, sequences, and narratives and should pose only moderate workflow problems. *Billy Budd*, however, presents the greatest digital challenge. It is the focal text in our development of TextLab, and we have already begun drafting preliminary mark-up and transcribed selected manuscript leaves. Even so, we will spread the work of editing *Billy Budd* over all three years of the proposed grant period. By the end of Year Three, the diplomatic transcription and base version of the *Billy Budd* manuscript will be completed.

Because Melville continues to be a popular and critically useful writer, nationally and internationally, we have no doubt that MEL will attract numerous online users, and Hofstra has the capacity, academic standing in Melville studies, and computing staff to maintain the site in perpetuity. With further development and testing, MEL's TextLab will become a model for collaborative editing in other digital archives. One case in point: Beat Generation scholars are currently contemplating an online edition of the versions of Kerouac's *On the Road* based on fluid-text principles that would also draw upon MEL's TextLab technology.

The presence of Melville in our culture and the world has grown steadily since WWII, seeping into the imaginations of readers and artists everywhere. Melville speaks to the modern world, whether the issue is democracy, sexuality, or terrorism; whether his prose or poetry discloses hidden layers of anxiety in the dramatic loss of a leg, the hanging of John Brown, or the

killing of an innocent sailor. As interest in the Civil War sesquicentennial intensifies during the proposed grant period, we anticipate users turning to MEL’s reliable and searchable digital texts to discover Melville’s evolving encounter, in poetry and prose, with defiance and conciliation, race and class, authority and resistance, art and America. And with its focus on the editing of revision, MEL will introduce readers to Melville’s creative processes and evolving texts throughout his ever-changing writing career. In MEL, readers may come to see “the whale,” and will, but they will also find other unexpected Versions of Melville.

Work Plan

	Technical Activities	Editorial Activities
Year 1 2009-10 First Half Sep 2009 Feb 2010	Arrange Server space Begin TEI Schema [in consultation w/ Pitti, Flanders] Begin metadata design [Library staff] Begin MEL Interface [HFCS: Raja] Continue TextLab development MELville Camp 2009: Structuring and Coding MEL [dirs. Bryant & Kelley]	Acquire images <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Battle-Pieces</i> ○ <i>Billy Budd</i> manuscript (1st third) ○ <i>Billy Budd</i> (Weaver ed.) Double-key <i>Battle-Pieces</i> & <i>Billy Budd</i> (Weaver) <i>Battle-Pieces</i> Team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Collate <i>Battle-Pieces</i> print texts [Juxta] ○ Edit base version & mark-up Revision Sites ○ Edit Revision Narratives ○ Proofing <i>Billy Budd</i> Team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mark-up Revision Sites ○ Begin Diplomatic Transcription of MS ○ Proofing
Year 1 2009-10 Second Half Mar 2010 Aug 2010	Consult on Juxta [Laiacona] Continue TEI Schema Continue metadata design Continue TextLab development Complete MEL Interface	Acquire images <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Billy Budd</i> manuscript (1st third) <i>Battle-Pieces</i> Team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mark-up Revision Sites ○ Edit Revision Narratives ○ Proof Versions of <i>Battle-Pieces</i> <i>Billy Budd</i> Team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mark-up Revision Sites ○ Continue Diplomatic Transcription of MS ○ Proofing
Year 2 2010-11	Continue MEL’s Schema Continue metadata design	Acquire images <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Moby-Dick</i>

<p>First Half Sep 2009 Feb 2010</p>	<p>Continue TextLab development Develop Protocols for Collaborative Editing [Bryant & teams] Launch Versions of <i>Battle-Pieces</i> MELville Camp 2010: Melville & War [dirs. Bryant & Kelley]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Billy Budd</i> manuscript (2nd third) ○ <i>Billy Budd</i> (Freeman ed.) Double-key <i>Moby-Dick & Billy Budd</i> (Freeman) <i>Moby-Dick</i> Team ○ Collate <i>Moby-Dick</i> print texts [Juxta] ○ Edit base version & mark-up Revision Sites ○ Edit Revision Narratives ○ Proofing <i>Billy Budd</i> Team ○ Mark-up Revision Sites ○ Continue Diplomatic Transcription of MS ○ Proofing
<p>Year 2 2010-11 Second Half Mar 2011 Aug 2011</p>	<p>Complete TEI Schema Complete metadata design Complete Protocols for Collaborative Editing Continue TextLab development</p>	<p>Acquire images</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Billy Budd</i> manuscript (2nd third) <i>Moby-Dick</i> Team ○ Mark-up Revision Sites ○ Edit Revision Narratives ○ Proof Versions of <i>Moby-Dick</i> <i>Billy Budd</i> Team ○ Mark-up Revision Sites ○ Continue Diplomatic Transcription of MS ○ Proofing
<p>Year 3 2011-12 First Half Sep 2011 Feb 2012</p>	<p>Continue TextLab development MELville Camp 2011: Manuscript & Transcription Launch Versions of <i>Moby-Dick</i></p>	<p>Acquire images</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Billy Budd</i> manuscript (last third) ○ <i>Billy Budd</i> (Hayford/Sealts ed.) Double-key <i>Billy Budd</i> (Hayford/Sealts ed) <i>Billy Budd</i> Team ○ Collate <i>Billy Budd</i> print texts [Juxta] ○ Edit print base version & mark-up Revision Sites ○ Mark-up print Revision Sites ○ Edit print Revision Narratives ○ Continue Diplomatic Transcription of MS ○ Proofing
<p>Year 3 2011-12 Second Half Mar 2012 Aug 2012</p>	<p>Continue TextLab development Modify MEL Interface Launch Versions of <i>Billy Budd</i></p>	<p><i>Billy Budd</i> Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mark-up print Revision Sites ○ Edit print Revision Narratives ○ Complete Diplomatic Transcription of MS ○ Proofing

Project Budget

Appendices

Appendix A.

Schedule of Future Scanning of Melville's Works

The three featured texts in the present grant proposal were chosen for the textual challenges they pose for the digitization of prose and poetry in manuscript and print, and in this regard they serve as models for further digitizing of the remainder of Melville's manuscript and published works. The remaining works are arranged below to reflect reader usage, print and manuscript texts, and their relative importance for the future structuring and hyperlinking of additional MEL texts.

2009-2012

Battle-Pieces

Moby-Dick

Billy Budd

2012-2015

Typee

Israel Potter and Magazine Pieces (16 tales, including "Bartleby" and "Benito Cereno")

Correspondence: To 1857

Journal: 1849-50

Late Poems & Burgundy Club Sketches

2015-2018

Pierre

The Confidence-Man

Clarel

Correspondence: 1858-78

Journal: 1856-67

Late Poems & John Marr

2018-2021

Redburn

Correspondence 1879-91

Journal: 1860

Late Poems & Timoleon

2021-2024

Omoo

Mardi

White-Jacket

Late Poems & Weeds and Wildings

Appendices B, C, and D.

As part of MEL's 2008-09 NEH Digital Humanities Start-Up grant, Bryant has begun to strategize ways of adapting TEI-XML coding to fluid-text protocols for the editing of revision. Following TEI's newly-released P5 Guidelines for marking revision variants (<add> and) and sequencing them with its <timeline> element, Bryant has developed a two-stage (or "stand-off") editorial approach (see storyboard, Fig. 10). That is, with a fully operational TextLab, MEL's "primary editors" would mark up directly on a digital image (either in print or manuscript) contiguous sections of text each including a single revision site and transcribe both unrevised and revised text, encoding the site's revision variants. (See Appendix B for sample of primary coding.) In a user interface, an XSLT transformation will generate a diplomatic transcription from the XML coding of text and variants, which will also be linked to a base version of the revision text. (See Appendix C for sample transcription.) With any given site's revision variants stored in a database, "secondary editors," working collaboratively with MEL associates within the Wiki framework (see storyboard, Fig. 11), will be able to view in separate frames the print or manuscript image, its transcription, base version, and marked revision sites. Furthermore, with a displayed list of variants these users may generate and preserve (also in TEI-compliant XML) a corresponding revision sequence and revision narrative for the revision site. (Appendix D for sample secondary coding.)

B. TEI-XML Primary Coding of Manuscript

Billy Budd, MS Leaves 345 & 346

See Appendix E for original document

Preliminary draft of the "Primary Editing" mark-up of two leaves from the *Billy Budd* manuscript.

```
<?xml version='1.0' encoding='UTF-8'?>
<!-- <?xml-stylesheet type="text/css" href="../support/tiny_TEI_template.css"? -->
<?xml-stylesheet type="text/xsl" href="tei.xsl">
<?oxygen RNGSchema="../support/exercise.rnc" type="compact"?>
<TEI xmlns="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0">
  <teiHeader>
    <fileDesc>
      <titleStmt>
        <title>Billy Budd Manuscript</title>
      </titleStmt>
    </fileDesc>
  </teiHeader>
  <text>
    <body>
      <div type="section">
        <head>Page 345r</head>
        <p>
          <lb/>—/—
          <lb/>Everything is for a term <unclear resp="HS">venerated</unclear> in
          <lb/>navies.
          <del xml:id="bbms345r001" type="crossout" rend="false start">Sailors</del>
```

Any tangible object ~~associated~~ with
~~any s~~
some striking incident,
of
~~that~~ ~~the~~
service is
converted into a monument. The spar
from which the Foretopman was suspended,
~~was for some years~~ was for some few
~~followed~~ years kept trace of by the
bluejackets. Their ~~knowledges~~
~~pursued~~
~~followed~~
it
from ship to deck-yard and again
from deck-yard to ship,
~~following~~
~~still pursuing~~
it
even when ~~at last~~ reduced to a meer
deck-yard boom. To them a chip of it
was as a ~~piece~~ of the Cross. Ignorant tho'
they were of the secret facts of the tragedy,
and not thinking but that the penalty was
somehow
~~justly~~
~~necessarily~~
~~unavoidably~~
inflicted from the naval point of view,

</p>

</div>

<div type="section">

<head>Page 346r</head>

<p>

~~instinctively~~ ~~view~~ for all that they ~~they~~ ~~knew~~ felt
that Billy was
~~a bully boy,~~ ~~was w~~ a ~~sort~~
of ~~true~~ man ~~as~~ incapable
~~of wilful murder~~, ~~alike~~ of ~~causeless~~
~~mutiny~~ ~~as~~ as of
wilful murder. ~~The~~ They recalled ~~his~~
the ~~fresh~~ ~~young~~ image of the
~~Hand~~ ~~hand~~ some Sailor, ~~its beauty~~

```

</b><del>and those features</del>. That face <del>upon which they</del>
</b><del>had never seen a sn</del> never deformed by <del>any</del> a
</b><del>vile</del> <add>sneer or subtler vile</add> freak <del>within</del>. of the heart within.
</p>
</div>
</body>
<div type="editorial">
  <linkGrp type="oscillating_variants">
    <link targets="#A345r006 #A345r007 #A345r008"/>
  </linkGrp>
</div>
</text>
</TEI>

```

C. Draft Transcription of *Billy Budd* MS Leaves 345 & 346

Preliminary sketching out of an (incomplete) XSLT transformation of the mark-up of two leaves from the *Billy Budd* manuscript as coded above in Appendix B.

Billy Budd Manuscript Page 345r

—/—

Everything is for a term venerated in navies. Sailors Any tangible object associated with any— some striking incident, of that the service is converted into a monument. The spar from which the Foretopman was suspended, was for some years was for some few followed years kept trace of by the bluejackets. Their knowledges pursued followed it from ship to deck-yard and again from deck-yard to ship, following still pursuing it even when at last reduced to a meer deck-yard boom. To them a chip of it was as a piece of the Cross. Ignorant tho' they were of the secret facts of the tragedy, and not thinking but that the penalty was somehow justly necessarily unavoidably inflicted from the naval point of view,

Page 346r

instinctively view for all that they they knew felt that Billy was a bully boy, was w a sort of true man as incapable of wilful murder, alike of causeless mutiny as as of wilful murder. The They recalled his the fresh young image of the Handsome Sailor, its beauty and those features. That face upon which they had never seen a sn never deformed by any a vile sneer or subtler vile freak within. of the heart within.

D. TEI-XML Secondary Coding of Manuscript

Billy Budd, MS Leaves 345 & 346

Preliminary sketching of the “Secondary Editing” mark-up (using <timeline> elements) of two leaves from the *Billy Budd* manuscript.

```

    </b>and not thinking but that the penalty was
  </b>somehow
  <subst xml:id="bbms345r010">
    <del xml:id="bbms345r010.1">justly</del>
    <add xml:id="bbms345r010.2" place="supralinear" rend="caret">
    <del xml:id="bbms345r010.3">necessarily</del>
    </add>
    <add xml:id="bbms345r010.4" place="infralinear" rend="bubble">unavoidably</add>
  </subst>inflicted from the naval point of view,
  <timeline origin="#t0">
    <when xml:id="t0" absolute="00:00:00"/>
    <when xml:id="t1" interval="unknown" since="#t0"/>
    <when xml:id="t2" since="#t1"/>
    <when xml:id="t3" since="#t2"/>
    <when xml:id="t4" since="#t3"/>
  </timeline>
  <linkGrp type="oscillation">
    <link targets="#bbms345r010.1 #t1"/>
    <link targets="#bbms345r010.2 #t2"/>
    <link targets="#bbms345r010.3 #t3"/>
    <link targets="#bbms345r010.4 #t4"/>
  </linkGrp>

  <linkGrp type="oscillating_variants">
    <link targets="#A345r006 #A345r007 #A345r008"/>
  </linkGrp>
</div>
</back>
</text>
</TEI>

```

Appendices E and F.**E. Sample of Original Document (manuscript)****Billy Budd, MS Leaves 345 & 346****See Appendices B & C for XML coding**

F. Sample of Original Document (print)

Moby-Dick, 1851 American edition, Ch. 28, p. 133

See Fig. 1B for collation of “crucifixion” revision site

Appendix G and H.

G. Participant Letters

H. Participant Resumés

Appendix I**Figures**

Statement of Grant History

MEL has received a \$23,000 NEH Digital Start-Up grant for 2008-09. The grant funds the development of a proof of concept of TextLab—see History and Duration of Edition, above, for description—which is on schedule for completion in May, 2009, and MEL’s first “Melville Camp” organizational meeting, held at Hofstra University on October 24, 2008. In addition, the grant scheduled time for the drafting of the present NEH grant proposal and work on XML coding for revision sites (see Appendices B, C, and D).