The Typescript Versions of Conrad's *Under Western Eyes*
Motivations, Intentions and Editorial Possibilities

ROGER OSBORNE

During April and May 1910, Joseph Conrad revised a typescript of *Under Western Eyes* while recovering from a nervous breakdown he suffered two months earlier. In the process of revision he made a number of large cuts which he later described variously as 'reckless', 'ruthless' and 'necessary for the 'artistic purpose of the book'. The contradictions in Conrad's retrospective references to his revision are further complicated by extant correspondence from April and May 1910 that indicates TS was shortened primarily to secure serial publication in America. Several scholars have examined TS, but none have seriously considered the implications of the latter possibility, ensuring that the prevailing idea of Conrad excludes such motivations. Close examination of TS in relation to the contradictory correspondence shows that such a motivation cannot be discounted, stressing the need for continued analysis of Conrad's revision. This analysis will be best served by an edition that highlights the unstable nature of TS. Such an edition will challenge many critics' ideas of text and authorship, but revealing the contingency of these textual processes will, I believe, encourage more studies of the growth of *Under Western Eyes* and, subsequently, enhance our understanding of Conrad's motivations and intentions.

'Razumov' to *Under Western Eyes*: December 1907–October 1911

TS is an 843 page document that accumulated between October 1908 and January 1910. Conrad began writing in December 1907, sending small batches of manuscript to his literary agent, James Pinker, who arranged for their typing and return to Conrad for correction and revision. Conrad's practice of occasionally revising the new typescript before returning to his initial composition on pages of manuscript, ensured that MS cannot be considered a complete version of *Under Western Eyes*. Because MS contains text that Conrad rejected during his correction and revision of typed batches, it can be best described as a sometimes loosely

1. A manuscript and typescript of *Under Western Eyes* are extant. The manuscript (MS) is held at the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University. The typescript (TS) is held at the Philadelphia Free Library.
2. The scope of this essay does not allow for a comprehensive description of MS or TS. For more comprehensive descriptions see Higdon, 1991, Carabine, 1996 and Osborne, 2000.
3. James Pinker was one of the first literary agents in London, representing such writers as H. G. Wells, Stephen Crane, Henry James and Arnold Bennett. He had acted as Conrad's agent since 1900, providing Conrad with generous advances which had accumulated over the years to create Conrad's large debt.
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connected collection of drafts that were immediately set aside when a typed copy was received.

The tale was first conceived as a short story called 'Razumov', but it continued to evolve as Conrad explored the personal themes contained in the narrative. Despite repeated insistences that the composition was at a penultimate stage, Conrad continued to add to the narrative throughout the first eight months of 1908 until a 288 page clean typed copy (from the messy typed copy that had accumulated to that point) was prepared in September and October 1908 by Conrad's occasional secretary, Lillian Hallowes. Comparison of this section of TS reveals the narrative problems Conrad faced at the time and shows how deeply the writer was drawing from his personal experiences. In October 1908, Conrad insisted that 'Razumov' would conclude as a seven or eight chapter novel, requiring only a short period of time for completion. However, this did not occur and the narrative continued to expand. The first 288 pages of TS mark the end of a difficult ten months of composition and revision and the beginning of a further fifteen months of composition before Conrad's collapse at the end of January 1910.

Throughout 1909 Conrad continued to expand the story, adding almost five hundred pages of typescript to the pile that would become TS. The typescript is clearly divided into batches that match pages of MS, indicating that TS grew alongside MS as Conrad completed batches of manuscript and sent them for typing. (Osborne, 2000, 212–14) The typescript batches following the first 312 pages were held together with brads and eventually arranged and labelled A–T in April 1910. The last batch of typed copy was probably forwarded to Conrad soon after he first declared the novel complete on 26 January 1910: 'Book finished this morning too late to catch train' (Letters, 4, 320). But the stress caused by his £2700 debt to Pinker, his immersion in the personal narrative and the prospect that Under Western Eyes would not make enough money to erase his debt brought on a complete nervous breakdown at the end of January 1910. Conrad's first version of Under Western Eyes was finished, but it faced inevitable corrections and revisions. How much revision Conrad planned to do before his breakdown may never be known.

Conrad did not touch TS again until the end of March 1910, but he clearly needed to execute some revision because the latter parts of the novel had yet to be divided into chapters and he had not yet clearly defined the division of parts. With blue pencil, Conrad cut large sections of text from his new arrangement of parts and chapters during April 1910, before revising the remaining pages with

---

4. Carshine's studies of the influence of Conrad's personal history on the composition and revision of Under Western Eyes are indispensable. However, see also Moser, 1983, and Moser, 1984, for discussions on the characters Razumov and Natalia Haldin and their possible models: Ford Madox Ford, Olive Garnett and Sergey Stepanik. The variation between MS and TS in this section is substantial because of a lost intermediate typescript. After page 312 of TS, the pages of typescript are the first typing of corresponding batches of manuscript and show little substantive variation.
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grey pencil. This process of division and revision produced the second distinct version of *Under Western Eyes*.

Despite the uncertainty of Conrad's motivations during his revision of TS, *Under Western Eyes* was published serially in America and England before the first English and American editions appeared in October 1911. Conrad continued to correct and revise two clean typed copies of TS and galley proofs of the *English Review* serialisation. The American serial and American first edition, however, received little of Conrad's attention. The serialisation of *Under Western Eyes* in the *North American Review* was set from one of the clean typed copies of the revised text of TS (TSR) and house styled, but Conrad did not see or comment on proofs, leaving this published text closest to TSR in terms of substantive variation. Harper and Brothers' first American edition was set from published pages and galley proofs of the *English Review*, like Methuen, but this set of proofs was not corrected and revised to the same extent because of Conrad's general disregard for the American publication and the pressure of meeting Harper and Brothers' printing deadlines. The transmission of text through these publications has its own difficulties, but for the purposes of this essay, it shows Conrad's satisfaction with the revised text of TS. Conrad's later acceptance of the new text does not, however, erase the mixed motivations and possible intentions that must have raced through his mind in the first months of 1910. To better understand the status of TS and Conrad's motivations and intentions in the first months of 1910 a closer look at the revision is necessary.

**The Division and Revision of TS: April and May 1910**

Conrad began revising TS at the end of March 1910, then sent a batch of corrected typescript to his lawyer, Robert Garnett, on 7 April, writing in the accompanying letter, 'I send you this batch trusting to your kindness to have it put in hand at some good typing office. Another lot will follow in a few days but I can't yet work at this sort of thing for longer than one hour at a time' (*Letters*, 4, 323). According to this letter Edward Garnett planned a visit to his ailing friend which Conrad welcomed. After this visit, Conrad continued to work on TS and sent another batch of typescript to Robert Garnett on 14 April, writing,

Thanks for your kind letter. This batch is rather slender but the next early next week shall be bigger. A request I must make that if you feel inclined to look at the stuff at all you will use the shortened copy such as I mean it to appear serially. (*Letters*, 4, 323–24)

---

5. For a more detailed discussion of this period, see Osborne, 2000, 183–203.
6. In late January 1910, Conrad and Pinker argued heatedly after the final pages of MS were supplied, causing a rift that took several months to heal. In the interim, Robert Garnett provided the assistance usually managed by Pinker. Edward Garnett was a reader for several publishers and a prominent literary critic of the time. In 1910, he and Conrad had been friends for more than a decade.
Scholars have ignored the implications of this letter, which suggests that the large revisions in blue indelible pencil could have been executed to secure serial publication. Throughout the composition of *Under Western Eyes*, Conrad discussed the possibility of shortening the text for serial publication. The most dramatic example of such a plan occurred three months earlier, on 29 December 1909, when he wrote to Perceval Gibbon:  

> to give [Pinker] a chance of serialising I'll take the guts out artistically. It'll take me three days extra. And then I shall come to see you whooping and singing savage warsongs with an eagle's feather in my hair and Pinker's scalp at my waist. Amen! *(Letters, 4, 311–12)*

Conrad had a history of offering shorter works for serialisation: He and Ford Madox Ford produced a drastically shortened version of their collaboration, *Romance*, for Pinker to offer to magazines; he willingly allowed *Nostromo* to be compressed for *T. P's Weekly*, and he published a short serial version of *The Secret Agent* before increasing the novel by over 26,000 words for book publication. When looking back at the differences between the serial version and the book version of *The Secret Agent* in the context of his contract with Methuen, Conrad explained that the text first shown to Methuen was "An abbreviated text for purposes of serial pub" *(Letters, 5, 179)*. Later in 1910, Conrad showed what he was willing to do to secure magazine publication by cutting the text of 'A Smile of Fortune' for the *London Magazine*, telling Pinker, 'if terms allow you make it up to [£]55 for me shall deliver altered MS by Friday' *(Letters, 4, 389)*. Conrad's attitude to serial publication seen in these letters and other comments throughout his correspondence suggest that the large cuts could have been primarily motivated by his desire and need to secure serial publication.  

The possibility of such an action is further supported by correspondence between John Galsworthy and Edward Garnett, two of Conrad's closest friends. In reply to Galsworthy's query about Conrad's health on 24 April 1910, Garnett outlined what was required for Conrad to get on with his career. Unfortunately, this letter is lost, leaving us to ponder exactly what Garnett's letter actually contained, but Galsworthy's response offers some explanation. Galsworthy wrote,  

---

7. Perceval Gibbon was a young writer and friend of Conrad's. The two had maintained a regular correspondence for the previous six months and occasionally visited each other.
9. Conrad sent the altered text on [24 or 25] November 1910, with instructions and the comment, 'I am disgusted at the silly job but what has been agreed to is performed' *(Letters, 4, 391)*.
10. Galsworthy had read a copy of the typescript prepared by Miss Hallowes in late 1908 and gave Conrad an unfavourable opinion of the story, suggesting truncation. However, it is not likely that this was a primary influence for Conrad's revisions in April 1910.
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Yes, I agree about Conrad, but personally I know of no young fellow who would take on the job. ... Is the novel cut down for America yet? (Garnett, 1934, 178)

Negotiations with Harper and Brothers and the dire need of certain income could have motivated Conrad to execute the cuts he would later describe as 'reckless' and 'ruthless'. One can only wonder about the role of the 'young fellow', but an assistant for the retrieval of the long version could be possible. While there is no proof to suggest Garnett played a hand in the shortening, his visit in April 1910 could not have passed without some discussion of the fate of Under Western Eyes. It is conceivable that Edward Garnett recommended the cuts. In his introduction to Conrad's Prefaces To His Works Garnett recounts, 'Looking back on the period, 1907, when [Under Western Eyes] was written, in the light of all that has happened since, one sees how admirable is the atmosphere and perspective of the picture, though Miss Haldin is the weakness of the book' (Garnett 1971, 27). Garnett was well aware of the passages containing Miss Haldin's possibilities that were cut in April 1910. His presence during the period of this revision, his communication to Galsworthy that the novel was 'cut down for America' and this retrospective comment have a resonance that cannot be ignored.

Conrad's correspondence reveals a strong attitude to American publication that places the implications of this letter in context. When discussing the prospect of American publication with Pinker in December 1909, Conrad wrote,

'It's all a matter of money. I have the same intense dislike for all these American humbugs in the publishing line. If McClure should take it I would be a chance of serial in Eng. On the other hand Harpers, I suppose, pay the price for both countries (Letters, 4, 306–7).

Conrad's correspondence clearly indicates the possibility that he was motivated by his desire to publish serially and ensure book publication in America. However, this possibility remains one of several possibilities without further proof.

There is no record of Conrad's comments on this shortening and revision until September and October 1911 when he described his actions variously as 'ruthless', 'reckless' and necessary for the 'artistic purpose of the book'. Conrad first described the cuts to John Quinn, a collector of manuscripts, who had requested some of Conrad's manuscripts for his collection. Conrad wrote on 25 September,

The MS of Under Western Eyes will have to be checked and arranged, being in a state of great confusion and scattered in various receptacles. It consists of upwards of 1300 pp and contains a great deal more text than has appeared in print. I have been cutting down that novel ruthlessly. (Letters, 4, 480)

The MS was dispatched at the end of September and Quinn forwarded a draft for £60 in November 1911 to conclude the exchange (Letters, 4, 514). The novel
was published in London on 5 October 1911 and Conrad began to receive responses to the publication soon after. John Galsworthy, who had read the excised scenes in November 1908, expressed some reservations and Conrad replied, acknowledging that some revisions may have been ill-advised:

Yes. There is no arguing against what you say. One could attempt to explain certain things but it would be an unprofitable occupation.... You know there are about 30000 words more than the printed text. Revising while ill in bed I am afraid I have struck out whole pages recklessly.... There are passages which should have remained. I wasn't in a fit state to judge them. (Letters, 4, 486)

How does one interpret these letters? Is Conrad's description of 'ruthless cuts' a ploy to make MS more attractive to Quinn? Were some of the cuts reckless and ill advised while Conrad recovered from his nervous breakdown? Carabine and Higdon and Sheard have assessed the passages critically, and attest to their quality, but demonstrate their dispensability in relation to the newly conceived narrative with which most readers of Under Western Eyes are familiar. However, they do not pursue the possibility that Conrad was motivated by something other than narrative concerns. Conrad's response to Galsworthy's disappointment is understandable, but it does not clearly identify a primary motivation for the cuts, leaving the question of why Conrad decided to cut the scenes unanswered.

A letter to Olivia Garnett complicates the issue even more. Despite the admission of 'ruthless' and 'reckless' revision to Quinn and Galsworthy, Conrad gave a different account to Edward Garnett's sister on 20 October 1911. Conrad apologised for the simplicity of Natalia Haldin in his only extant letter to Olivia Garnett, writing,

You are a good critic. That girl does not move. No excuse can be offered for such a defect but there is an explanation. I wanted a pivot for the action to turn on. She had to be a pivot. And I had to be very careful because if I had allowed myself to make more of her she would have killed the artistic purpose of the book: the development of a single mood. It isn't that I was afraid or ignorant of her possibilities. Indeed they were very tempting. But it had to be a performance on one string. It had to be. You may think such self-imposed limitation a very stupid thing. But something of the kind must be done or else novel-writing becomes a mere debauch of the imagination. No doubt if I had taken another line the book would have been much richer. But what I aimed at this time was an effect of virtuosity before anything else. Still I need not have made Miss Haldin a mere peg as I am sorry to admit she is. Result of over caution. (Letters, 4, 489–90)

Olivia Garnett was probably aware of the changes that Conrad made to the character of Natalia Haldin. According to Thomas Moser, she read a typescript of Under Western Eyes in August 1910, recording the event in her diary (Moser,
1984, 31)." Olivia Garnett's critique could have been prompted by her awareness of the 'possibilities' of the character. Carabine cites this letter as evidence that Conrad, motivated only by the artistic requirements of the narrative, used Miss Haldin as a 'peg' to produce a 'single mood'. However, he ignores Conrad's admission that the character of Natalia Haldin was a 'defect' and that he was 'sorry' that he had made her a 'mere peg'. Despite the artistic assertion, there is a tone of regret in this letter, making it difficult to relate this letter to Conrad's artistic intentions without acknowledging the ambiguity of the entire letter. Conrad was not likely to share his major narrative problems with Olivia Garnett, so this letter should be read, I believe, with some reserve and in conjunction with the letters described in the previous paragraph. Where this letter expresses some artistic motivation with a tinge of regret, the other letters scream 'reckless' and 'ruthless'. These letters get us no closer to a conclusive statement about Conrad's motivation unless we suppress their ambiguity.

The possibility of a motivation to compress the novel to secure serialization has not been explored by other scholars who have concentrated on Conrad's psychological motivations and the problems with the narrative, but as these letters show, the possibility cannot be discounted. Roderick Davis acknowledges the effect that the breakdown had on Conrad's state of mind, arguing, 'Clearly the burden of revision had been on a reviser in less than top form. And lacking the energy and clarity of mind to deal adequately with questionable elements of either small or large scope, the confused and exhausted author must have relied on deletions of these as the least taxing solution to whatever appeared troublesome' (Davis, 1977, 62). Davis also argues that several passages might have been cut because they were 'too revelatory of [Conrad's] own inner life and professional aims for him to permit their publication' (ibid., 68). Carabine expands on many of Davis's points because he had access to TS which was only discovered in the Philadelphia Free Library in 1980, several years after Davis conducted his study. Employing the MS and TS to describe Conrad's method of composition and revision, Carabine argues that Conrad's difficulty with the character of Natalia Haldin 'guided his final reshaping of the novel' (Carabine, 1996, 130); that the connections between Peter Ivanovitch, Tolstoy and Dostoevsky were cut because 'they ... served to muddy [Conrad's] conception and presentation of Peter, and to distract the reader' (Carabine 1993, 8); and that revision was required to mend a 'deficient chronology and the absence of a relationship between Razumov and Natalia, which were both highlighted by the protagonist's belated plot of evil and redemption' (Carabine, 1996, 199). Higdon and Sheard conclude that Conrad

---

11. The passage in Olivia Garnett's diary reads, 'Mon. 1st Aug 1910 ... Began 'Under Western Eyes' by Conrad, typewritten with corrections' (in Moser, 1984, 31, n., 42). The typescript that Olivia Garnett read, could have been TS, because it remained in Edward Garnett's possession, but she might also refer to the typed copy organized and corrected by Robert Garnett. Nevertheless, it is possible that she was informed of Conrad's large omissions.
had to cut some scenes from TS because Natalia Haldin was trapped 'between two forces (much as Razumov was earlier trapped), but [these scenes] ultimately establish[ed] her as a protagonist and saddl[ed] Conrad with a mirrored or doubled plot he did not wish to handle' (Higdon and Sheard, 181).

As these scholars have shown, the narrative of TS before revision needed adjustments, however, Conrad's primary motivation for shortening the text has yet to be conclusively stated. The autobiographical nature of excluded passages allows critics to assert Conrad's psychological discomfort and, thus, produce a psychological motivation for the cuts. The narrative problems of the text before revision enable an argument for artistic motivations behind cuts that, in this context, were inevitable. But why did Conrad not 'fix' the text by dealing with the complexity of Natalia Haldin's character instead of making her, as he told Olivia Garnett, 'a mere peg as I am sorry to admit she is'? Was this the 'least taxing solution' as Davis suggests? Or, did Conrad plan, at the time, to return to the text and further develop the narrative as he did with his previous novel, The Secret Agent? Were there 'passages which should have remained', as he told Galsworthy; and was he in a fit state to judge their omission? Did he simply shorten the text to secure serial publication in America; and did he do so on Edward Garnett's recommendation? Some of these questions might not be taken seriously by critics, but they remain pertinent until further evidence becomes available. It might never be known exactly why Conrad decided to shorten TS, but examination of TS supports an explanation of how he did it. What this examination confirms is that Conrad decided to shorten TS during revision, not before, and that the truncation is closely connected to the implementation of parts and chapters.

*******

Despite the attention TS has received from Davis, Higdon and Carabine, a complete description of the way Conrad divided and shortened the novel has not been provided. Such a description demonstrates that Conrad decided to shorten TS during April 1910 and that the major cuts are closely related to the chapter divisions that were implemented at the time. TS was disorganized in April 1910 and was not yet divided into parts and chapters, requiring a period of preparation before revision could begin. Conrad recruited his son, Borys, to organize TS, allowing him to implement the part and chapter divisions. He admitted to Galsworthy that 'With one hand only one cannot do that sort of thing easily (and in bed at that)', and affectionately explained Borys's role, writing that his son, 'put in order for me 600 pp all unnumbered and considerably shuffled working methodically and with quiet perseverance for an hour or so every morning' (Letters, 4, 328). This probably occurred near 15 April when Conrad identified the 'shortened copy'. Because one would expect the first 288 pages to be quite well organized, Conrad's letter most likely refers to the ordering and labelling of packets A–T, the 531-page collection of typed batches to which he appended a
24-page handwritten expansion of the original 10 page MS conclusion. The first page of packet A contains a 'note for typist' that shows Conrad's progressive revision. Conrad wrote in pencil, 'All the pages are in sequence and the batches are lettered. Please carry on the numbering of the clean copy. This is the end of part II containing end of Chap IV and Chapter V'. This notation corresponds to packets A–D and marks the end of revision for Part Second. These packets would have been sent soon after Conrad had 'shortened' the text and suggests that Conrad had completed a period of organization during which he implemented part and chapter divisions and labelled the packets of unpaginated typescript with blue pencil. Conrad might have required two weeks to complete this organization. He wrote to Davray on 3 May that 'I have been back at work for eight days', (Letters, 4, 325) suggesting that, given he had been revising since early April, he only began the second and more difficult phase of revision on 26 April 1910.

Conrad probably revised TS with two separate procedures that were executed between 15 April and 11 May 1910. Conrad wrote to John Galsworthy on 17 May 1910 to tell him that the revision of the TS was finished:

I finished the revise of Raz. on the night of Wednesday last — say a week ago [11 May 1910]. For the next 24 hours I lay supine but not so broken up as I feared.... I thought that Garnett would let you know that the book was out of my hands at last, and that the stage of negotiation has been reached. He has been most friendly and wonderfully kind, volunteering to read over and correct the clean final copy. With three superimposed revisions there were a good many phrases without grammar and even without sense to be found in the rough typed copy. And I dreaded the task of wading through all that shallow, sticky stuff again. (Letters, 4, 328)

Conrad's description of 'three superimposed revisions' probably refers to ink revisions that were executed during composition and revision that occurred on two separate occasions in April and May 1910.

Higdon and Carabine disagree about the complexity of the layers of revision found on TS. Higdon has argued that Throughout the typescript, Conrad revised in black ink, blue pencil, and black lead pencil, and it is easily demonstrable that these represent three different layers of revision done at different times.

12. I follow Carabine in referring to this packet as 'X'.
13. It is important to note that packets A–T contain one or more batches neatly, suggesting that the batches were arranged or bradded individually before they were collected within the larger packet. The exceptions are packet J and N where the original batch divisions are not followed (Osborne, 2000, 214).
14. Chapter divisions are found in packets C, D/E, G, I, K, M, Q and T.
15. There is some uncertainty whether Conrad referred to Robert or Edward Garnett. Nevertheless, the TS remained in Edward Garnett's possession and was sold during the April 1928 sale of the Edward Garnett collection. The TS was sold to Gabriel Wells for $2200 (Higdon 1991a, 84).
(Higdon, 1991a, 93). But, Carabine concludes that 'we cannot always differentiate between or establish precise 'times' of the first and second revisions' (Carabine, 1996, 93). The issue of 'timing' is less complex, however, when one considers that most of the revision of TS occurred in two phases between April 15 and May 11 1910: a phase of division and shortening dominated by blue pencil; and a second phase of revision, done with lead pencil and some blue pencil, in response to that shortening.

Consistently distinguishing between these two phases of organization and revision is sometimes difficult because of Conrad's occasionally inconsistent use of media, but close examination of TS reveals that lead pencil dominates the second phase of revision. One is faced, in the first pages of TS, with small but regular ink revision and sporadic lead pencil corrections. Blue pencil is used most frequently to strike through small and large passages, and, rarely, to execute small corrections and revisions of one or several words. Large blue cuts of more than five lines are found occasionally, but additions or expansions are rarely connected with these omissions. The most substantial cuts were executed in shortening Part Second where Conrad struck through twelve pages between TS215 and TS227, eighteen pages between TS238 and TS256 and nineteen pages between TS269 and TS287, excising most of the composition he had laboured over between May and October 1908. Inconsistent layering is introduced on TS38 where a lead pencil correction lies underneath a blue pencil omission. On TS133 ink is used after a blue pencil omission, adding several lines and crossing over the omission with a long directive arrow. These examples mark the beginning of occasional inconsistent use, predominantly, of grey and blue pencils. Lead pencil was used frequently to assist the typist recruited by Robert Garnett, signaling


17. Few examples of ink providing the last layer of revision can be detected. Most ink revisions probably occurred before Conrad's breakdown in January 1910.

18. TS137 shows ink beneath a blue deletion, but used after the blue deletion as a transition. On TS171 a blue correction is underneath a blue omission. On TS188 Conrad rewrote the last sentence of a ten-line cut in ink (possibly before the deletion was marked) to allow the paragraph to flow smoothly. On TS190 ink and blue pencil alternate. In the very large cuts in the Geneva episodes blue pencil covers pencil corrections and ink revisions. On TS232 blue pencil and ink are used together. On TS265 blue pencil covers an earlier lead pencil strike-through. On TS284 a one-word revision was first executed in blue, overwritten with ink, then omitted with many other pages in a large blue omission.

19. Conrad used blue pencil for these directions on the first 288 pages of TS, but beginning with the lead pencil instructions on the first page of packet 'A', lead pencil was used for these instructions, often clarifying blue notation. For example: on TS269 Conrad first wrote 'end of III' but later inserted a pencil 'ch' to produce 'end of ch III'; on TS287 Conrad first wrote 'Part II' with blue pencil on the top of the page, but later inserted the lead pencil 'Chap IV begins' immediately below; and on the nineteenth page of packet 'K' Conrad first indicated the beginning of the fourth
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the end of chapters or parts (e.g. 'end of part II' on the last page of packet 'D') or indicating the contents of a packet (e.g. 'Part III I continued' on the first page of packet 'G'). Lead pencil was used to inscribe notes to the typist and becomes more prominent in later packets until it is used exclusively to revise packet T and write packet 'X'. Conrad's directions to the typist, the increasing incidence of lead pencil revision in the latter packets of TS and the exclusive use of lead pencil on packet T and packet 'X' combine to strongly suggest that Conrad's lead pencil dominated the final layer of revision.

The truncation of TS focussed on the characters of Miss Haldin and Peter Ivanovitch. The text of what we know as chapter 3 of Part Two in print form was extracted from pages 235–287 of TS. This section contains approximately 11,100 words, but was first divided on TS at the bottom of TS265 to make separate chapters of approximately 5,800 and 5,300 words respectively. These had been labelled as VI and VII in October 1908, preceding Conrad's mistake in repeating VII on TS287. Chapter VI and Chapter VII were subsequently conflated during Conrad's revision and substantially shortened in April 1910 by excising large passages of dialogue between Miss Haldin and the Narrator from chapter VI and the entire cafe scene in chapter VII where the Narrator and Peter Ivanovitch feature. These are certainly the passages that Conrad wanted Robert Garnett to ignore when he asked him to read 'the shortened copy such as I mean it to appear serially'.

Conrad's chapter division on TS in April 1910 produced several significant changes that suggest his decision to shorten TS was made during his organisation and division, not before. Conrad changed the inked 'VI' (inserted in August 1908) to a blue 'III' on TS235 to conform with the new four-part structure, then proceeded to TS265 where he had inked a division and written 'end of VI' in October 1908, emphasizing Miss Haldin's plea, 'I want to know...'. After crossing out these marks with blue pencil, Conrad turned the page and replaced the inked 'VII' on TS266 with a blue 'IV'. Soon after this division Conrad decided to conflate these chapters. The inked 'VII' on TS287 was changed to a blue 'IV' and Conrad returned to TS265–66 and crossed out all previous divisions with blue pencil. A blue notation 'end of III' was then added to TS269 with the note 'To page 287. In this scenario, the notation 'end of III' had to occur after Conrad first labeled TS265 'IV' and after he decided to begin chapter 'IV' on TS287. We must conclude that Conrad decided to shorten TS during his organization and division of TS, not before.

---

chapter of Part Three with a blue 'IV' and and wrote 'Part III end of III' at the top of the page. He came back later with pencil to stress 'chapter IV' and expanded his top of page notation to read, 'Part III end of III begin IV on new page end of III (lead pencil represented with italics). Such additions stress that Conrad looked over the TS twice and often used pencil during the second phase.

20. Conrad made a similar mistake in Part Four. See below.

21. For further discussion of these cuts see (Carabine, 1996) and (Higdon and Sheard, 1987).
The addition of packet 'X', the handwritten expansion of the final chapter of the novel first attempted in MS, has been placed by scholars in both January 1910 and April/May 1910. Carabine argues that Conrad wrote this 24 page chapter at the end of January 1910, then returned to TS in April and May to revise TS in response to the new ending (Carabine 1996, 57). However, there are several problems with Carabine's chronology. 21 First, packet 'X', which became chapter five of Part Four, is marked as 'Part IV' chapter 'IV' in lead pencil on the top of its first page. 22 This matches the lead pencil notations that appear on the last page of extant typescript. Conrad wrote 'Part IV end of III' at the top of the page and 'end of III' was interlined above the third last line of type. This mistake in chapter numbering carries on from Conrad's mistake of repeating 'III' on the fifth page of packet 'T' and writing 'Part IV.III.' in blue at the top of that page. Conrad had already implemented that division correctly on the eighteenth page of packet 'Q'. 23 The most important part of these connections is that Conrad would not have been able to identify these chapter numbers in January 1910 because they were not inserted until April. Because Conrad wrote the final section of the novel in connection with packet 'T' and because all of the revision done to packet 'T' is done in pencil (the packet is marked 'T' in pencil, directions to the typist are marked in pencil and packet 'X' was written entirely in lead pencil) it is most likely that the composition of packet 'X' was the last major revision Conrad executed and was sent to Garnett with packet 'T' on 11 May 1910. The second version of Joseph Conrad's *Under Western Eyes* was complete.

**Towards an Edition of the Typescript of *Under Western Eyes***

Despite the availability of TS, the primary motivation behind Conrad's decision to shorten the text in April 1910 is obscured by ambiguous and contradictory correspondence. After his comprehensive examination of Conrad's composition and revision, Carabine admits, 'Clearly we can never know, finally, why Conrad 'slashed' his TS so drastically in 1910' (Carabine, 1993, 25). My own analysis of the documents and correspondence does not conclusively describe Conrad's mo-

---

22. Carabine uses dates written MS and TS to support his argument, but I have shown elsewhere that these dates are, if not ambiguous, incorrect (Osborne, 2000, 148-50).

23. In fact, the entire packet is written in lead pencil. Inspection of the paper Conrad used for these final pages reveals that it matches the paper used for the final batch of the MS. Both have the watermark, 'Fine Commercial', but there is a light variation in the dimensions of the two batches. The MS batch measures 201mm by 253mm and the TS batch measures 200mm by 258mm. Conrad's use of ink on the former and pencil on the latter, combined with the small variation in paper size, suggest they were produced on two different occasions.

24. Another piece of evidence on the first page of 'T' supports this interpretation. Conrad first wrote in pencil 'end of III begg of IV' then crossed out everything but the 'III' and added 'cont' in pencil. If the previous packets had been sent to Garnett, Conrad had only the blue 'III' on the fifth page to refer to and adjusted his notation accordingly.
The Typescript Versions of *Under Western Eyes*

...tivations and intentions, but highlights, instead, the contradictions of the extant correspondence in relation to the way TS was revised. The textual condition of *Under Western Eyes* supports many editorial approaches. Capturing Conrad’s ‘final’ intentions is probably best achieved by using the revised text of TS as copy text and drawing substantive readings primarily from Methuen’s first English edition. Alternatively, one could follow a sociological approach and select one of the collected editions from the 1920s as a reading text and accept all textual change incorporated during Conrad’s lifetime. But, because of the large amount of variation, such approaches would conceal the complexity, contradictions and uncertainty of TS in an apparatus too difficult to decipher. Therefore, an edition that presents the dynamics of Conrad’s revision would be a significant contribution to Conrad scholarship, providing a version of *Under Western Eyes* that, to this time, has been available to only a handful of scholars. Using the first *unstable* version of *Under Western Eyes* as a reading text, the revisions can be recorded in a foot-of-page apparatus to enable readers to quickly incorporate the variant from the revised text in their reading. This design will force readers to radiate from the variant and confront the uncertainty of Conrad’s motivations and intentions in the first months of 1910. An edition based on the extant typescript will challenge Conradians’ ideas of text and authorship and influence, I believe, new ways of thinking about Conrad’s texts.

Roger Osborne works at the Australian Scholarly Editions Centre, in the School of Language, Literature and Communication, University of New South Wales ADFA, where he completed his PhD on textual criticism of *Under Western Eyes* in 2000.
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25. Variants from MS can also be recorded, but because they significantly affect only the first 288 pages of TS, a separate apparatus in the back of the edition would be more useful.
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