

J·D·H·L·S

Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies

Citation details

Title: **APPENDIX: EDITORIAL METHOD AND ITS EFFECTS**

Author: Paul Eggert

Source: *Journal of the D. H. Lawrence Society*, vol. 5.3 (2020)

Pages: 111–18

Copyright: individual author and the D. H. Lawrence Society.
Quotations from Lawrence's works © The Estate of Frieda
Lawrence Ravagli. Extracts and poems from various publications
by D. H. Lawrence reprinted by permission of Pollinger Limited
(www.pollingerltd.com) on behalf of the Estate of Frieda Lawrence
Ravagli.

**A Publication of the
D. H. Lawrence Society of Great Britain**

APPENDIX: EDITORIAL METHOD AND ITS EFFECTS

The following observations extend claims and remarks about editorial methodology in *The Poems* made more briefly in the main text of this essay.

(1) *Rhyming Poems*: Authorial revisions in TS143a and TS143b (see note 19 above)

Pollnitz deals with the different authorial revisions that the now-lost setting copy for *Rhyming Poems* in *Col*, TS143a, and its extant duplicate TS143b would have borne by invoking a principle of chronological supersession:

Since LP [Laurence Pollinger, Lawrence's agent] decided at random which duplicate typescript to take to Secker and which to forward to New York, the extant carbon, TS143b, is deemed to have equal authority with the lost ribbon copy (TS143a) ... autograph corrections found in TS143b but not in *Col* are presumed to represent a later authorial intention. (ii. 821–2)

I question whether chronology (“a later authorial intention”) is the right principle to invoke here. A revision on one typescript not copied to the other may have been the result of oversight or carelessness, but equally its absence on the other one may have resulted from a change of mind. We simply don't know. All we know for sure is that Lawrence made the revision on one of them, which we must accept as being intentional.

Pollnitz does not discuss whether there are any cases of competing revisions (i.e. when *Col* does not incorporate the authorial revision visible on TS143b and does not follow its typed state either, meaning that it may have been made on TS143a). Here chronology *would* be pertinent (e.g. if one revised reading was clearly a development of the other), but elsewhere both typescripts would be needed if there were to be any hope of tracking Lawrence's

inscriptions back and forth between them in order to find the final reading. For one case where it did prove possible, see Paul Eggert, ‘Document or Process as the Site of Authority: Establishing Chronology of Revision in Competing Typescripts of Lawrence’s *The Boy in the Bush*’, *Studies in Bibliography*, 44 (1991), 364–76.

(2) Silent categories, ColA and other errors noticed (see note 21 above)

One of the versions collated for ‘A Man Who Died’, ColA, does not appear in the apparatus at all, and so I suspected a silent category had overruled the recording. I inquired of the editor and he kindly sent me a list of all nine ColA variants in *The Poems*. This showed that there is an error in the Cambridge Edition here: at line 45 ColA (not Col as stated) reads “thought:” whereas the reading text and Col read “thought;” (ii. 837).

Being a photographic reproduction ColA normally reads identically with Col; but in rare cases (caused by glitches in its printing process) it can vary. Where ColA is given as one of the versions collated, *not* reporting a variant in ColA in any entry would normally mean it is not variant: *i.e.*, it coincides with the reading text. There are three other cases in this poem’s apparatus where a Col variant is reported (correctly) but the reading in ColA is not given.

To remove this ambiguity in the apparatus what is needed is a statement like this: “ColA always reads the same as Col except where otherwise specified”. This is implied at ii. 822, but it needs spelling out. Contrarily, ‘Whether or Not’ does list a variant in ColA but the siglum is not listed as a Version collated. This is another error to be noted (ii. 852).

Other errors noticed (**bold** text in original):

At ii. 716 line 15 for were read was

At ii. 896 line 22 for **Trans** 00). read **Trans** 846).

At ii. 941 line 27 for **Layout**: In LWH read **Layout**: In P61b, LWH and AC139a

- At ii. 944 line 10 for the print read the type
- At ii. 991 line 3-up for 11 MS177, read 11 MS117,
- At ii. 1112 line 3 for prepared to< read prepared to>
- At iii. cv line 4 for the “The read “The
- At iii. 1755 line 8 for HC read HC.
- At iii. 1818 line 9 for MS37b read TS37b
- At iii. 1842 line 7 for version]2] read version [2]

(3) *Pansies* and its exclusions (see notes 26 and 30 above)

For *Pansies*, although the apparatus is rich, the decision not to record the texts of the *Pansies* notebook MS150 and Lawrence’s own first (extant) typing TS164a is disappointing. It flows from the decision to employ his third typing TS167c as base-text. Pollnitz justifies the decision as follows: “His revision of the *pensées* in his second and third typings was too extensive to make it necessary to refer to the notebooks, and even the first typescript is only appealed to to confirm a few details of layout” (ii. 1076). Once again the editorial focus can be seen to be on the minimum requirements necessary to establish final-intentions reading texts, not on settling the historical record of the poems’ changes.

Nevertheless, the editorial approach adopted brings the poems expurgated from the first editions of *Pansies* (those which appeared only in the unexpurgated printings) back into the fold: e.g. ‘There is no way out—’ (see ii. 1111–12). And selecting TS167c as base-text solved the problem of sequencing the poems since “In all states of the unexpurgated edition, short poems were moved about to balance pages and save paper. In *Pa* [Secker’s edition] and *PaA* [Knopf’s] the sequence was broken up and compacted by the omission of 14 *pensées*” (ii. 1077), as noted above.

(4) *Amores* and its proofs (see note 30 above)

One cost of not fully engaging with the complete transmission of the poems edited in Volumes I and II became apparent during the

preparation of Volume III, in which Pollnitz had to reject his earlier inferences (given at ii. 692) about the extant sets of proofs of *Amores*: P49b and P49c. The English typesetting of *Amores* (symbol *Am*) was corrected from P49c. (A third, uncorrected set P49a was used to set the New York edition.)

Comparison of P49b's authorial corrections, which only occurred in its first four "signatures" (when in bound form, the first four folded sheets, pp. 1–64), with the text of the English edition shows that P49b was not used in the production process. In Volume II, this revision stage in P49b was regarded as experimentation only that Lawrence rejected before recording his new readings on the other proof set P49c. Suspiciously, those recordings only appear on the last five signatures of P49c (pp. 65–178).

In Volume III Pollnitz points out that the revision stage that occurred in the last five signatures of P49c and was transmitted to *Am* does not prove that its first four have authority since there could easily have been some accidental exchange of corrected and uncorrected signatures as Lawrence was returning them, perhaps instalment by instalment corresponding to his receipt of them, via his agent to the publisher. The example Pollnitz gives – a startlingly different description of Miriam's face in 'Last Words to Miriam [1]' (iii. 1917–18) – involves only one signature, but the problem involves all four.

Since the edition in Volumes I and II does not revert for its emendations to the proofs of *Am*, and since the *Am* readings in only 13 of the 60 poems in *Am* (the ones Lawrence did not type in TS143b) were deemed relevant to the editing there, and also since TS143b is chosen as the basis of the reading texts of the *Am* poems in *Col*, it follows that the reading texts of the affected poems sourced from *Am* need revisiting, at least those that fall within the first four signatures. (In fact, some autograph corrections of punctuation in P49b are drawn upon in Volume III in the separate editing of the *Am* collection, but that does not fully address the objection. See iii. 1918.)

Pollnitz disputes the need for the revisiting, arguing: “For Volumes I and II of this edition, the texts of interest are not those he might have wished to see in print when correcting the proofs of *Amores* in May 1916, but those which served as the basis for his November 1927 reworking” (iii. 1918). However, the moment you open the door to retrieving readings from documents before the base-text there is no logical reason to stop only at the first one you encounter: in this case, *Am*.

Thus Lawrence’s intentions for some readings in *Am* were probably frustrated by accident or oversight, which he did not recall in 1927–28 or perhaps never recognised. TS143b perpetuated the error, and yet those intentions are not respected by making good in Volume III, despite the statement elsewhere that “passively accepted error has been corrected in this edition” (ii. 821). The outcome was not recognised during work on Volumes I and II. Pollnitz’s digging in here in Volume III only brings the paradox of all final-intentions editing to the surface: aiming to create the intended text of the work the editor establishes the text of what is only another version.

Similarly, in April 1921 when Lawrence’s newly appointed agent Curtis Brown mislaid recently revised (and still extant) manuscript copies of ‘Hibiscus and Salvia Flowers [2]’, ‘Purple Anemones [3]’ and ‘The Ass [2]’. The result was that their revisions were not carried forward to *BBF*, upon which volume Lawrence worked in 1927–28 when preparing for *Col*; and thus the revisions are not incorporated in the reading texts in *Poems*. Fortunately, the mislaid versions are presented in full in Volume III (see iii. cxii).

(5) Fluidity of creative expression and the editing of ‘The “Nettles” Notebook’ (see note 32, also note 24)

How does the editing of ‘The “Nettles” Notebook’ (MS170) of February–September 1929 address the underlying fluidity of Lawrence’s creative expression, given that he saw only a small number of the poems through to publication?

The great majority of the poems are able to be presented in one version based on MS170, from which many of the poems that would appear in 1932 in *Last Poems* were also taken. MS170 gives the sequence; and the 25 poems that appeared in *Nettles* in 1930 (and are therefore separately edited in Volumes I–II) are noted in the appropriate places in the sequence of MS170. Fourteen poems that Lawrence copied in August–September 1929 and sent for magazine publication or to friends have variant readings. These documents (MS180–MS184) are later than MS170, although Pollnitz states that Lawrence revised first in MS170 and then transcribed (ii. 1182). Their variant readings are in any case rejected as a group although their punctuation has been consulted when MS170's is problematic.

At such junctures a distinction emerges between (1) final-intentions editing as ordinarily conceived (the readings in these copyings are later); and (2) respect for Lawrence's "full (or nearest to full) control" of a document that contains "the last states of the text" (ii. 812). Resting on the latter, the Cambridge Edition appeals to a single Notebook document, yet the editing is not documentary. Rather, it remains critical: i.e. normally for each poem it eclectically draws on more than one document to establish a clear reading text. This upshot for the MS170 poems (at least the ones he didn't see through to publication) is not self-evidently desirable, for what is their status?

Consider, for example, the poem 'True Love at Last' (ii. 1191). The manuscript has some unresolved alternative readings, which Lawrence hasn't finalised. The need to choose and reject to create a reading text leads to a choice influenced by the corresponding reading in MS180 – understandable if this were a strictly critical text. Perhaps it is more accurately described as a hybrid documentary–critical text, but with the editorial leash straining towards the critical – as also, for instance, in 'Bells' (ii. 1206–8) where a later manuscript of the poem (MS188a) supplies punctuation deemed necessary by the editor to make a reading text where MS170 is deficient.

Clear reading texts are probably better for first-time users (and certainly easier for later citation and quotation) than a documentary

reading text with the deletions and additions enclosed within appropriate symbols. Yet the latter would be a more faithful representation of the evidence. If both texts had been provided another interest would also have been served: the desire to understand the textual genesis as inscribed by Lawrence on the manuscript page. Much the same set of observations could be made of the ‘Last Poems Notebook’.

Other volumes in the Cambridge Works that present manuscript versions in Appendixes have used the documentary method, *e.g.* the 1922 autograph of the ‘Whitman’ essay in *Studies in Classic American Literature*. To elevate documentary texts into the main section of the *Poems* edition was evidently considered a step too far.

(6) “Conservative” editing (see note 40 above, also note 43)

The term “conservative”, as applied above to Volumes I and II of *Poems*, needs explanation.

Critical editing does not mandate the use of a late base- [or copy-] text. It can, more ambitiously, start from the beginning and work forwards, weighing the evidence critically for the authority of each substantive variant separately. The copy-text itself is normally used to provide a surer footing for the punctuation, spelling and other accidentals of the reading text. Because of its fundamental reliance on editorial judgement, critical editing does not – as G. Thomas Tanselle has pointed out – strictly require a copy-text at all, even though nearly all critical editions rely on one (‘Editing without a Copy-Text’, *Studies in Bibliography*, 47 [1994], 1–22).

The closer an editor cleaves to the text of an extant document, especially if a printed one such as a first or later edition, the more conservative a critical edition is said to be. By extension, the same may be said of a preprint document, especially when the criterion of the author’s “control” is used with it: “the last state[] of the text over which Lawrence had full (or nearest to full) control” (ii. 812). Rather than choosing the document that witnessed that text poem by poem, the choice is a document for the collection as a whole. This simplifies

matters, to be sure, but restricts the editor's emending hand. For *Rhyming Poems* the control document (base-text) is TS143b; for 'The "Nettles" Notebook' it is MS170, etc.

Because it must produce readable texts *The Poems* does not always cleave as close to its base-text documents as it promises. Exceptions are cast as scarce compromises: "In rare cases reference may be made to a state of text of a particular poem which precedes the base-text" (ii. 813). This statement is a fudge: going in behind the base-text is quite common in *Rhyming Poems* but less so afterwards.