Editing D. H. Lawrence's *Collected Poems*: The Composite Typescript and Base-Text

CHRISTOPHER POLLNITZ

But I am alone, and wavering home
Along this haunted read . . .

*CP 125*

The process of assembling, ordering, and critically editing texts for the Cambridge variorum edition of D. H. Lawrence's *Poems* has been a long one, but (in spite of the provocative misprint in the 1928 *Collected Poems*) it would be over-dramatising to call the process a "haunted read," and untrue to call it lonely. Carole Ferrier's unpublished thesis and published manuscript listings,² as well as her advice and collaboration when inducting me into the project, laid the foundations on which I have continued to build. James T. Boulton's magisterial eight-volume edition of Lawrence's *Letters* has been an invaluable companion, as have Warren Roberts's *Bibliography* (the third edition of which was completed by Paul Poplawski) and the three-volume biography crafted by John Worthen, Mark Kinkead-Weekes and David Ellis. Being a member of the Cambridge Lawrence project has meant information and advice have been always at hand. On occasion, bibliographical data is of use to biographers; more often, as has been the case with the *Collected Poems*, the triangulation of biographical data with ambiguous manuscript evidence suggests new hypotheses about textual transmission. No less helpful are the already published volumes in the Cambridge University Press edition of Lawrence's *Works*, with their detailed textual introductions. From these, a new but consistent picture has emerged, of Lawrence as author and of the material production of his works.

It is rare to find a Lawrence volume not bowdlerised by a publisher. On both sides of the Atlantic, publishers bowdlerised to avoid prosecution for obscenity, on the basis of passages and usages that today seem either trivial or hilarious. The wisdom of opting for 'final expectations' or 'last intentions' as the editing theory guiding the Lawrence edition has been borne out, as volume after Cambridge volume has restored text subsequently cut from the last version over which the author had full control. Repunctuation is a less controversial but equally prevalent issue. Not only Lawrence's publishers, but the editors of what is currently the standard text for his poetry, the *Complete Poems*, routinely ignored his clear preferences with regard to punctuation.³ To restore authorial punctuation shows

*Bulletin of the Bibliographical Society of Australia & New Zealand*

28: 3 (2004): 78-96
Lawrence not only as a craftsman in this respect but also as an experimentalist. Not simply the rewriter Aldous Huxley remembered, Lawrence would revise at every stage before publication, but seldom, if ever, referred to earlier versions as he worked through typescripts and proofs. Common features of Lawrence's revision practices become apparent in the various Cambridge editions — features such as his practice of adding different autograph corrections to ribbon and carbon typescripts, when correcting copy-texts for his English and American publishers. Lawrence's common practice makes it possible for me to consult the strategies adopted by other Cambridge editors when, as happens if editions have been set from typescripts that Lawrence corrected differently, he sowed a dragon's-tooth army of textual variants that have seemingly equal authority. Some irregularities of textual transmission are, however, peculiar to Lawrence's poetry. The parallelist and anaphoric structures of his verse, for instance, increase the frequency of typist eye-skip.

The editors of Lawrence's *Complete Poems*, Vivian de Sola Pinto and Warren Roberts, were able to emend the compositorial slip quoted in the epigraph without recourse to the evidence of textual transmission. "This haunted read" — amusingly enough, from a poem titled "Drunk" — reverted to "this haunted road." Another long-lived misprint from "Ballad of Another Ophelia" — referring to the taste of unripened apples as "blackish" rather than "brackish" (CP 146) — was also corrected. To isolate these errors as having occurred at the typesetting stage, and to go on to produce a critically edited text, however, it is essential to examine all extant manuscripts and to analyse the textual transmission that led to Martin Secker's 1928 English edition of *Collected Poems*, as well as to Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith's 1929 American edition.

For two reasons, this paper is focused on Volume 1 of the *Collected Poems*, the volume subtitled, *Rhyming Poems*. Authorial revision of the verse is concentrated in the *Rhyming Poems*. The volume was set from a typescript, which Lawrence in part prepared, and which he wholly oversaw in order to revise and reorder his early poems. The poems in Volume 1 came from all but one of his pre-1920 volumes — from *Love Poems and Others* (1913), *Amores* (1916), *New Poems* (1918) and *Bay* (1919). For Volume 2 — subtitled *Unrhyming Poems* and comprising the two remaining pre-1928 volumes, *Look! We Have Come Through!* (1917) and *Birds, Beasts and Flowers* (1923) — Lawrence supplied Secker with two author's copies (Roberts E205.8c and E47h). Sending setting copy in this form did not preclude his making autograph alterations and laying in additional poems, or from making further changes in proof. Nevertheless, what he broadly promised Secker — "Vol.2 I shan't alter, except very little — add a poem or two to *Look*" (Letters, vol.6, 280) — was broadly what he delivered. Whereas the documentary evidence for re-
editing *Look! We Have Come Through!* is too slight to require separate discussion, the unraveling of the textual history of *Birds, Beasts and Flowers*, leading up to its inclusion in *Collected Poems*, requires separate and extensive analysis. The first *Collected Poems* volume, on the other hand, provides a set of discrete puzzles for both bibliographers and editors to solve, as well as raising matters of critical interest. Lawrence's 1927–1928 selection, rewriting, revision, and reordering of the 146 poems he assembled for Volume 1 of *Collected Poems* authorise these versions of these poems as the ones to be considered for the first section of the Cambridge *Poems*. The puzzles are confined to which variants, from a restricted set of typed, autograph-revised and printed texts, are to be adopted.

Martin Secker asked Lawrence to collect his poems as early as August 1919, after Secker had brought out *New Poems*. Lawrence foresaw difficulties securing copyright from the four different publishers of his first five volumes and, without directly refusing the offer, wondered why Secker had made it (*Letters*, vol.3, 379; 383). The author was more responsive when his publisher repeated the suggestion in September 1927. Lawrence took it as a good omen that he had rediscovered a rare copy of Duckworth's *Love Poems and Others* (Roberts E214b), which had been left for safe-keeping, since 1913, in the Jaffes's wooden house in Irchenhausen (see *Letters*, vol.1, 540–4; 543). While he did not begin work on his *Collected* at once — "I could work at it when I got back to the Mirenda," he had told Secker in September (*Letters*, vol.6, 168) — during November 1927, when he and Frieda had returned to Tuscany and the Villa Mirenda, he does make reference to preparation of the volume (*Letters*, vol.6, 213; 223). Lawrence had copies of *Love Poems, Amores* and *Bay* to hand. By January 1928, Secker had sent the other three volumes he needed, *New Poems, Look! We Have Come Through!* and *Birds, Beasts and Flowers* (*Letters*, vol.6, 264). It may have been in January that Lawrence pencilled, in the preliminary pages of his own copy of *Love Poems*, a contents table for the *Collected*; but the pencil insertions found in the poems "Lilies in the Fire," "Dog-Tired," and "Michael-Angelo" had more probably been made in November 1927.8 By contrast, the autograph changes he pencilled, in large script, into his copy of *Amores* (Roberts E14.5e) served a less exploratory purpose. The copy of *New Poems* that Secker sent Lawrence is not extant: whether he made autograph alterations and, if he did, what alterations he made on the wartime paper of this copy is problematic. Also unlocated is his copy of *Bay*, which may have circumnavigated the globe with Lawrence. It is less likely that he would have entered autograph changes on a valuable limited edition like *Bay*.

Despite reporting of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, on 8 December 1927, that he was writing the novel (in its third version) "all over again" (*Letters*, vol.6, 233),9 and despite ill health over Christmas and the New Year, Lawrence claimed, on
11 January 1928, that he had revised and typed out all of Love Poems "and Amores, nearly" (Letters, vol.6, 264). By 16 January, he announced he had "done the first two books — Bay is tiny" (Letters, vol.6, 268) — but he asked Secker to have New Poems typed for him in London. Four days later, taking Frieda and his typewriter with him, Lawrence set out to join the Huxleys at the ski resort of Les Diablerets, near Aigle. But Lawrence had not been working solidly on his Collected from mid-November 1927 to 16 January 1928; on the contrary, he had put in the extraordinary burst of energy required for the third, handwritten version of Lady Chatterley's Lover during this period, working on the novel, Michael Squires estimates, from 26 November to 8 January. It may be, that is, that Lawrence had spent no more than two or three weeks on his Collected Poems by 16 January. Capable as he was of remarkable feats with his fountain pen, his lesser talents on the typewriter make it questionable whether he could have both revised and retyped Love Poems, Amores and Bay, before packing for Les Diablerets. The Huxleys who assembled at the resort included Aldous the novelist with his wife Maria, Julian the scientist with his wife Juliette, and their children. The men worked in the mornings, Juliette assisting Julian with his contributions to a mammoth collaboration, The Science of Life, while Maria is known to have assisted Lawrence by typing the Chapters 13 to 19 of Lady Chatterley's Lover, providing Lawrence with typescripts that he planned, but never quite managed, to expurgate. What has not been known is that Maria also helped prepare the Collected Poems, Volume 1 typescript (Roberts E72), apparently working on the poems before she turned her attention to the novel.

The Volume 1 typescript held at the University of Austin at Texas is a predominantly ribbon copy, with autograph ink and pencil corrections, but no sign of publisher's directions or printer's marks. It is not the setting copy for Secker's edition, but a typescript sent to Curtis Brown's New York office, with the aim of providing copy for Alfred A. Knopf's edition of Collected Poems. But it was not used for that purpose; Knopf refused the American edition (Letters, vol.6, 539). Lawrence was involved in negotiations first with Viking, then with Cape and Smith, about a contract for the American edition (see Letters, vol.7, 52; 65–66; 221; 236; 266; 297 and 320), but his correspondence includes no suggestion of his ever correcting proofs for it. Collation of the American and English editions reveals nine accidental variants in Volume 1, despite there being no separate entry in Roberts and Poplawski's Bibliography for what is described as the "first American impression." Although the variants appear to be fully formed punctuation marks, the slightly blurred finish of this 'impression' prompted me to ask whether the edition — printed by the National Process Co. — might not have been photographed from sheets of the Secker edition. Specialist American bibliographers, Rich Oram and John Thomas an-
swered that this hypothesis was, in their opinion, a "likely" explanation of the Cape and Smith edition's "flat . . . not crisp" print lacking in "type impressions," and of the "mysterious dots and distortions" on some pages. A 1920s photographic process helps explain how the handful of accidental variants in the American edition coexists with misprints, like "haunted read," reproduced from the English edition.

In the Volume 1 typescript, three styles of titles appear: upper case only; upper case, underlined with hyphens; and initial capitals, with terminating punctuation. The first style, used for all of Love Poems and most of Amores, heads 105 pages of mostly ribbon typescript, which is firmly typed and type-corrected, and can be attributed to Lawrence. The second style, used only for New Poems titles, heads 50 pages of carbon typescript, in which literals and misspellings are rare and have, in many but not all cases, been autograph-corrected by Lawrence; these pages had been typed by Secker's professional secretary. The third style, used for the 18 poems from Bay and the last 11 poems from Amores; 31 pages in all, mixes black carbon with black and red ribbon typescripts. Comparison with chapters Maria Huxley is known to have copied in the typescript of Lady Chatterley's Lover (Roberts E186f) verifies that she is the likely copyist for the 31 pages of amateurishly typed poetry. English was not Maria Huxley's first language. Literals, misspellings and mispunctuations abound in these pages, as do autograph corrections, over typings and type deletions. A very high percentage of the autograph entries is devoted to correcting the typing errors. Lawrence's description of her typing as "a simple chicken-pox of mistakes" (Letters, vol.6, 293) is apt metaphor rather than impatient hyperbole.

Lawrence's motive in clearly inscribing alterations in his copy of Amores (Roberts E14.5e) can be appreciated. Correcting the poems that Maria Huxley typed resulted in pages too cluttered with autograph ink to facilitate either Lawrence's adding creative revisions or a compositor's seeing them. Rather than revise the Amores poems after they had been typed, Lawrence pencilled easily followed revisions into his author's copy. Although Lawrence corrected a high incidence of the typing errors, it was all too easy for a number to slip past his guard. Likewise Secker's professional typist, fluently typing what she took in at a glance, could produce inaccurate copy that read plausibly to an author who did not cross-check with the earlier text. The third typescript (Roberts E303g) of Lawrence's next volume of poems, Pansies, was a document that Lawrence decided, after postal authorities intercepted copies from the first typing of Pansies, he had to type himself, even though in doing so he would be serving as his own copy typist; it shows what a poor copy typist he was of his own work. But in the Collected Poems, Volume 1 typescripts, Lawrence embarked on the revision — in cases like "Virgin Youth," the total recreation — of his early verse. His attention was engaged in the
process of creative revision, and the accuracy of his typing improved accordingly. Authorially typed pages in the Volume 1 typescript provide copy accurate at this, the last stage of transmission over which Lawrence had full control.

Whereas the text Lawrence contributed to the Volume 1, Collected Poems typescript serves as a base-text (the term used in the Lawrence edition for 'copy-text'), the same authority does not extend to the pages typed by Secker's professional typist and Maria Huxley. There, Lawrence's aim was to secure an accurate typescript copy of New Poems, Bay and the last 11 poems of Amores, a text to which he could conveniently add autograph revisions. For this reason, a base-text that is a composite of typescript and first editions has been chosen. For Love Poems and the first 49 poems from Amores, the base-text is composed of the authorial typescripts; for the last 11 poems of Amores, it is composed of the author's copy of that volume with its autograph corrections (Roberts E14.5e); for New Poems it is composed of the 1918 Secker edition, for Bay of the 1919 Beaumont edition. One advantage of adopting a composite base-text is that it saves having to record every last autograph entry Lawrence or Maria Huxley made to correct Maria's mistypings, it being impossible to be sure who made them in single-letter instances. The composite base-text can be used to identify significant typist error and relegate it to the textual apparatus, the exception being cases in which Lawrence has made typist error the occasion for creative revision. The autograph changes in the author's copy of Amores suggest a second possible exception, if it can be demonstrated that Lawrence entered similar autograph changes in his unlocated author's copy of Bay or of New Poems. Alterations appearing in the non-authorial pages of the Volume 1 typescript, which cannot be plausibly explained as typist error and which can be argued to have the creative character of authorial revision — examples will be considered — would indicate that Lawrence made autograph changes in one (or both) of these volume copies. Such variants would have to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Differential autograph revision of the two Volume 1 typescripts should also be considered as alteration occurring during the generation of the base-text, although, because of the loss of Secker's setting copy, the only witness to differential autograph changes is post-base-text: it is in fact the Secker edition.

In the absence of the Secker setting copy and proofs, the distinction between printer's alterations and authorial alterations becomes a matter of editorial judgement. Editorial decisions have been grounded in what is known of Lawrence's writing and Secker's publishing practice rather than on subjective preference. This knowledge has been gained through individual experience editing the poems, but also collectively, through the scholarly conversation between Lawrence editors and editions. John Worthen and Michael Black, for instance, have indicated to
me that publishers of the 1920s had no staff of proofreaders and copyeditors, that publishers themselves both took a more hands-on approach to textual alteration and left it to their printers to enforce a house style. In 1919, Secker had used the Westminster Press for New Poems, but in 1923 had gone over to the Riverside Press for Birds, Beasts and Flowers and for subsequent editions of Lawrence's poetry as well. From 1923 on, the Riverside Press's literate compositors saw to it that no Lawrentian "almond tree" went unhyphenated, and that no line ending lacked the punctuation it would be accorded in prose. The house styling of Secker's printer is sufficiently standardised, and Lawrence's punctuation is sufficiently idiosyncratic, that collation of the composite base-text with Collected Poems can be used to remove the former and retain the latter. Compositorial error (of the "lonely read" variety) is also easily distinguished.

While other variants between the base-text and the Secker edition might point to censorship, Collected Poems appears to be notable among Lawrence's volumes in not being bowdlerised. One sign of this, to which David Ellis draws attention, is the appearance of the 'taboo' word "cunt" in the concluding section added to the Volume 1 typescript of "Whether or Not" — its appearance there and its failure to disappear in Secker's edition (CP 89). Although the possibility of textual censorship can only be eliminated by checking all substantive changes made in the postbase-text phase for sexual or political censorship — that is, by editing Rhyming Poems — the despatch with which proofs were printed and corrected is worth remarking. Lawrence announced on 3 February 1928 that "the MS [was] ready to go off" (Letters, vol.6, 284); Secker's partner, Percival Presland Howe, returned complete proofs to Lawrence's agent, Laurence Pollinger, on 14 March; and Lawrence corrected the proofs (which he had received in instalments) between 9 and 16 March (Letters, vol.6, 316; 330). The bulk of the substantive changes made after Lawrence sent the two typescripts to his agents appear to have been authorial and to have been entered in the proofs that Lawrence corrected in March. These, in outline, are the procedures that have been followed and the precautions observed, on the basis of the biographical and bibliographical record, to produce a base-text and prepare to edit Lawrence's Rhyming Poems. Further information about the volume's transmission history is generated by the editing itself.

Five case histories serve to illustrate editorial decisions about accidentals in Volume 1 of Collected Poems. In New Poems, lines 3–4 of "From a College Window" read: "Below, the lawn, in soft blue shade is keeping / The daisy-froth quiescent, softly in thrall." In the Volume 1 typescript, line 3 terminates with a comma added by Secker's typist. Either the compositor or (more probably) Lawrence removed the superfluous comma, which does not appear in the Secker
Restoring Lawrence's idiosyncratic but thoughtful punctuation of semicolons, colons, dashes, question marks and exclamation marks ("Guards" will again become "Guards!" in the Cambridge Poems) does much to restore his meaning. Preparing the Volume 1 typescript, Lawrence increased the number of semicolons, for instance in
line 10 of “Dog-Tired,” where he replaced the dash in Love Poems — “Into the cool of night — if she came to me now!”22 — with a semicolon: “To cool in the night; if she came to me now!” (CP 11). If a comma represents a single beat, the semicolon might be thought of as a double beat. Between the typescript version of “Dog-Tired” and that in Secker’s edition, two other mid-line semicolons have been inserted, of which the first, in line 19, occurs in the fourth line of this, the fourth stanza:

I should like to drop
On the hay, with my head on her knee,
And lie dead still, while she
Breathed quiet above me; and the crop
Of stars grew silently.

(CP 11)

This and the further semicolon at line 22 are deemed to be authorial insertions. In one stanza from the Collected Poems version of “Last Words to Miriam,” lines 31–35, the persona appears to reproduce the spite of Mr Collins’s remark to Elizabeth Bennet: “It is by no means certain that another offer of marriage may ever be made to you.”23 Miriam having repulsed the speaker’s offer, if not of marriage, the persona asks:

Now who will burn you free
From your body’s deadness and dross?
Since the fire has failed in me,
What man will stoop in your flesh to plough
The shrieking cross?

(CP 134)

In the Volume 1 typescript, Lawrence end-punctuated the third line of the stanza with a full stop that Secker’s compositor altered to a comma. The full stop was in keeping with Lawrence’s practice, in some complex verse sentences, of terminating the interrogative clause rather than the whole sentence with a question mark. Read as an explanatory conclusion to the opening three lines, the “since” clause becomes a confession of failure: I have lost the desire needed to “burn you free.” Enough sexual-political implications remain, about the ordeal Miriam needs for her liberation, to make the stanza obnoxious to many a reader; but restoring the idiosyncratic punctuation removes the insulting query whether any man, ever, will have desire enough for Miriam to “free” her.

To turn from accidental to substantive corruptions in the transmission: the major source of these in the Volume 1 typescript is typist eye-skip. In copy typing
“Intime” from *New Poems* — the poem was retitled “A Passing Visit to Helen” for *Collected Poems* — Secker’s professional typist reached the last word of line 19, “fire,” glanced down two lines to “fire!” in line 21, and continued typing from line 22, hence omitting the marked passage, lines 20–21:

Be all yourself, one bonny, burning coal  
That stays with steady joy of its own fire.  
| But do not seek to take me by desire.  
|  
| Oh, do not seek to thrust on me your fire!  
For in the firing all my porcelain  
Of flesh does crackle and shiver and break in pain . . .

In copy typing “Bread upon the Waters” from Bay, Maria Huxley reached the last words of line 16, “approach you!”, looked down to the end of line 19, “reproach you,” and proceeded to type the concluding line, line 20, thereby omitting the triplet, lines 17–19:

Drift then, for the sightless birds  
And the fish in shadow-waved herds  
To approach you.  
| Drift then, bread cast out;  
|  
| Drift, lest I fall in doubt,  
|  
| And reproach you.

For you are lost to me.

Lawrence’s practice of not comparing typescript with copy told against his discovery of these omitted lines, which will all be restored in the Cambridge *Poems*.

Though a contemporary of Pound and acquainted with Imagist styles like Pound’s, Lawrence is often at his poetic best when he allows himself expansive, rhythmic repetitions. Two further examples of typist eye-skip, in the copying of “Embankment at Night, Before the War: Outcasts,” illustrate what has been lost, but is worth recovering, in the transmission of *Collected Poems*. Lawrence drafted this “Embankment” poem in summer or autumn 1909, and recorded it in the first College notebook under the title “After the Theatre.” At that time he had been teaching in south London for a year, but the “young man” (CP 6) from the Midlands was still shocked to see the homeless sleeping out in the great metropolis,
under the railway bridge that crosses from the theatre district to Waterloo Station. When Lawrence revised the poem for New Poems in April 1918, he threw further emphasis on the Thames waters — on the ebb and flow of the river as emblematic of the fortunes and misfortunes of those sleeping on its bank, and on the golden lights splashing across its darkness as the trains passed overhead. Having six months before, in 1917, suffered eviction when the police and military raided his rented cottage on the Cornish coast, Lawrence also retouched the portraits of two of the sleeping derelicts so as to enhance their likeness to Frieda and himself. Thus, in New Poems, the male sleeper is depicted as "A little, bearded man, pale, peaked in sleeping." In the typescript, however, the copyist’s eye leapt over the first alliterating epithet, and the error was transmitted to Collected Poems, where the self-portrait is merely of "A little, bearded man, peaked in sleeping" (CP 183). In New Poems, the faces of the sleeping man and wife are imaged as "Two pale clots swept and swept by the light of the cars" passing above, but the copying of the line by the Secker typist — "Two pale clots swept by the light of the cars" (see CP 183) — stripped away the shuttering of electric light and darkness from the bridge above, and the tidal flux and reflux of the river below. Recuperation of these three words restores some sense of the difference between Poundian and Lawrentian Imagist practice, and may promote revaluation of a curious and neglected early poem.

Emendation of typist error is less straightforward when it has been overwritten by the author. In New Poems, the writer of the "Letter from Town: The Almond Tree" tells how he has stood daily beneath the tree, "to look up for the flowers that expand / At rest in the blue" (lines 7–8). Secker’s typist reproduced this as "... look up from the flowers ..." and Lawrence corrected the typescript, in autograph, to "... look up at the flowers ..." (see CP 49). The correction did not recover the sense of expectation of the original line, which will be preferred in the Cambridge Poems. In reproducing another of the New Poems, "Reading a Letter," the copyist mistyped a line describing the wind in the oak above the letter-reader’s head — "the sound / Of the wind in the knotted buds is a canopy" — so that the concluding words read "in a canopy." In replacement of the typescript’s "in," Lawrence pencilled "makes" (see CP 195), an improvement of the original line, and hence adopted.

The verse from New Poems distributed through the Volume 1 typescript exhibits some half-dozen substantive variants that, taken individually, do not seem to be typist error. Taken collectively, the variants leave little doubt that Lawrence made some autograph changes in the copy of New Poems, which he returned to Secker, a copy that has since been lost. The variants include two corrections to the text of "Two Wives" published in New Poems — line 16, "between then," which
becomes “between them” (see CP 198); and line 32, “now saw," which becomes “nor saw” (see CP 199). There is an alteration, characteristic of the anti-city polemic of Lawrence's later essays, to line 6 of “Hyde Park at Night, Before the War: Clerks”: “the chambered weariness” becomes “the chambered wilderness” (CP 6). By contrast, the insertion of “as” in line 1 of “Tarantella,” so that it becomes “Sad as he sits on the white sea-stone” in the typescript and Secker's edition (CP 162), appears not to be authorial; the insertion deprives the poem's opening sentence of a main clause. Even if the interpolation were conjectured to be authorial and not the product of typist error, no “new act of attention” occurred sufficient to displace the text of the New Poems version. Similar reservations must be weighed in regard to the alteration of the New Poems title, “Letter from Town: On a Grey Evening in March,” to “... a Grey Morning...” in the typescript (see CP 47). The occurrence of the word “morning” in the stanza from the preceding poem in New Poems is not adequate to make a case for typist eye-skip. Yet it also seems implausible that Lawrence would write of a young man sitting in what is presumably a public library at what is presumably dawn, since at this hour, on a March morning according to the revised title, his girl in the north country is envisaged looking out at “red-fire seas” of cloud. If the alteration is authorial, Lawrence's re-entry into the world of the text is insufficient to make the revision of “evening” to “morning” authoritative. The truest crux, among what may have been hasty autograph entries in the 1918 author's copy, is found in “Piccadilly Circus at Night: Street-Walkers,” line 9; the prostitutes, those “fard-faced creatures” in New Poems, re-emerge as “hard-faced creatures” in the typescript and the Secker edition (CP 70). The earlier compound adjective was no New Poems misprint: in Aaron's Rod (begun in autumn 1917), the Marchesa's white face-paint both attracts and repels Aaron Sisson; the fard is part of the Cleopatra mask from which he both succeeds and fails in freeing the Marchesa. On a ‘qwerty’ keyboard, 't' is close enough to 'h' to make a mistyping plausible; to take the other tack, “hard-faced” can read either as a realistic re-visioning, or an ill-considered cliché, without becoming less plausible as an authorial alteration. It is hard to imagine an author choosing to rob the streetwalkers of that Orientalist mystery with which Lawrence invests them in both his London nocturnes. On balance, typist error has seemed the more plausible alternative, and “fard-faced” has been preferred.

At this point it is well to reawaken the distinction between the non-extant, largely carbon typescript retained by Secker as setting copy for his edition of Collected Poems — henceforward referred to as the English typescript — and the extant, predominantly ribbon typescript forwarded to Curtis Brown's New York office (Roberts E72), henceforward referred to as the American typescript. In the absence of the English typescript and proofs, what differential autograph revi-
sions were in that typescript, what errors or corrections entered the proofs during typesetting, what corruptions or corrections of the authorial text were added by the printer, and what revisions and corrections were contributed by Lawrence are matters of editorial judgement. It can be easier to distinguish authorial changes from those introduced by printer and publisher than to determine the stage at which a change was made.

In the American typescript, Lawrence struggled with the conclusion of line 44 of “Dreams Old and Nascent: Nascent,” which deals with the delusions that drive the workmen on. The reference he typed, to men “screaming for money, as they sink in a ditch,” he revised in autograph to “screaming for money, as they dream and they itch.” Since it is credible that the (slight) improvement of the line in Secker’s edition, in which the workmen are “gasping for money, as they dream and they itch” (CP 226), was a further, English-typescript revision that Lawrence forgot to transfer back to the American typescript, no change will be made to the Secker Collected’s line in the Cambridge reading text. Line 42 of “Discipline,” as it appears in the American typescript, was changed in the Collected when the compositor, in all likelihood, set “my self” as “myself” (CP 104); in the Cambridge Poems, the line will revert to “I throw from out of the darkness my self.” An alteration, which, on prima facie grounds, is thought of as being made in proofs, occurs in line 56 of “Two Wives,” at which the typescript’s “e’er” becomes “ere” (CP 200). This was a necessary correction of “e’er sprung,” but one which Lawrence had not made when correcting New Poems, nor when correcting the work of the Secker copy typist, at least not in the American typescript. A final house-styled re-spelling, presumed to have been made in proofs by a compositor, was perpetrated in the last stanza of “A Man Who Died,” a poem based on the plot premise of the Lawrence short story, “Odour of Chrysanthemums.” Like Elizabeth Bates — the collier’s wife who questions the body of her husband when he is brought home smothered by a rock-fall — the woman speaker of the poem questions what her husband’s life and death have meant: “Is this the sum of you? / Is it all nought?” (lines 67–68). If it was the printer who re-spelt the word “naught” (CP 46), he reduced the sense of loss implied in the arithmetical pun, and the typescript reading will be restored.

Numerous instances might be invoked to show that Lawrence revised the English typescript differently from the American, or revised the English typescript when he did not revise the American. In “Kisses in the Train,” Lawrence altered the American typescript, “My mouth on her pulsing / Warmth was found” (lines 9–10), with the ink revision “… pulsing / Mouth …”, but in the English typescript (probably) revised to “…pulsing / Throat…” (CP 148), the phrase that was transmitted to Collected Poems. There is no reason to prefer the American type-
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script over the transmitted English typescript revision. Line 52 of "Dreams Old and Nascent: Nascent" reads "The rich and the poor alike dreaming and writhing, a squirming heap" in the American typescript, but this was revised in autograph to read "...the poor all dreaming ...". Probably, in the English typescript, the line was revised to read "The rich and the poor alike dreaming and writhing, all in one heap". There are reasons to prefer both the rhythm and the syntax of this revision. Line 12 of "Reading a Letter" in the American typescript, "Nor sound, save intermittent machinery whirring," offers a straight forward example of a substantive authorial alteration made subsequently: "...only intermittent machinery..." becomes the phrase (CP 195). The majority of the autograph revisions, which are presumed to have been entered in the English typescript and which differ from those in the American edition, appear to have been second thoughts or later intentions on Lawrence's part.

When editing The Boy in the Bush for the Cambridge Works, Paul Eggert had likewise to contend with an English and an American typescript, both of which were extant in the case of this novel. Eggert's reconstruction of the Lawrentian process of revision had the author sitting at table with a chapter of ribbon typescript on the one hand, and a chapter of carbon typescript on the other. Sometimes he would take first from one pile, sometimes from the other. He would correct a leaf of typescript at a time, transferring his revisions, as he completed them on the ribbon or the carbon page, to the carbon or the ribbon page. He did not always accurately transfer revisions, nor did he always resist the temptation to make further revisions on the second page, revisions he might then fail to copy back to the first. The process of revision and transference of revision completed, Lawrence would then, inconsistently, add the pages to one or the other pile of what became the American or the English typescript. Each typescript became a composite of ribbon and carbon copies, and neither document could in itself be designated as representing the author's later (or final) intention. Eggert discriminates between Lawrence's "author function" and his "production function" in the chain of publication. "As an author in revision," Eggert observes, Lawrence conscientiously availed himself of "the opportunity presented by transcription to further shape" his fiction; "as a scribe" he was much less conscientious about his contributions to the publication process, which "were only mediocre." He appeared to care more for refining his work than he did for ensuring that "the English and American editions were ... exactly the same." Rather than choose one typescript above the other as the 'site' for revision of a base-text, Eggert opts for the 'process' of revision as the basis for emending the base-text. Which revisions had preceded, and which succeeded others, was a question that sometimes could only be decided on the basis of tiny non-significant indicators (like auto-
graph correction of imperfectly typed letters), but Eggert reports that it nevertheless "proved possible to establish the chronology of revision" in every instance.32

Comparing the documents and transmission history of The Boy in the Bush with those of Collected Poems, Volume 1, the differences that emerge are not a revolution in the processes by which Lawrence revised and discharged his production function: they are that the English typescript has not survived, and that the American edition was not separately set from the American typescript. The second of these differences has little bearing, however, on the issue of author intention. At the time he was revising the American and English typescripts, Lawrence still expected Knopf to accept Collected Poems, and hence to set the American edition from the typescript that was forwarded to New York. It is salient that the English typescript is all but certainly lost; yet were it available, it seems that detailed analysis of Lawrence’s corrections of Maria Huxley’s typing (for example) would not be needed to ascertain whether the American or the English typescript bore the later authorial revisions. Lawrence made many corrections, but almost no revisions on Huxley’s typescripts. The autograph revisions he made were to the edition of Amores that Huxley was typing from. With Maria Huxley proving to be a less than mediocre scribe on the typewriter, it seems that Lawrence limited himself to discharging his “production function” with the poems from Bay and the end of Amores; he exercised his “author’s function” on his author’s copy of Amores. What I found to be the case with Huxley’s typing of Volume 1 of the poems is what Michael Squires found with her typing of Lady Chatterley’s Lover:

Although she [Maria Huxley] did not routinely alter Lawrence’s text, she was not an accurate typist; and Lawrence appears simply to have patched up her errors and omissions. In these circumstances an editor recovers the original text by following the MS as base-text . . .

The equivalent to the procedure that Michael Squires devised for Lady Chatterley’s Lover, of reverting to the manuscript notebook for a base-text, is the one I have adopted for Collected Poems, by incorporating Bay and the last part of Amores in the base-text.

With the English typescript lost, only one, and that the most straightforward of Eggert’s procedures for determining the process of Lawrence’s revision, is applicable to the textual transmission of Collected Poems, Volume 1. Where autograph alterations are entered in the American typescript, but Secker’s edition of Collected Poems merely reproduces the typed text, there is a prima facie case that Lawrence, in his production function, did not transfer these autograph revisions to the English typescript, despite their representing a later authorial intention in the process of his revision. Where no other plausible assumption presents itself, these auto-
graph alterations in the American autograph will be preferred in the reading text of the Cambridge Poems. In line 26 of the American typescript version of "Virgin Youth," for instance, Lawrence replaced "the holy ground" on which the phallus stands with "the living ground." In "Whether or Not," to take another example, Lawrence added a new section 11, possibly in November 1927, when he worked on retyping Love Poems and Others; then, possibly in January 1928, he added further autograph revisions to this final section of the poem in the American typescript. The typed text of the newly composed section's first stanza (lines 209-12) is exactly that transmitted to Collected Poems —

Ay, I'm sorry, I'm sorry,
But what o' that!
Ay, I'm sorry! Tha nedna worry
Nor fret thy fat.

(CP 87)

— and so is presumed to have been the unaltered text in the English typescript. In the American typescript, Lawrence's autograph deletions and substitutions have changed the quatrain to:

Ay, I'm sorry, I'm sorry,
But what by that!
Ay, I'm sorry! Tha nedna
Fret thy fat.

These and other autograph alterations found in the American typescript of "Whether or Not" were not transferred to the English typescript, and not transmitted to the English Collected Poems, but because they represent a later stage of revision, a stage intended for publication in the American edition, they will be adopted in the Cambridge edition.

Unlike many of the volumes Lawrence saw through the press, the four volumes of verse brought together in Volume 1 of Collected Poems were spared the indignity of publisher censorship, both when they were first selected and when they were finally collected as Rhyming Poems. Assured that they had aroused no prior doubts, Secker left these poems unvetted, a little rashly in view of the "Note" in which Lawrence declared that he had revised Volume 1 in order "to let the demon say his say" (CP 6). Given their unbowdlerised transmission, and the preparation of what has previously been thought to be a largely authorial typescript — a typescript that was, moreover, subject to authorial correction and revision — Volume 1 of Collected Poems has posed unexpected difficulties for an editor attempting to determine a base-text. Because two non-authorial typists were
involved in the preparation of the typescript, an unexpectedly high number of emendations and restorations is needed to establish a reading text that corresponds to Lawrence's final expectations. Compositorial and proof-correcting errors are not numerous, and house-styled repunctuation and re-spelling alter textual significance relatively infrequently. Nevertheless, the omissions introduced by typist eye-skip, when combined with other typist errors, house stylings, misconstructions and literals, accumulate to reach a critical mass. With Lawrence's early verse having received little critical attention, it is to be hoped that a critically edited text of the *Rhyming Poems* will provoke some critical revisitation of previously neglected poems and some critical reconsideration of Lawrence's place in the history of early modernist poetry.
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Endnotes

1 Parenthetic references in this form are to The Collected Poems of D. H. Lawrence, 2 vols. (London: Martin Secker, 1928).
6 Parenthetic references in this form are to the manuscript listing, Section E, of Warren Roberts and Paul Poplawski, A Bibliography of D. H. Lawrence, 3rd edn. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). Lawrence had signed the flyleaves of both the Chatto and Windus edition of Look! We Have Come Through! and the Secker edition of Birds, Beasts and Flowers; in the latter case adding the admonition: "D. H. Lawrence| his own copy| not given to anybody," Lawrence laid in typescripts of "Bei Hennef," "Everlasting Flowers," "Coming Awake" and "Song of a Man Who is Loved" in Look!, and added autograph corrections to the copy of Birds, Beasts and Flowers. These were 'author's copies' in the sense that Lawrence adapted them for his use.
8 While the revisions can only be found in Roberts E214b, for a transcription of the draft contents table see Holly Laird, Self and Sequence: The Poetry of D. H. Lawrence (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1988), 249–56.
10 Ibid., 397.
12 Ellis, Dying Game, 398–99.
13 Roberts E72 has two title pages, the top one in pencil autograph, the bottom one typed. The autograph title page reads: "Collected Poems of D. H. Lawrence| Vol.1. Rhyming Poems| MS for New York." Secker's Letterbook shows that, until the end of June 1928, both Secker and Lawrence's London agent, Laurence Pollinger, were under the impression that Knopf would undertake publication of the American edition. Writing for Secker, P. P. Howe informed Pollinger on 1 June that he had not heard from Knopf on the matter (Letterbook, Vol.8, p. 211). On 29 June Secker proposed to Knopf that, if he wished to import sheets, Secker could offer him "a favourable quotation for 500 sets" (Letterbook, Vol.8, p.245).
14 Roberts and Poplawski, Bibliography, 158.
15 Acknowledgement of the National Process Co. appears on the verso of the title page, [p. 4], in D. H. Lawrence, Collected Poems, 2 vols. (New York: Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith, 1929). Rich Oram is the Librarian and John Thomas the Rare Book Cataloger at the Harry Humanities Research Center, the University of Texas at Austin. Their opinions were conveyed to me by Rachel Howarth, the Reading Room Librarian, in a letter of 22 December 1999.
that need changing for a reader of Pinto and Robert’s Complete Poems. The 11 poems make up the last in Duckworth’s edition of Amores.


Chatto and Windus insisted that two poems (“Song of a Man Who Is Loved” and “Meeting Among the Mountains”) be omitted from Look! We Have Come Through! and asked that further cuts and alterations be made in five other poems (Letters, vol.3, 145, n. 1). Thomas Seltzer demanded and effected alterations in the American edition of Birds, Beasts and Flowers, and in the English edition Seeker made a surreptitious cut to “Cypresses.” Under direction from the Home Office, English postal authorities intercepted the first typescript of Pansies and threatened to suppress publication of the volume. In order to publish his trade edition of Pansies, Seeker demanded omission of eleven pensees (then quietly dropped another three), as well as requiring “various changes and suppressions” (Letters, vol.7, 278). Faber and Faber omitted three satires (“Daddy-Do-Nothing,” “Question” and “British Sincerity”) from their edition of Nброс, in what seems to have been an act of political censorship.

David Ellis, introduction to The Complete Poems of D. H. Lawrence (Ware, Herts.: Wordsworth Editions, 2002), vii. Perhaps the likely reader, Seeker’s partner Howe, thought the word a dialectal usage.

Seeker Letterbook, vol.8, p.115.

Cf. D. H. Lawrence, “Anxiety,” in Amores (London: Duckworth, 1916), 57. The equivalent text in Amores — “Along the vacant road, a red / Bicycle approaches” — has the comma already in place, but by making the cycle a “Telegram-bicycle” in the Volume 1 typescript, Lawrence related the circumstances to the War, as well as retarding the bicycle’s approach.


Lawrence writes to Seeker that he has received “the poetry books,” including New Poems, on 11 January 1928, and on 16 January, remits the copy of New Poems with the request that Seeker have it typed (Letters, vol.6, 264; 268). On 20 January, Seeker reports that he is “having New Poems’ typed out in duplicate and will send this to you in a few days” (Seeker Letterbook, Vol.8, p. 28).


In the linked “Hyde Park At Night, Before the War,” the young clerk hides himself “in the Shalimar / With a wanton princess” (CP 69).

Here and elsewhere, Eggert’s intricate analysis of the documents involved in transmission of The Boy in the Bush is simplified. Roughly a quarter of the novel (166 pages out of 543) was retyped from a single, revised, now-lost typescript; and Lawrence simply added the ribbon and carbon retypings to the American and English typescript. See Paul Eggert, “Development or Process as the Site of Authority: Establishing Chronology of Revision in Competing Typescripts of Lawrence’s The Boy in the Bush,” in Studies in Bibliography, 44 (1991): 364–75 (p.366).

Ibid., 367; 372.

Squires, “Introduction” in Lady Chatterley’s Lover, li.