ABSTRACT

MASSEY, LARA BELL. A “fitter” Text of John Donne’s “The Good Morrow.” (Under the Direction of M. Thomas Hester.)

The purpose of this paper has been to explain the process by which I established the text of John Donne’s “The Good Morrow.” In order to construct the text I examined the forty manuscripts and seven seventeenth-century editions that contain part or all of the poem, and I transcribed the poem from each source. Then I collated the transcriptions using a computer software program called the Donne Variorum Collation Program. I filiated the manuscripts based on verbal variants and, through investigation and comparison, created a schema of the poem’s transmissional history. I deduced that Donne made minor revisions to the original “The Good Morrow,” and I conservatively emended the version of “The Good Morrow” in the Dolau Cothi manuscript, the closest manuscript to Donne’s Lost Revised Holograph, and presented that copy-text for “The Good Morrow.” I presented a modernized version of the text also. In addition to a detailed explanation of this process, I also included a complete listing of variants, the transmissional schema of the poem, and an explanation of how this work fits into the context of contemporary Donne studies and modern editorial practices.
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I

“O that this too too solid flesh would melt, / Thaw and resolve itself into a dew.”

Many a student of English has memorized this soliloquy, Hamlet’s first expression of agony. Yet, how does one such student know that she is reciting the lines as Shakespeare intended them? The word “solid”—a simple reading that “may carry an unfortunate suggestion that Hamlet has a body-image problem” according to Ron Rosenbaum—comes from the 1623 First Folio (68). However, the 1604 “Good” Quarto reads “too too sallied flesh,” and many critics have conjectured that “sallied” was a scribal misprint of the word that they suggest Shakespeare intended: “sullied.” Both readings introduce distinct interpretations of the line. So, did Shakespeare write “solid,” “sallied,” or “sullied”—or perhaps another word entirely? And if one cannot know for sure, how does that student’s English teacher convince her that the Bard’s lines are “not of an age, but for all time” if not sure himself of the original lines?

Various answers have been proposed for such issues involving Renaissance editing. Regarding Shakespeare, there are no known extant copies of plays in his hand; in fact, there are no remaining manuscripts of successful plays performed prior to 1642 at all.¹ For Shakespeare, there are simply 148 lines in a collaborative play titled Sir Thomas More that are believed possibly to be in his hand (Dawson, Kennedy-Skipton 3-4). Renaissance dramatists did not save their plays. The modern sense of ownership over literary creations simply was not prevalent. The Renaissance considered handmade, expensive paper a marketable commodity, one far more useful for wrapping fish than for saving as plays. Plays were written to be performed, not to be copy-righted and passed down for generations, so

¹ However, manuscripts of Jonson’s The Masque of Queens and some unsuccessful plays exist, as well as a fragment of The Massacre at Paris that might be in Marlowe’s hand, according to Dawson and Kennedy-Skipton (3-4).
modern editors are faced with the task of examining the few extant manuscripts and printed editions in order to ascertain the closest readings to Shakespeare and other Renaissance dramatists’ original intentions.

These dramatic issues extend into Renaissance poetry as well. Just as playwrights seldom thought their plays worthy of collecting, many poets also lacked the desire for ownership over their work, leaving a shortage of holographs and few authorized printed versions. In addition, Renaissance literature was undergoing the transition from a manuscript culture to a print culture, in much the same way that the modern era is evolving from a print to an on-line and multimedia culture. Just as some are hesitant to read Milton on a computer screen instead of having *Paradise Lost* in their hands, many during the Renaissance preferred to write out their work in manuscripts and to read from them. Although the printing press had existed for quite some time, the change was gradual, and occasionally the typesetters were no more cautious or accurate than the scribes. In addition, many poets not only did not intend for their work to be printed but tried very hard to keep their work from being printed. Many poets wrote lyrics that were considered controversial—spiritually, politically, or sexually—simply to pass amongst their court coterie, recognizing that the public display of these poems could carry significant consequences.²

One such Renaissance poet was John Donne, a man who once labeled himself “two authors”: a young Catholic recusant, “Jack” Donne, who wrote bawdy and bold lyrics, and the older “Doctor” Donne who wrote intense spiritual works. While this over-simplified classification does little justice to the intertwined images of worldly love and spiritual love

² Such issues surrounding scribal practices are further analyzed by Harold Love in *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* and by Ted-Larry Pebworth in “Manuscript Poems and Print Assumptions: Donne and His Modern Editors.”
present throughout Donne’s work, one easily can understand how the circulation of such bawdy poems as “The Flea” or such politically charged poems as *Metempsychosis* after Donne’s ordination could pose great danger to his reputation as a spiritual leader, and possibly even to his life.³

For whatever reason, Donne chose not to publish a collection of his poems.⁴ Donne did not even collect his own poems, as evident by his need to inquire in a letter to his friend Henry Goodyer for the “old book” containing copies of the poems when Donne sought them; apparently, Donne planned at one time to publish a volume of his poems “not for much publique view, but at mine own cost…as a valediction to the world, before I take Orders,” but he never actually printed the volume (*Letters* 197). Although Donne did allow his two *Anniversaries* to be printed, he later chastised himself in a letter to George Garrard: “I…do not pardon my self” for having “descended to print anything in verse” (*Letters* 238). Donne was probably quite careful about who saw the poems and possibly even sought their destruction. Modern editors are left, in fact, with only one known holograph of a Donne poem, a verse epistle addressed to the Lady Carey and Mrs. Essex Riche. For all other poems, editors must gather copies, most of which contain either minor or significant variants, scattered throughout a multitude of scribal manuscripts and seventeenth-century printed editions in order to construct the poetry of this major Renaissance author (Stringer et al *Elegies* XLIX-L).

The goal of this study is to establish the text of one such poem: “The Good Morrow,” and to explain the process of that endeavor. Donne’s “The Good Morrow” is a twenty-one

---

³ Ernest Sullivan analyzes these issues further in “Who Was Reading/Writing Donne Verse in the Seventeenth Century?”.
⁴ No printed editions were issued until after Donne’s death.
line aubade broken into three stanzas in which the speaker compares the waking of his lover and him in their bedroom to the waking of their “souls” upon finding mutual love. Donne employs metaphors of exploration, discovery, and conquest to contrast the lovers’ microcosmic “one little room” with the macrocosmic world (“everywhere”) and their love with the greatest worldly glories. The poem appears in all seven seventeenth-century printed editions, as well as forty extant manuscripts, and no two manuscript versions are identical. Whether the changes are minor, such as insignificant spelling differences or obvious accidental corruptions, or major line alterations, I have examined and accounted for them in the establishment of this text. Both my copy-text, taken from the Dolau Cothi manuscript for reasons that will be explained later, and a modernized version of my text are provided, in acknowledgment that some readers prefer not to require the study of Renaissance spelling and paleographic conventions in order to read the text. Following the presentation of the poem is a detailed explanation of how the text has been established, as well as a complete listing of all printed edition and manuscript variants and a schematic representation of the poem’s transmissional history.

II

Prior to the last twenty years, editors of Donne advanced a variety of approaches in order to produce their versions of Donne’s poetry. Some, such as John Shawcross, relied heavily on one or more of the seventeenth-century printed editions, usually beginning with the posthumous 1633 Poems, by J.D. with Elegies on the Authors Death; some of these editors did not gather much material from the manuscripts, in spite of their comparative chronological closeness to Donne’s composition of the poems. Other editors made use of the
available manuscripts when establishing copy-texts, usually establishing their texts as a conglomeration of the existing manuscript versions and noting variants among them. Although many of these editors made extensive fine use of the known manuscripts at the time, not until the 1980 publication of Peter Beal’s *Index of English Literary Manuscripts* was the complete listing of Donne’s poems contained in all known manuscripts available, allowing for manuscript material never incorporated into modern editions to be included and strengthening the growing call for a new edition of Donne’s poetry (Stringer et al *Elegies* XLV).

This call has been answered by a group of Donne scholars who first gathered in 1981 to begin a variorum edition of Donne’s work, an edition aimed at being inclusive, thorough, and current. The contents of this Variorum project have been broken into eight separate volumes, three of which have been published at this time. According to the Donne Variorum general editors the goal of the textual work is “to recover and present exactly what Donne wrote” (XLIX), although they certainly recognize the obvious challenges of such an undertaking. Although there are some available materials in Donne’s hand, including approximately forty prose letters, there remains only one holograph of a Donne poem; the remainder survive only in non-authorial copies which amount to over 5000 transcriptions of poems, all “at indeterminate degrees of remove from holograph and therefore of indeterminate authority” (XLIX). This lack of evidence from which scholarly editors can derive Donne’s poetic intention extends past the texts of the individual poems to their possible sequence and even to what works should be admitted to the canon at all. Thus, with 239 manuscript sources and over 200 seventeenth-century books, including diaries, miscellanies, and commonplace books, that contain Donne poems or excerpts, in addition to
the seven printed editions of Donne’s poetry, editors face the task of sifting through evidence to establish the transmissional history of the poems so as to work their way back to the versions most similar to Donne’s original intentions.

Seeking out “Donne’s original intentions” could seem to many modern literary scholars a pointless task, one that cannot and should not be attempted. However, neither the Donne Variorum editors nor I claim to understand the effect Donne “intended” for his poem to have on its readers, and the emphasis of my study certainly is not to figure out Donne’s “intentions” in that sense. The term “intention” has been contentious since long before the publication of Wimsatt and Beardsley’s “Intentional Fallacy” but certainly has been drawn to the forefront of scholarly debate since then, and, as Annabel Patterson concludes in her essay on the term in Critical Terms for Literary Study, a main source of this controversy regarding “intention” is that literary scholars maintain slightly different definitions for the term. Thus, in order to avoid confusion, when I refer to Donne’s “intended work” in this study, I “intend” simply to refer to Donne’s original wording—the words that constituted the poem as he wrote it. I am not addressing issues of reader response or affect. This M. A. project involves examining all extant evidence to recover the precise words that Donne “intended” to make up his poem “The Good Morrow.”

For this M. A. project, I have followed the method of the Variorum editors, aiming to examine all of the available artifacts of “The Good Morrow,” to compare them using computer software (the Donne Variorum Collation Program) so as to choose the copy-text that appears to be closest to Donne’s intention, and then to make the minimal editorial interventions. In most cases the Variorum editors have chosen their copy-texts from manuscript versions, which are more likely to reflect accurately the original holographs due
to their earlier date of composition and to the unlikelihood that any extensive holograph collection of Donne’s poems ever existed⁵; the absence of such a collection suggests that the printed editions were mainly or solely based on manuscript materials of varied origin anyway.⁶ In fact, Dawson and Kennedy-Skipton suggest that manuscript versions were altered by printers to fit the customs of publishing houses who injected the poems with their various spelling, capitalization, and punctuation conventions, as well as introducing verbal corruptions. This process probably has caused the printed versions to be even further from Donne’s intended works than the manuscripts. While the scribes certainly introduced their own corruptions, either through accident or through the notion that they were “improving” the poems, one can examine the variants and corruptions so closely that one can trace the poem’s line of descent back as far as possible to pick out the “least corrupted surviving version(s),” or exemplar, of the poem (Stringer et al LII). Although the manuscript exemplar an editor chooses is not the holograph and cannot be treated as such, it is the closest version still in existence to Donne’s original based on all extant material evidence.

Two theories in contemporary editing practices focus attention on how an editor is to handle this exemplar. One theory suggests that editors should present the manuscript exemplar exactly as is, without any changes or emendations. This approach protects the editor from any accusation of textual tampering—of introducing his/her own critical interpretation of the poem into its bibliographical analysis. However, quite rarely is one copy found that contains the exact text that all evidence suggests that Donne wrote. Usually at least one punctuation mark or verbal choice will appear to be an obvious corruption, and

⁵ Stringer et al have provided substantial evidence for this in the General Introduction to the Variorum (Elegies LI).
⁶ However, all seventeenth century printed edition variants are listed for reference as well.
correcting those few clear errors provides a reading that probably is much closer to Donne’s intention. As the Variorum editors point out, “except by extreme good fortune, we are not likely to present any non-holographic poem exactly as Donne wrote it, but this approach does allow us to present a text of every poem essentially free of conjecture and anachronistic intervention” (LIII). Thus the theory of the Variorum editors instructs one to emend the texts minimally so as to present the closest versions possible to Donne’s original poems.

I have followed this course in establishing the following copy-text of “The Good Morrow”—which is derived from the Dolau Cothi manuscript for reasons that will be explained later—and my modernized version of his poem.
The Good Morrow

I wonder by my troth, what thou and I,
Did till wee lou'd; were wee not weand till then?
But suckt on Countrye pleasures Childishly?
Or snorted wee in the Seauen sleepers den?
Twas soe; But this all pleasures fancies bee
If euer anie Beawtye I did see
Which I desird, and gott, twas but a Dreame of thee.

And now Good morrowe to our wakinge soules
Which watch not one another out of feare
For loue all loue of other sights controules,
And makes one littell roome an euerie where.
Let Sea discouererers to new worlds haue gone,
Let Maps to others, worlds on worlds haue showne
Let vs posses our world: each hath one, and is one.

My face in thine eye, Thine in myne appeares
And true plaine harts, doe in the faces rest
Where can wee finde two fitter Hemispheres
Without sharpe North, without declyninge west;
What ever dies was not mixt equallye:
If our two loues bee one, or thou and I
Loue soe alike, that none doe slacken, none can die.
Modernized text:

The Good Morrow

I wonder by my troth, what thou and I,
Did till we loved; were we not weaned till then?
But sucked on Country pleasures Childishly?
Or snorted we in the Seven sleepers den?
’Twas so; But this all pleasures fancies be.
If ever any Beauty I did see
Which I desired, and got, ’twas but a Dream of thee.

And now Good morrow to our waking souls
Which watch not one another out of fear
For love all love of other sights controls,
And makes one little room an everywhere.
Let Sea discoverers to new worlds have gone,
Let Maps to others, worlds on worlds have shown
Let us possess our world: each hath one, and is one.

My face in thine eye, Thine in mine appears
And true plain hearts do in the faces rest.
Where can we find two fitter Hemispheres
Without sharp North, without declining west;
What ever dies was not mixed equally:
If our two loves be one, or thou and I
Love so alike, that none do slacken, none can die.
III

I began the process of establishing this text of “The Good Morrow” by transcribing the seven seventeenth-century printed editions and all forty manuscripts that contain part or all of the poem. The manuscript copies were collected from microfilm of the originals except when access to the microfilm was not possible, in which cases photocopies of microfilm were substituted. Although some copies were easier to read than others and certainly transcribing from the original manuscripts would have been ideal, all versions were clear enough to establish accurate transcriptions. Most manuscripts contain all twenty-one lines, but some have as few as five. Not surprisingly, the spelling and punctuation vary, as do the inclusion of titles and subscripts, as well as decorative scribal flourishes. There also are many scribal strike-throughs, insertions, and corrections, usually marked by the original scribe but sometimes by other scribes after composition.

Following is an example of one manuscript version of the poem and a transcription of this version (in the format of the Donne Variorum Collation Program). This particular manuscript version is found in folio 118 of the Narcissus Luttrell manuscript, abbreviated as C9 by the Variorum editors, with “C” representing its location in the Cambridge University Library. This manuscript contains one of the most legible versions of the poem, one that provides examples of several of the paleographic conventions of the time, such as the interchangeable “u” and “v” and the absence of the letter “j”; the last line of this sample includes the word “iust” instead of “just” as do many of the other manuscripts. Also, “e” is arbitrarily added to the ends of words, such as “sillilye” and “denne,” which also contains the doubling of “n,” another common Renaissance convention. The abbreviation “o” in line 8, with the common superscript “r,” does not represent “or” but “our”; abbreviating this word as
such was quite common, as was “wch” for “which.” This sample provides an instructive example of how little spelling should be taken into account when establishing Renaissance texts, for the scribes simply lacked modern spelling conventions. There also was no standard method for punctuating; some scribes hardly punctuated at all, assuming that the end of a line provided enough of a pause so that no other mark was needed. Each scribe maintained a unique style of spelling, capitalizing, and punctuating. Thus, while examining these differences is important investigative work that can provide support for theories of transmission developed through verbal variants, lending them too much credence can be dangerous, for the variant words themselves provide much more information about the poem’s history.
I wonder by my truth what thou art
Did till for loath, more we are wound till thou?
But such in childish pleasure silly
or scorned for in the y sleeping time?
I was so. But this all pleasures fancies be.
If ever any beauty of bliss
which I descried got, they bat a dream of shew.

And now good morrow to the waking soul
which watch not one another of peace
for love are love of others sightly control
And make our little round our sorry world.
Let sea disjoiner, to see your joy on go,
let happy to others better on woe the hand shew
but as possible to works, each hath one of one.

my face in three eye, sheweth more appeare
And true pleasure heartes do in faire rest
where can we find two such terminable
without sharp hert, without declination
what earth or way we not must equal.
If our two love be one soul, then be
our love also wise, none of these loves can dye.
I wonder by my troth what thou & I
Did till we lou'd, were we not weand till then?
But suckd on childish pleasure sillilye
or snorted wee in the 7 sleepers denne
Twas so. But this, all pleasures fancies bee
If euer any beauty I did see
which I desird & gott, 'twas but a dreame of thee.
And now good morrow to o%5r%6 waking soules
which watch not one another SCRIBAL DELETION >out< of feare
ffor Loue all loue of others sights controlls
And makes one little roome an euery where
Lett Sea-discouerers to new worlds haue gon
Lett mapps to others worlds SCRIBAL DELETION on worlde haue showne
Lett vs possesse o%5r%6 world, each hath one, & is one.
My face in thine eye, thine in mine appeares
And true plaine hearts do in y%5e%6 faces rest
where can we find two fitter Hemispheres
without sharp north, without declyning west
what euer dyes was not mixt equally
If our two loues be one, both thou & I
Louve iust alike in all, none of these loues can dye.

3 7-line sts; ind. lns. 2,4,9,11,16,18; ind. more lns. 5-6,12-13,19-20; scribal symbol centered where title would be; "out" written to side of line 9
A computer file like the previous example was created for each of the manuscript and printed versions of “The Good Morrow.” Each version contains an introductory line that provides general information about the copy being transcribed, a heading line (listed as “om” if the heading was omitted from that version), the 21 line body of the poem, a subscription if one exists, and an explanatory line of the indentation pattern and of other unique features of the poem. Only through creating these completely consistent files could they be examined against one another by the Donne Variorum Collation Program so as to provide a listing of the variants among the versions.

At this point in the process, a copy-text had to be chosen at random for each collation so that the poems could be contrasted with some particular version of the text. However, the goal of running the collations is to reach an understanding of the poem’s history, thus enabling the editor to determine the most qualified copy-text, or “what seems to be the earliest, least-corrupted state of the text as preserved in the best witness among the artifacts in which it appears” (Stringer et al LIV), to emend it as little as possible to prevent misreading, and then to compare all of the manuscripts and printed editions with that copy-text to establish the listing of variants.

Following are two example pages from the final collation of “The Good Morrow,” those representing lines 1 and 17. In general, the collations contain line-by-line comparisons. The top line is the copy-text (or prior to the final collation whatever text has been arbitrarily chosen as the copy-text) line, and the same line from all other manuscripts and printed

---

7 If a line is missing from the poem, it also is listed as “om.” Because the Donne Variorum Collation Program examines character strings, the format of all poems must be identical so that the proper words and lines can be compared. Thus the general framework for each file is consistent with this example.
versions appears beneath the copy-text line by the manuscripts’ Variorum abbreviations.\(^8\)

Each version contains blank space beneath the copy-text if the individual version is identical to the copy-text for a particular word. Thus, only words that contain differences from the copy-text appear, whether they are spelling (if they could have an effect on the meter), punctuation, or capitalization variations or entirely different words. As evident in the first example, some lines contain very few differences, and most are minor, such as the addition of a comma.\(^9\) However, some lines of “The Good Morrow” contain much more dramatic differences; such differences are apparent in the second example in which some versions contain “fitter” and some “better.” This is one of several lines with substantial variants, verbal variations that must be analyzed in order to establish the most accurate version of the text.

---

\(^8\) The copy-text, manuscripts, and printed versions are separated into three sections by divider lines. These divider lines have been added merely to assist the reader with visualizing the separation between groups.

\(^9\) When words contain superscript letters, the Donne Variorum Collation Program treats those words as variants. Because the software only reads plain text documents, ASCII codes must be applied to words with superscript letters, italics, etc. One can see those codes in these examples. Superscript letters are surrounded by `%5` and `%6`. In the later variants section of this work, all ASCII codes have been replaced by the conventions they represent with two exceptions. `%p` represents “per” or “pro,” and `%v` attached to the beginning of a word represents a word that a scribe inserted with a caret symbol.
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Wonder, thou, I
Where can we finde two fitter Hemispheres

Where twoe we better find Hemispheares

Where we find Hemispheres

Where we find Hemyspheares,

Where we fynde better Hemishpeares

Where we find hemispheares

Where we fynd fitt better Hemyspheares

When twoe better Hemispheares,

Where twoe we better find Hemispheares, Wheare fynde better Hemispheares, Can we two better Hemyspheares,

Where we fynde better Hemispheares

Where twoe we better find Hemispheares

Can we too better Hemyspheares, Wheare fynde better Hemispheares, Wheare fynde better Hemispheares,

Where we twoe we better find hemispheares
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>032.00C.017</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>hemispheares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032.00D.017</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>hemispheares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032.00E.017</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>hemispheares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032.00F.017</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>hemispheares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032.00G.017</td>
<td>we find</td>
<td>hemisphears</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After collating all transcriptions of “The Good Morrow,” the next step was to filiate the transcriptions. This filiation process involved the separation and ordering of the manuscripts based on unique verbal variations so as to establish a transmissional schema which could enable the uncovering of the closest reading to Donne’s Lost Original Holograph (LOH), the version that once existed in Donne’s hand but is no longer extant. Filiation involved numerous collations which were used to discover patterns that, in combination with what is already known about the chronology of and connections between the manuscripts, would evolve into a family tree for the poem. Ideally these established connections and family trees, developed from previous work done on other poems, would be sufficient information for this poem as well. However, because scribes gathered their materials from many sources before composing, an editor cannot assume that what was a source for a poem in one instance in a manuscript will be the case for the entire manuscript, although having that information can be a useful starting point and guide.

Upon running the first collation of “The Good Morrow,” a pattern did begin to emerge. Although many variants were apparent, lines 3 and 21 seemed to contain the most dramatically different readings: “But sucked on country pleasures childishly?” versus “But sucked on childish pleasures sillily?” for line 3, and “Love so alike, that none do slacken, none can die.” as opposed to “Love just alike in all, none of these loves can die.” for line 21. These two readings, however, do not occur haphazardly. In every case in which line 3 reads “country pleasures childishly?” line 21 reads “Love so alike, that none do slacken, none can die.” The other two readings always are paired as well. Thus, due to the significant difference between the lines and the fact that they consistently are linked, I initially surmised
that there must be a clean break between the LOH and another Lost Revised Holograph (LRH), a version that contains revisions that Donne made to his original poem. I observed that all manuscripts traditionally considered in Groups III\textsuperscript{10} and II contain “childish pleasures sillily” and “Love just alike…” readings, while all of the traditional Group I manuscripts and others that are often associated with Group I contain the “country pleasures childishly” and “Love so alike…slacken…” readings.

To examine these three groups further, another collation was run, segregating these three sets of manuscripts to see what other major verbal differences seemed to reappear often and to determine how these variations, revisions and/or corruptions to an original version, correspond with the split in the poem groups. That procedure confirmed that the major word changes in the manuscripts are as follows:\textsuperscript{11}

- line 3: “country pleasures childishly” I+
  “childish pleasures sillily” Σ

- line 4: “snorted” III+, I+
  “slumbered” Σ

- line 10: “For love” III, I+, John Cave (NY1), Nedham (VA2)
  “But love” Σ

\textsuperscript{10} Donne’s poems have been grouped according to commonalities among the readings. There are four main groups; however, Group IV consists solely of the Westmoreland manuscript, which does not contain “The Good Morrow.” Most manuscripts contain consistent readings from one group, but others contain a variety of group readings and cannot be easily categorized. Chronologically Group III was the earliest manuscript group. The Group I manuscripts were composed later, and often the Group II manuscripts were derived from the Group I readings, although that is not always the case.

\textsuperscript{11} The Σ symbol represents all other remaining manuscripts. I, II, and III represent Group I, Group II, and Group III respectively, and + following the numeral represents the other manuscripts that sometimes are associated with that group; in this case, those manuscripts maintain that group’s reading of “The Good Morrow.” There are several manuscripts that fall into the extended Group I category for this poem, but Group III+ simply includes the main Group III manuscripts and the Stephens ms. (H7). For more information on these groups, see \textit{Elegies} XLIII.
In addition to those two major variants in lines 3 and 21, the three most significant verbal
differences appeared in lines 3 (“snorted” versus “slumbered”), 17 (“fitter” versus “better”),
and 20 (“our two loves” versus “both our loves”). However, in the first case, the alteration
did not neatly fit into the original split (Groups III and II versus Group I) because both the
Group III+ and the Group I+ manuscripts contain “snorted,” while the extended Group II
manuscripts contain “slumbered.” Several of these other major changes were not consistent
with the split either, which suggests that the transmissional history is more complicated than
simply one original version being revised to a second version.
Thus, the next step was to examine each of these ten major verbal inconsistencies in order to establish a more detailed theory about the poem’s history of progression. All extant material evidence suggests that Group III manuscripts are the oldest and therefore usually present Donne’s original poems, so it is likely that changes made between this group and Group I and/or Group II poems are one of two types: scribal corruptions or authorial changes to a Group III prototype (from which the other manuscript groups were derived).

Determining what types of changes have been made can be quite difficult, but certainly guidelines are useful. First, based on knowledge of Renaissance paleography, one must determine whether the change could simply be a scribal misreading. For example, the words “our” and “one” can look nearly indistinguishable in both the secretary and the italic hands: both words are three letters and begin with “o,” and the handwritten “u” and “n” are almost identical, as are some versions of the “t” and “e.”12 Thus, a change from one of these words to the other could be an easily understandable misreading on the part of a scribe.

The most helpful factor in determining whether or not a change is authorial is whether the more chronologically recent reading the more challenging and/or unique reading. Critics sometimes differ on this point, for, while some readings are considered “stronger,”13 not all cases are clear. Lines 3 and 21 would seem to fit this guideline. The phrase “country pleasures childishly” (in the same vein as the “country pleasures” remarked on by Hamlet) expresses a rough lewdness and immaturity, in addition to a sexual suggestion, that “childish

---

12 For example, see “one” in line 9 of the Luttrell manuscript. Although, based on the shape and form of this scribe’s letters in other words, it is clear that the his intended word was “one,” this word easily could be misread as “our”; scribes, especially rushed or careless scribes, often mistakenly interchanged these words.

13 By “stronger” reading I mean that one version contains more vibrant and appropriate language, typically with multiple connotations, and usually a more multifaceted and significant meaning than the other version. In other words, that “stronger” version contains language that seems more fitting and precise and provides a more complex reading. Evidence has shown (and logic suggests) that in most cases the “stronger” readings are Donne’s versions.
pleasures sillily” lacks. And, apparently, Donne’s original rather bland ending—“Love just alike in all, none of these loves can die.”—has been replaced by a line that reminds the reader of the delicate mutual tension between two opposing and yet necessarily linked forces, the man and woman just like the hemispheres of the world in “Love so alike, that none do slacken, none can die.” providing for a much “stronger” conclusion.

On the other hand, the case of “fitter” versus “better” in line 17 is not so clear-cut. Chronologically “better” seems to have come after “fitter” (as will be examined later), which would suggest that Donne himself made this change. Of course, one can argue that an aspiring poet-scribe could have made the alteration, trying to establish a “better” reading than that intended by the poet, but Donne’s “fitter” certainly seems the “fitter” choice overall. The likelihood that Donne would have revised “fitter” to “better” is slim, and the editor must assume that a scribe working on the manuscript from which this group was derived made this choice either on purpose or more likely by accident, an understandable mistake since the words look nearly identical in some hands.14 In general, while these types of possible scribal misreadings do create great difficulty for the editor working with none of Donne’s originals and only the connections between the manuscripts as evidence, many conclusions can be reached with great certainty. Close examination of each verbal variant to determine whether it is more likely an authorial change or a scribal mistake is critical for establishing the author’s intended text, as well as whether or not the poem was revised.

In the case of “The Good Morrow,” examination of the three groups and the ten previously presented major word differences in each led to the conclusion that Donne did in fact revise an original version of the poem, as originally theorized; but is also led to the
likelihood that another corrupted version of the poem must have resulted as well. Therefore, there are three general groupings of the poem: the LOH descendants (Group III+), the LRH descendants (Group I+), and the corrupted version descendants (Group II). Only the John Cave (NY1) and Nedham (VA2) manuscripts fail to fit easily into these three categories, but, as I will demonstrate, the differences found in these manuscripts are readily accounted for upon examination.

The Group III+ manuscripts, descended from Donne’s original text, contain similar verbal features, most of which are still present in the Group I+ manuscripts. Group III+ manuscripts maintain the simpler readings of lines 3 and 21 (“childish pleasures sillily” and “Love just alike in all, none of these loves can die.”). Of the ten major verbal differences previously presented, they also contain “snorted” (line 4), “For” (line 10), “one” (line 11), “our” (line 14), “true plain” (line 16), “fitter” (line 17), “was” (line 19), and “our two” (line 20). The only main differences between these manuscripts and the majority of the Group I+ manuscripts are in lines 3, 21, and 17. As previously examined, the “new” lines (“country pleasures childishly” and “Love so alike, that none do slacken, none can die.”) provide stronger readings for the poem overall. The changes present such a vastly more conceptually complex reading that it is highly unlikely that a scribe created them. These changes certainly must be authorial—revisions that Donne made to his original poem which were incorporated by the chronologically more recent manuscripts. However, as discussed, “better” does not appear authorial; it was almost certainly a corruption. Thus, most likely the LRH contains

---

14 Both words have the same number of letters, four of which are identical. And “fi” and “be” can appear quite similar.
15 The VA2 manuscript is nearly an exact copy of the NY1 manuscript in all cases.
the lines 3 and 21 improvements, but another version (represented by \( \chi_1 \) in the schema) contains the line 17 corruption from which the rest of the group was derived.

However, approximately half of the Group I+ manuscripts contain another significant alteration as well: “our world” to “one world” in line 14. Although it could be argued that “one” seems to be a more exact word-choice, since it represents the joining of two pieces and of two people into one and fits the numerical language central to the poem, “our” also fits the line and general meaning of the poem in its declaration of the mutual ownership of the couple of their own room and their own world. Thus, whether this change is authorial cannot be determined solely on the basis of a reading of the resulting density and complexity of the poem. However, because all other materials substantiate that other authorial changes were made at an earlier point, prior to the corruption of line 17, the historical evidence strongly suggests that the logical misreading of “our” to “one” is also a corruption. Most likely this scribe created a corrupted manuscript (represented by \( \pi_2 \) in the schema) from which several other manuscripts in Group I+ were derived.

The Group II manuscripts also contain many common verbal readings which are either derived from the LOH or are obvious corruptions of the LOH. Lines 3 and 21 maintain the original readings, “childish pleasures sillily” and “Love just alike in all, none of these loves can die.” The Group II manuscripts also retain “fitter” in line 17 and “our” in line 14—thus providing further evidence, in fact, that those alterations were corruptions that occurred further down the family tree in the Group I+ manuscripts. The first common corruption among the Group II manuscripts, the alteration of “snorted” to “slumbered” in line 4, also occurs in NY1 and VA2; otherwise, NY1 and VA2 read like the other Group III+ manuscripts. But, this verbal variant is unusual enough that the potential for two different
scribes to happen to make the same verbal change coincidentally is very slim. More likely both manuscript sets were derived from a common lost ancestor (represented by $\gamma$ in the schema) that contains this single corruption from the LOH.

Unlike the other Group II manuscripts, which contain several other shared verbal readings, in all other respects NY1 and VA2 are consistent with other Group III manuscripts. First, all Group II manuscripts contain “But” instead of “For” (line 10),\textsuperscript{16} “a” in place of “one” (line 11), “plain true hearts” instead of “true plain hearts” (line 16), “is” in place of “was” (line 19), and “both our” instead of “our two” (line 20). Comparison of these readings with the original Group III manuscript readings shows none of the changes to be improvements; indeed, most of them offer poorer readings. “But” in line 10 makes little sense, and “a” instead of “one” takes away from the numerical terminology present in the poem,\textsuperscript{17} as well as the specificity provided by the word “one.” The inversion of “plain true hearts” for “true plain hearts” is explainable by the nature of the print industry: the phrase probably was corrupted by a hurried scribe’s rushing to complete an assignment for which he was quite likely paid by the word; certainly the clichéd “true hearts” could spring to the mind of the busy scribe quickly scanning the lines, thus causing an accidental inversion.\textsuperscript{18} The replacement of “was” with “is” also must be a corruption, for setting the unequal mixing of elements contemporaneously with death, as indicated by “is,” removes the cause-and-effect relationship established by “was,” a much more logical reading. Finally, “both our” certainly

\textsuperscript{16} Although this change also occurs in the Stephens manuscripts (H7), the alteration of these similar three-letter words is so common that the likelihood of this chance occurrence is high between two different scribes and is not significant enough on its own to suggest a relationship between the Stephens and the other Group II manuscripts.

\textsuperscript{17} The poem contains several number references: “Seven,” “one” (several times), and “two” (twice).

\textsuperscript{18} For more information on scribal methods see Peter Beal’s \textit{In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and their Makers in Seventeenth-Century England}. 
does not strengthen or sustain the line, offering instead a reading that is not as precise as the pulling together of two forces into one, represented by “our two.” None of these readings can be construed as authorial changes, thus indicating that the Group II manuscripts are derived from a corrupt manuscript (represented in the schema by χ 2).

Since all evidence gathered thus far in the process substantiated the theory that the manuscripts fall into these three groups, the next step was to run further collations to segregate these main groups into families and sub-families to provide a more exact transmissional history. Some prior knowledge of the manuscripts was helpful in this initial grouping, although not allowing prior assumptions to deter from thoroughly checking for patterns and possibilities is critical in accurate schema determination. When Variorum editors established the text of “Loves Warre,” for example, the Thomas Smyth (F4) and Bridgewater (HH1) manuscripts were determined to be a sub-family, so naturally looking for distinguishing word patterns between the versions of “The Good Morrow” in these two manuscripts was a logical step in this process. As expected, there were some commonalities; both contain “fancy” instead of “fancies” in line 5, and both alter “out” in line 9 to another three-letter word: “but” in F4 and “not” in HH1. Although “but” and “not” obviously are different words, when combined with other evidence changes like this can substantiate the possibility that both manuscripts were copied from the same parent, one in which that particular word was difficult to read.

Another example of this investigative grouping technique can be found in the Dalhousie II (TT2) manuscript, which usually appears to be a child of the Dalhousie I
Because this parent-child relationship has occurred in other cases, looking for unusual linking features between the two versions of the poem in these manuscripts was logical, and several such linkages became obvious. Both contain “our childish pleasures” instead of the usual “on childish pleasures” in line 3 and “but as all pleasures” instead of “but this, all pleasures” in line 5. However, I then had to determine whether these manuscripts are siblings, children of another manuscript that contains these unique readings, or a parent and child, in which one was copied from the other. Therefore, I analyzed the manuscripts to see if each one contains readings that make it so unique that the scribe who composed the other manuscript could not have copied the poem and coincidentally changed that corrupted part back to the original, uncorrupted reading. In this case, for example, TT2 (incorrectly) reads “But love, all other love” instead of “But love, all love.” TT1, however, maintains “But love, all love.” The chance that the TT1 scribe copied the TT2 manuscript but by happenstance changed that line back from the TT2 “all other love” reading to the correct original “all love” reading is so remote that TT1 cannot be a child of TT2. But, so many verbal variants connect the two manuscripts that they must be a sub-family, so logically, the TT2 scribe must have corrupted the TT1 text, establishing the parent-child relationship indicated in the schema.

Another example of this process is evident in the Phillips (O21) and Osborn (Y03) manuscripts, traditionally considered to be siblings, which exhibit many unique, linking features such as their reading of line 14—“each hath his one & his owne” instead of the traditional “each hath one, and is one.” Certainly, neither of these manuscripts could be parents to any other extant manuscripts, for these dramatically different readings would have been consistent among others copied from these, and no extant manuscripts contain such

\[19\] The term “child” refers to a manuscript that has been derived from another manuscript, its “parent.” When
readings. In addition, many other unusual verbal commonalities between these two manuscripts exist, clearly establishing the sibling connection between the two.

Through this thorough process of finding unique connections between the manuscripts, such as those in these examples, associations that clearly establish families and sub-families, the probable transmissional history of “The Good Morrow” became apparent. This family tree of relationships was then diagramed in a schematic form. Although the limitations of the schema do not allow for a full listing of the verbal variants that assisted in the breaking up of families and sub-families, the emendations list (beginning on page 30) provides all variants, so that nuances, such as those in the examples above, can be found in this list if needed. As previously mentioned, not all divisions are based solely on verbal variations, for knowledge of parent/child and sibling relationships in other works and recognition of other aspects of the manuscripts, including sequence and indentation patterns, have been useful as well. For example, an unusual indentation pattern (containing indentation of lines 5-6, 12-13, and 19-20 only) found among nine manuscripts within Group II, combined with other verbal evidence, suggested a sub-family of a lost descendant (represented by π 3 in the schema). Consideration of all such evidence is necessary for the creation of the most accurate schema possible, one that can substantiate or refute all theories about the holographs. In the case of “The Good Morrow,” the evidence does substantiate the idea that Donne composed the poem and then revised it. The next step in the process was to construct the text of “The Good Morrow.”
After establishing that Donne must have revised the original holograph from the Group III reading to the Group I+ reading, I had to determine whether to provide readers with the original holograph text, the revised holograph text, or both versions of “The Good Morrow.” In any literary period, when separate versions provide significantly different interpretations of a work, such as Henry James’s original version of *Portrait of a Lady* compared with the later New York edition which presents nearly an entirely different heroine, editors often choose to provide all versions. This also has been the decision of the Arden *Hamlet* editors who decided that the “Good” Quarto, “Bad” Quarto, and First Folio versions all warrant presentation.20 The Donne Variorum editors also have chosen to present different versions of some of Donne’s poems, but one must consider the magnitude of the verbal variations. In the case of “The Good Morrow” the major alterations between the Lost Original Holograph and the Lost Revised Holograph do not radically affect the poem’s meaning. The phrases “childish pleasures sillily” and “country pleasures childishly” are fairly similar in meaning, although the second reading, as examined earlier, is more suggestive and complex. And, although the revised version of the last line has more levels of meaning and depth, both are genuine alternative endings. The variants are significant and certainly worthy of discussion and consideration, but they are relatively minor and do not greatly affect a reader’s experience of the poem. Therefore, only one version of this poem need be presented.

20 Although the versions contain similar *Hamlet* texts, there are enough significant variants that the versions are extraordinarily different. For example, according to Rosenbaum the “Good” Quarto contains a thirty-five line soliloquy towards the conclusion of the play that is absent from the First Folio.
My next question was whether to choose the copy-text from the Group III manuscripts derived from the LOH or from the LRH version present in the Group I+ manuscripts. In other words, should one print the author’s original or final intention? Some authors answer this question for editors; James, for instance, insisted that his revised version of Portrait far exceeded his original endeavor. However, no such knowledge is available for Donne. In the case of “The Good Morrow,” most scholars would agree that the revised version offers more vivid language and a more evocative reading, in which each word seems to fit more perfectly than in the original version. And, just as scholars would cringe at the idea of having a rough draft of a dissertation published or even read, most authors prefer that their final preferences be those which are passed down through generations. Thus, for this edition I have followed in the direction that most editors choose: the author’s final intention.

However, choosing a copy-text for “The Good Morrow” is not simple, for an editor must determine the artifact that both seems to have the fewest corruptions and stands the highest on the family tree. In the Group I+ manuscripts, two manuscripts stand out clearly as the most likely candidates: the Dolau Cothi (WN1) and the Dublin II (DT2) manuscripts. These two manuscripts contain very few unusual variants, are somewhat consistent with the LRH, and are high on the family tree of that group. And again, although both contain unusual punctuation, when choosing the copy-text the verbal readings are much more significant, for Renaissance punctuation, like the spelling and capitalization, was so idiosyncratic and relatively haphazard.

The Dolau Cothi is the more sensible choice, for it has even fewer corruptions than the Dublin II and contains the three-stanza pattern and lack of indentation that evidence suggests the LRH most likely contains. Consisting of 129 Donne poems, all composed in the
same hand, and dates between 1622 and 1633, this manuscript was owned by Richard Lloyde circa 1700, belonged to the Johns family of Dolau Cothi until approximately 1944, and now resides in the National Library of Wales. It contains generally Group II readings, although some poems, such as “The Good Morrow,” are more consistent with Group I (Stringer et al XCII). Although the Welsh spelling, capitalization, and punctuation are even more unusual than most manuscripts, the Dolau Cothi provides the most consistent verbal readings and would require the fewest of editorial emendations and thus is the most logical choice for the copy-text of “The Good Morrow.”

V

Following is the textual apparatus for “The Good Morrow.” This apparatus contains variants, ranging from variations in stanza indentation to verbal changes, for all manuscripts and seventeenth-century printed editions. The information is broken down line by line, with the words from the copy-text presented first and then followed by all substantive variants in manuscripts or seventeenth-century printed editions. By “substantive” I refer to any variants that affect the meaning or meter of the line. Thus, minor spelling differences need not be reported, as examined earlier, but all differences in punctuation and capitalization, as well as spelling changes that could affect meter, are recorded. This apparatus contains an exhaustive list—in a sense a complete description of the variants that usually appear in shortened forms in the footnotes of most critical editions.

Following this extensive variant list is the poem’s schema, a sort of “family tree” for the transmissional progression of the poem from Donne’s original work through his authorial editions and through the editions and corruptions made by other scribes. I began this schema
of “The Good Morrow” with Donne’s Lost Original Holograph and then established the rest through the previously discussed investigative process of analyzing verbal variants in collations to determine family relationships among the manuscript versions of the poem.

Several categories of information are included for this textual apparatus. The categories are a reflection of those established by the Donne Variorum editors.

1) Copy-text. Both the original version, based on the Dolau Cothi manuscript, and a modernized version. Already presented.

2) Sources Collated. Titles of manuscripts and printed editions with their Variorum abbreviations.

3) Emendations of the Copy text. The minor differences between the Dolau Cothi manuscript and the final established copy-text.

4) Historical Collation.
   a. Format. Noteworthy differences in the manuscript versions, including indentation patterns, stanzaic forms, and various information affecting the text.
   b. Headings.
   c. Line-by-line collation. All variants in the body of the poem except those spelling differences that would not affect scansion or pronunciation. Each line contains the copy-text version of any word that has a variant reading; this word, the lemma, is presented with “]” after the word. Following the lemma] are the variant(s) and the abbreviation(s) for the manuscript version(s) that contain such variants.
EXAMPLE: Line 1 contains the following variants for the unpunctuated word “wonder”:

wonder] ~, B32 C8 O20 SA1 SP1 G wonde' H7 Wonder OJ1 A-F.

“wonder]” is the lemma and is followed by “~,” which represents “wonder,” for “~” is an abbreviation for the original lemma and is followed by the alteration “,”. The manuscripts B32, C8, O20, SA1, SP1 and the printed version G (1669) contain “wonder,” instead of “wonder”. The next variant is “wonde’” and is found in H7. “Wonder” with a capital “W” is found in OJ1 and printed versions A-F. These are all of the variants of the copy-text “wonder” present in the manuscripts or printed versions.

d. Subscriptions.

e. Schema (or Stemma) of Textual Relationships. As described by the Variorum editors, the schema “Charts in schematic form the genealogy of each poem and the relationships of the textual artifacts, denoting definite lines of transmission with arrows, definite associations and family linkages with solid lines, and conjectural lines of relationship with dotted lines” (LVI). The word “conjectural” does not mean simply a guess or estimate. All associations are grounded on sufficient evidence to warrant such assumptions. However, only the linkages that are absolutely beyond any doubt appear with solid lines; if there is any possibility that there could be other explanations, the lines are dotted. This schema provides a transmissional history of the text of “The Good Morrow” based on all available contemporary evidence.
Sources Collated

Denbigh ms. (B7), Skipwith ms. (B13), Glover ms. (B23), Harley Noel ms. (B30),
Newcastle ms. (B32), Lansdowne ms. (B40), Stowe ms. (B46), Stowe II ms. (B47), Edward
Smyth ms. (C1), Cambridge Balam ms. (C2), Leconfield ms. (C8), Luttrell ms. (C9),
Emmanuel College, Cambridge ms. (CE1), Puckering ms. (CT1), Dublin ms. (DT1), Dublin
II ms. (DT2), Thomas Smyth ms. (F4), Norton ms. (H4), Dobell ms. (H5), O'Flahertie ms.
(H6), Stephens ms. (H7), Utterson ms. (H8), Bridgewater ms. (HH1), Haslewood-
Kingsborough II ms. (HH5), John Cave ms. (NY1), Dowden ms. (O20), Phillipps ms. (O21),
St. John's ms. (OJ1), Bishop ms. (R9), Grey ms. (SA1), Drummond miscellany (SN2),
Wedderburn ms. (SN4), St. Paul's ms. (SP1), Dalhousie I ms. (TT1), Dalhousie II ms. (TT2),
Nedham ms. (VA2), Dolau Cothi ms. (WN1), Herbert ms. (WN3), King ms. (Y2), Osborn
ms. (Y3), 1633 edition (A), 1635 edition (B), 1639 edition (C), 1649 edition (D), 1650
dition (E), 1654 edition (F), 1669 edition (G)

Emendations of the Copy-text

2 lou’d;
8 Good morrowe] God-morrowe
16 true] trw
17 can] cane
fitter] better

Historical Collation

Format:

Indentations: lines 5-6, 12-13, and 19-20 indented B7 B40 B47 DT1 SA1 TT1 TT2 Y3, no
indentation B13 B23 B30 B32 C2 C8 DT2 F4 NY1 O20 O21 OJ1 R9 SN4 SP1 VA2 WN1
WN3 A-G, lines 6, 13, and 20 indented B46, lines 2, 4, 9, 11, 16, and 18 indented and lines
5-6, 12-13, and 19-20 further indented C9 H6, lines 12-14 and 19-21 indented CE1, lines 5-6
Stanzaic Forms: 3 stanzas of 6 lines, 8 lines, and 7 lines each B13
B23 B30 B32 B40 B46 B47 C2 C8 C9 CE1 CT1 DT1 F4 H4 H5 H6 H7 H8 HH1 NY1 O20
O21 OJ1 R9 SA1 SN4 SP1 TT1 TT2 VA2 WN1 WN3 Y2 Y3 A-G, 1 long stanza DT2 HH5

Miscellaneous: Only has the last stanza of the poem and contains no indentation C1, “out”
written to side of line 9 C9, line 12 appears to have been added after original composition
H6, missing line 12 H7, missing line 4 HH1, repeats line 14 at top of next page O20, contains
cursive handwritten remarks out to the side of the printed edition containing line 3: “on
childish pleasure seelily” line 20: “both thou and I” and line 21: “Loue just alike in all. None
of these loues can dye.” OJ1, contains unreadable 3-letter scribal strikethrough in line 14 R9,
contains a few lines of “The Good Morrow” in the midst of other poems with slight
indentation of line 15 and the word “images” written to the left of line 15 SN2, stanzas
numbered in left margin Y2

Headings: The good Morrowe B7 CT1 The Good Morrow. B40 Elegie B46 The good
morrow. B47 to his M⁷ CE1 The Good Morrowe DT1 H4 H5 D⁷ Donne. To his mistresse.
F4 The Good-morrow H7 I.D. H8 The good morrow. OJ1 >>[By John Donne]<< R9 The
B32 C01 C02 C08 C09 DT2 H06 HH1 HH5 NY1 O20 O21 SN2 SN4 SP1 TT1 TT2 VA2
WN3 Y03

Line-by-line collation:
1: om C01 SN2 wonder] ~, B32 C08 O20 SA1 SP1 G wonde\(^t\) H07 Wonder OJ1 A-F by] (~ CE1 troth,] ~ B13 B23 B30 B40 B47 C09 DT2 F04 H05 H08 HH1 HH5 NY1 O21 R09 SP1 TT1 VA2 WN3 Y02 Troth, C02 ~) CE1 troath DT1 Y03 Troth H06 trothe, O20 SN4 trothe TT2 what] What B13 w\(^t\). H08 w\(^t\) NY1 Y03 thou] ~, B13 B40 B47 C08 H04 OJ1 SP1 TT2 A-G Thou, C02 O20 y" NY1 you VA2 and] & B47 C09 CE1 H08 HH1 HH5 O21 WN3 Y02 Y03 ~, H07 I,] ~ B07 B13 B23 B30 B32 B40 B46 B47 C02 C08 C09 CE1 CT1 DT1 DT2 H04 H05 H06 H07 H08 HH1 HH5 NY1 O20 O21 OJ1 R09 SA1 SN4 SP1 TT1 TT2 VA2 WN3 Y02 Y03 A-G

2: om C01 SN2 Did] did B13 B40 B47 DT1 H07 HH1 HH5 NY1 O21 SA1 Y03 ~, B32 C08 O20 OJ1 SP1 A-G Dyd, C02 did, H05 till] e'are DT2 tyll O20 lou'd;] loued B13 ~, B13 B30 B47 C08 C09 DT1 DT2 H06 NY1 O20 Y02 lov'd, B32 C02 HH1 OJ1 A-B ~ B46 lov'd. CE1 lov'd? F04 C-G loud? H05 lou'de H07 lou'de? H08 Loued O21 loud, R09 loued, SA1 SP1 Y03 TT1 loved, TT2 loud’, VA2 ~. WN3 were] Were CE1 F04 H06 wee] not O21 not] wee O21 weand] wan'd B07 weaned, B32 wear'ed C02 wain'd F04 weand’ H05 weand, O20 SP1 then?] ~, B13 H08 G ~ B30 DT2 HH1 O21 R09 TT1 TT2 WN3 Y02 Y03
3: om C01 SN2 But] or B13 but H05 HH5 NY1 O21 SA1 suckt] suck’d B07 B30 B32 B40 C02 CT1 DT1 O20 OJ1 TT1 WN3 A-G suckd C09 B47 H06 SN4 SP1 suck’d C08 VA2 s**>u<ckt CE1 sucked NY1 suck TT2 on] wee B13 one B40 B46 HH5 Y03 our TT1 TT2 Countrye] childish B07 B47 C09 CE1 CT1 DT1 F04 H04 H05 H06 H08 HH5 NY1 R09 SA1 TT1 VA2 WN3 Y02 Y03 G childishe B13 TT2 cuntrye B23 country B30 SN4 Childish B40 B46 H07 HH1 O21 Countrye childi** C02 empty DT2 Countryes O20 countrey OJ1 A-F Countrieys SP1 pleasures] Pleasures B32 pleasure B46 C09 F04 H06 ~, C02 C08 OJ1 A-F Childishly?] sillily? B07 CT1 DT1 NY1 R09 SA1 VA2 WN3 sillilye, B13 childishlye. B23 childishly? B30 B32 O20 OJ1 SP1 A-F seelily? B40 B47 G sillily B46 H06 O21Y03 Childishlye? sillilye? C02 childishlie, C08 sillilye C09 sillily, CE1 H05 childishly DT2 sillilie? F04 H07 sillilye? H04 seelily H08 sillily, HH1 seelilye? HH5 childishlye? SN4 seelilie TT1 TT2 Y02
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SCHEMA OF “THE GOOD MORROW”

Lost Original Holograph

Lost Revised Holograph
3: country pleasures childishly; 20: Love so alike, that none doe slacken, none can die.

γ (4: slumbered)

NY1 (14: one; 17: better)

χ (10: But; 11: a; 16: plain true; 19: is; 20: both our)
In order to appreciate the process of transcription, collation, and filiation that went into constructing this schematic transmissional history of “The Good Morrow,” one must keep in mind an important element: why this work is worthwhile. Scholars and editors argue about the most minute word and punctuation choices, provoking some English instructors to throw up their hands in exasperation and say, “Who cares!” Certainly one can understand how the difference between “solid,” “sallied,” and “sullied” might seem insignificant to most readers; so why do editors labor over choosing the “best” text instead of merely picking a word and moving on to other endeavors?

In fact, editors basically have followed that route for years, making choices based mainly on scholarly interpretations (which are naturally biased by each scholar’s reading of the work) and usually then listing the other known variants. But these scholars did not have the tools—the available manuscripts, the computer software, the understanding of Renaissance paleography—we have today, and I suggest that the availability of these tools obliges modern editors to make use of them.

But, even with these tools available, does an editor establish a text based on what appears to be the best reading of the work, or does one make choices based on what seems most historically accurate? While no one scholar can provide a definitive answer, most contemporary scholars have come to the conclusion that editors must consider both choices. An editor should aim to gather all available material evidence and, through the use of computer software, such as the Donne Variorum Collation Program, and the detective-like process of examining variants so as to create a transmissional history, strive to determine the closest possible version to an author’s original. But there are
some issues that simply cannot be determined this way. Sometimes one cannot ascertain if a word change was a scribal corruption or an authorial change. This is where the element of interpretation enters, for at this point an editor must look to scholarly critics to determine which is the stronger reading—the reading more likely to be that which Donne intended. While this portion of editing is speculative, often scholars at least can agree on which reading seems more difficult and more fitting to the poem’s overall meaning and thus is more likely the author’s; this more difficult reading is the one chosen.

The copy-text of “The Good Morrow” I have established—the text I believe to be closest to Donne’s intention—presents language that provides the most complex, multifaceted reading of Donne’s complex, multifaceted love poem. R. E. Pritchard has said that “The Good Morrow”

presents a new love, different from ordinary sexuality, that is associated with the discovery of reality, the establishment of true faith, a replacement of the familiar world, an image of perfection and eternity, that recalls an original happy state, and involves an activity unlike that consequent upon the Fall. (220)

Because Donne broaches so many cosmic issues and involved metaphors in his description of this rich and complicated love, I suspect that he must have weighed each word carefully in order to create his “image of perfection and eternity.” For most authors this creative process would involve major revisions of their work. However, some scholars suggest that Donne probably did not revise his poems, which would invalidate my theory of his original and revised holographs of “The Good Morrow.” Gary Stringer discusses this issue in a forthcoming essay on Donne’s Holy Sonnets:
in one of the more widely known references that he makes to his role as a poet—the letter to Henry Goodyere of 20 December 1614—Donne depicts himself as one who tended to write a poem, present it to the intended audience, and be done with it. As I have suggested above with respect to the Holy Sonnets, however (and as we have shown with respect to other poems in previous volumes of the Variorum), abundant manuscript evidence counters this portrait of Donne as a neglectful custodian of his own work, revealing instead an artist who very much cared about his poems and who continued to fine-tune or revise individual items, sometimes in multiple stages, even after distributing the original versions.

As Stringer explains, the evidence that Donne revised his epithalamions, epigrams, elegies, and even songs and sonnets is substantial, and all available evidence suggests that Donne “continued to fine-tune” “The Good Morrow” as well.

My copy-text consists of the closest reading of “The Good Morrow” to Donne’s final intention based on all existing material evidence. First, Donne almost certainly revised his original “childish pleasures sillily” to “country pleasures childishly.” While “childish” and “silly” maintain similar meanings, making the original version repetitive, the words “country” and “childish” combine the lewd, simple, and uncouth with the notion of silly, uncomplicated youth, providing for a more complex overall reading. In addition, the revision of Donne’s original, bland ending21 to “thou and I / Love so alike, that none do slacken, none can die” provides a conclusion which, according to David Daiches, “affirms, in simple and ringing language, the eternity of their love” (184). This
ending reminds the reader of the delicate balance and strength of mutual love, just like
the delicate balance of the elements of the body (an important idea during the
Renaissance) and of the spheres of the world. Daiches suggests that this conclusion
“gives the necessary rhetorical weight to the final line of the poem” (186) that the
original ending lacks.

I also have chosen the word “snorted” for line 4 in place of “slumbered.”
Donne’s “snorted” has the same roughness of his “country pleasures” and therefore
provides a more consistent following line. This word suggests that the lovers were wild
and unenlightened before they awoke to the “light” they find together at daybreak—the
dawn of understanding they find in each other’s love. On the other hand, “slumbered”
implies an innocence and peace that does not fit the context of that stanza or of the poem
overall. In addition, one can imagine how a scribe copying the poem might have come
across “snorted” in the text and found it lewd or inappropriate in such a profound love
poem; that scribe could easily have substituted a less coarse word, one that implies more
refinement than “snorted,” believing it an improvement on the poem overall. While
“snorted” is an unusual word choice and a more difficult concept to grasp, “slumbered” is
a word that might come to anyone’s mind who is searching for a term to represent deep
sleep, further substantiating that “slumbered” probably was a scribal “improvement.”
Some might argue that “snorted” is not a clear-cut revision based on interpretation alone.
Although both are viable readings, all manuscript evidence points towards “snorted” as
being both the original word and the word that remains throughout the uncorrupted
manuscripts, as well as the more complex and “fit” reading.

21 Some modern editors, such as Redpath, prefer this ending and have printed it instead. Daiches points out
that Redpath finds the rhythm more consistent with the rest of the poem and thus more suitable. However,
“Let us possess our world” is another line that scholars might argue is not a clear-cut choice based on interpretation. As previously examined, some scholars urge that “Let us possess one world” is a stronger reading than “our world,” due to the poem’s number language and the idea “one” suggests of two becoming one. However, others argue that the inclusiveness and ownership of the world present in “our” make it a more likely candidate for the authorial reading; David Daiches claims, “‘our world’ probably makes better sense: they are one, and possess their common world, ‘ours’” (183). As previously stated, “our” to “one” (or vice versa) is easily explicable as a slip of the pen, a scribal misreading, and both words make sense in the poem. But all of the Group III readings and the majority of the Group I+ readings include “our”; all evidence points to “Let us possess our world” as the authorial reading and to “one” as a corruption. Although scholars might argue about what makes for the stronger reading, if one is trying to teach Donne’s poem, the transmissional history substantiates that Donne’s “The Good Morrow” reads “our world.”

In addition to these choices, which are found in the Dolau Cothi, there is the one major emendation I made to that manuscript reading: “better” to “fitter.” Although the Dolau Cothi contains the “better” reading, as the other Group I+ manuscripts do, for reasons already examined I believe that “fitter” is the “fitter” choice, the one that Donne composed but that was corrupted during the transmissional process. Donne’s “fitter” is a more precise word choice, fitting the image of two perfectly synchronized hemispheres comprising a world, or two perfectly suited people creating a model couple, and of course providing the suggestion of fitting together, both as pieces of a puzzle and as a sexually joined pair. The word “better” has none of these connotations, and, as already

most editors disagree and have chosen to print the “…none do slacken…” conclusion.
mentioned, could easily have been misinterpreted by the scribe who composed the manuscript from which the Group I+ readings are derived. Thus, the change of “better” to “fitter” is the only major verbal emendation to the Dolau Cothi manuscript that I have made during this editorial process.

But the question remains of why editors go through this process. Why do historicists and critics continue to debate rigorously these issues of “our” versus “one” and “fitter” versus “better”? Establishing texts is not about editorial territory—history versus interpretation, analysis versus assumption—but about presenting the author’s intended work. If a modern author composes a line to read “die,” but a publisher accidentally prints “did,” would not that author be livid, for the entire intended meaning would be lost due to a simple typographic error. And if a college freshman was unaware of the error, her entire reading of the piece might be affected, causing a misunderstanding of the author’s intention. Scholars are charged with examining literature, interpreting literature, assisting minds in understanding its value and appreciating its art. Yet, how can the words be examined if scholars are unsure whether or not what they are studying is even accurate? Surely, instructors never will be able to convince their students and others of literature’s value as art and as worthy of study and reflection if they cannot even feel confident that what they are teaching is art.

Establishing texts approaches a science, a science that combines investigative work and scholarly interpretation so as to preserve art. Just as a painting must be restored after years of deterioration, so must a Renaissance poem be restored—restored from the corruptions and “improvements” made by scribes, printers, and editors through the years—to the least corrupted form achievable. This is the task of modern Renaissance
editors, the task of establishing the closest text to the original possible so that it can be passed down through generations, until perhaps enough substantial evidence is discovered to warrant a re-examination.

How much of each poem’s transmissional history students should be made aware of to help them understand this process lies in the discretion of each instructor. Some may think that students need to understand the extensive work surrounding each Renaissance poem that they read in order to appreciate the circumstances surrounding the literary creation, but others may prefer to spend their time examining the final product itself. But whatever choice instructors make, the value of the effort necessary to create the best edition possible, one that all can read alike, is undeniable. This text of John Donne’s “The Good Morrow” is the result of such an endeavor.
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