A. H. Clough's "Poems" (1862): The English and American editions

The Harvard community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citable link</td>
<td><a href="https://nrs.harvard.edu/URN-3:HUL.INSTREPOS:37363995">https://nrs.harvard.edu/URN-3:HUL.INSTREPOS:37363995</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Use</td>
<td>This article was downloaded from Harvard University’s DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <a href="http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA">http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. H. Clough's Poems (1862):
The English and American Editions

P. G. Scott

Arthur Hugh Clough spent his early childhood in America; his nickname at Rugby School was "Yankee"; it was to America that he returned in 1851 in search of freedom, after his disappointing experience as Principal of University Hall, London; his long narrative poem The Botbie was reprinted at Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1849; several of his shorter poems appeared in magazines in America in the early fifties; and it was in the American Atlantic Monthly that Clough's epistolary verse-novel Amours de Voyage first appeared in 1858. When Clough died in 1861, a new American edition of his poems was being seen through the press by Charles Eliot Norton. Yet, strangely enough, the possible relationship between the two posthumous editions of the following year, American and English, has not been fully studied, nor the importance of the American text sufficiently recognized.

"Strangely" because considerable attention has, over the years, been given to the complications of the Clough texts, and much of that attention has focused on the posthumous editions of 1862. Do the 1862 editions fulfill Clough's latest intentions, or were they put together by their editors from the manuscripts he left? If the second, then they have no authority against those manuscripts which survive. The very substantial Oxford English Texts Clough Poems (1951) paid particular attention to the "large and bewildering mass" of manuscript material, to try to get behind the 1862 texts to Clough's own final wishes. The Oxford Poems has been subjected to very sharp attack from R. M. Gollin, for not taking this policy far enough: "the posthumous editions," Gollin wrote, "have little or no authority against the manu-

4 Poems of Arthur Hugh Clough, ed. H. F. Lowry, A. L. P. Norrington, and F. L. Mulhauser (Oxford, 1951), hereafter Poems: a summary of the textual policy is given on p. viii. I should like to thank Professor Mulhauser for discussing the argument of this paper with me, and to acknowledge research grants from Leicester and Edinburgh Universities.
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Examination of the relation between the English and American editions shows that, for certain sections of Clough’s work, the posthumous editions have greater authority than any extant manuscript. Gollin’s attack rested on the supposition that the 1862 texts were solely the product of editorial work on the manuscripts by Mrs. Clough and her late husband’s friends. Where his supposition was correct, his attack was, of course, justified. But the attack can be seen to be much less damaging when it is realized that for substantial sections of the 1862 text, the English edition was printed from proofs of the American edition, which in turn was set up from copy prepared by Clough himself before his death. In several instances, the American edition preserves readings which were misprinted or unauthoritatively rewritten in the production of the English edition. Even in cases where neither of the posthumous editions of 1862 is authoritative, the American edition can be a guide to the kind of editorial intervention exercised by Mrs. Clough, and from its variants can be reconstructed the nature of the copy which Clough had prepared, even when the English 1862 editors chose to use an earlier manuscript as the basis for their text.

The Background

As early as 1854, Charles Eliot Norton had been asking Clough to aid him in producing an edition of Clough’s shorter poems for America. Clough had refused to attempt the necessary revision just then: “I don’t think I can set to work to unravel my weaved-up follies at this present moment . . . I dislike returning to old things — but I should like to print something at Boston.” Clough did send some poems across, and Norton’s plan was to get Fields, of Ticknor and Fields, to publish the collected edition. Clough even sent the as-yet-unpublished poem *Amours de Voyage* for inclusion. The project never seems to have got off the ground, though, and a new manuscript of *Amours de Voyage* was sent across the Atlantic for its magazine publication by James Russell Lowell in 1858. New efforts were made, however, in 1858, and a number of references to the edition appear in Clough’s


*Correspondence*, II, 482 (12 May 1854).
correspondence with Norton.⁵ Among the material which Clough then sent over were corrections to the magazine text of the Amours, and a marked-up copy of the 1848 English edition of The Bothie with many alterations.⁶ Much of this material is now in the Houghton Library at Harvard, but not the marked-up copy of The Bothie, or, indeed, anything else that could have been used directly as copy for the printer. There were, however, numerous delays in the preparation of the edition, and it had not been printed, though it seems to have been set up in proof, when Clough died at Florence on 11 November 1861, after many weary travels in search of health.

Very soon afterwards, when Mrs. Clough got back to England and her children, she decided to prepare a new English edition of Clough's poems (no English edition had appeared since the half-share in the volume Ambraesia in 1849). She wrote off to Norton:

Will you tell me when you write how it stands now about the little collection of poems which he sent you . . . would you kindly tell me exactly what you have? I believe I have copies of all, if I remember I copied most of them, but I can't remember which were sent.⁷

She had not yet received Norton's reply when she sent off another letter to him:

We are now thinking . . . of having his poems republished together with some late additions. Would you be so kind as to let me have what you have in America.⁸

Norton's replies to these letters, unfortunately, are not now among either the Clough or Norton papers, but he appears to have told Mrs. Clough that the Boston edition was almost ready to print, for she returned to the topic a week later:

My dear Mr. Norton,

I can write only a few lines to try and catch tomorrow's steamer, because I think I must ask you not to have anything more done about publishing my husband's poems till I write again . . . I do not feel sure that it would be right


⁶ The first corrected copy of The Bothie was lost, and Clough had to send a second one.

⁷ Correspondence, II, 609 (11 November 1861). The last comment could mean that Blanche Smith Clough's Notebook, dated 1852 by the Oxford editors, could also include copies made circa 1858 of the revised texts then being sent to America.

⁸ Correspondence, II, 612 (15 January 1862).
to have it done in America at the same time as at home, by a different publisher.

The letter, which must have been a sore trial to Norton's good manners and his publisher's probity (the poems had no American copyright), went on to reveal that Mrs. Clough was not in the ideal position to edit her husband's poems:

I would very much like, but I fear it would be very troublesome, to have copies of the little things you have. There are several I cannot, now our house is let, lay my hands on with certainty that they are the right ones [most Clough poems exist in several manuscripts]...what I most care about is to have his corrections of the Booth and of Amarantha.8

Happily, Norton proved a kind and tolerant friend to Clough's widow. He and Tichnor held up the printing of their edition, while Mrs. Clough made arrangements with Macmillan for the publication of an English edition. Proofs of the Boston text were sent over to Mrs. Clough, and used as copy for sections of the Macmillan text. Many alterations and additions which Mrs. Clough proposed were made also to the Boston text, and the appearance of the American edition was delayed until late August/early September 1862, though the English edition appeared in July 1862. This two-way exchange of proofs and letters gave rise to a very complicated relationship between the two 1862 editions. I give first a short description of the two editions, and then try to clarify the relationship between the two by examining each section of the texts separately.

The English and American Editions

The English edition was printed by Spottiswoode and Co., and published by Macmillan, price six shillings. It is usually referred to below by the 1862 editors' sign, but where this might cause confusion the term "the English edition" or "the London edition" has been used instead. The title page reads:

POEMS / BY / ARTHUR HUGH CLOUGH / SOMETIME FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE, OXFORD / WITH A MEMOIR / MACMILLAN AND

9Harvard 1360 (24 January 1862). Unpublished letters are cited by their location (Harvard or the Bodleian) and then by the library's own numbering. Unpublished material is quoted by permission of Miss Katherine Duff, the Harvard College Library, and the Keeper of Western Manuscripts, The Bodleian Library. Mrs. Clough's letters to Norton at Harvard are catalogued bMS 1088 (1360-90).
It is a small octavo (page size 16.9 x 10.6 cm). It collates π², a², B–R², S². Presumably gathering S was imposed with gathering a. There are half-titles before each of the four sections of the book, and, though most of these sections do not correspond to the divisions between gatherings, it is worth noting that the shorter poems occupy exactly, gatherings B–F, and that the Botbie half-title which follows begins a new sheet; this possibly relates to the change in the order of printing of the sections made in late April 1862 (see below, "Minor Poems"). It suggests that The Botbie had already been begun by the compositors by that time, and that the number of shorter poems to be included was thereafter governed at least partly by the physical format of the book — the wish to fill exactly the five sheets allowed. This might explain the exclusion of some minor poems originally intended for inclusion. The pagination is xxviii + 259 pp. Francis Turner Palgrave’s Memoir occupies pp. v–xxiv. The book is bound in a green honeycomb grained cloth, stamped on the front cover with a pattern of rules in black and gold; the same pattern is blind-stamped on the back cover. The front cover is also gold-stamped with a roundel, containing a Greek cross, and the initials A H C. The spine is stamped in gold at the head POEMS. / BY / A. H. CLOUGH. (between double gold rules and a single black one); at the foot is stamped MACMILLAN & Co. / 6/- (over a black rule, and two gold ones). The endpapers are a dark red-brown. The cover-size is 17.6 x 10.8 cm.

The American edition was printed by Welch, Bigelow and Company, and published by Ticknor and Fields. Sheets of this edition were subsequently sold with a title page dated 1870, with the publishers given as Fields, Osgood and Co. The edition is referred to below as Boston, or "the American edition." The title page reads:


"This transfer explains why in 1884 the publisher was given as Osgood: "Collection towards a bibliography of Arthur Hugh Clough," The Literary World, XV (28 June 1884), 213. I wish to thank Miss Duff and Mr. Simon Nowell-Smith, for the loan of copies of Boston."
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The book is of 32mo size, but gathered as octavo (page size 13.9 x 8.3 cm). The prefatory matter is signed with lower-case letters, and the body of the book with numerals: [a]², b, c, [1]², 2-18, 19. Presumably gathering c was imposed with gathering 19. There are half-titles before each of the sections of the book, and the pagination is xxxvi + 299 pp. Norton's Memoir occupies pp. [xi]–xxxvi. The book is bound, like others of the same Ticknor series, such as the Longfellow and Lowell poems, in royal blue grained cloth, blind-stamped on the front and back covers, and gold-stamped on the spine: "CLOUGH'S / POEMS within a floral frame. The endpapers are brown, and all page edges gilt. The cover size is 14.5 x 8.4 cm. The sale price was 75 cents.

The obvious difference between the two editions, apart from the different prefatory memoir, is the change of sequence of the various sections. Boston runs The Botbie, Amours, Mari Magno, Minor Poems; the English edition has the shorter poems, The Botbie, Amours, and Mari Magno.¹¹

The Botbie

The Botbie had first appeared as The Botbie of Toper-na-Fuosie in 1848, and had been reprinted in America the following year. Clough made heavy revisions to the poem for the projected American collected edition, by marking up a copy of the 1848 printed text. He originally did this during February 1859, and on the 18th of that month he promised to dispatch the revised copy to Norton within a week.¹² This first marked copy, however, got lost in transit, and on 9 June 1859 Clough told Norton that he would "set to work to fit out another one." ¹³ This would be mainly clerical rather than intellectual labor, as Clough had by him the rough working copy of his corrections, marked in over the years in yet another copy of the 1848 edition, the one 1951 called A. It was July of the next year before Clough got another copy fitted out, and, since he then wrote

¹¹For lists of contents for 1862, and of differences in the contents of Boston, see R. M. Gollin, W. E. Houghton, and M. Timko, Arthur Hugh Clough, A Descriptive Catalogue (New York, 1967), pp. 32-34. This states, p. 43, that Boston omitted "My mind is at rest" from Amours: in fact, the section was included in Boston, but was not divided off from the previous section.

¹²Correspondence, II, 563-564.

¹³Correspondence, II, 569, 569.
to Norton for advice about a safe way of getting the corrections across the Atlantic, it was October 1860 before the copy was dispatched. The corrected copy does not survive among the Norton papers, or in the Clough family papers, but quite clearly a later and better copy than A was in existence, in America, in 1860-61, and represented Clough's final intentions about the Bothie text.

On the other side of the Atlantic, when Mrs. Clough was preparing the English edition, she did not have a clear copy of Clough's intended revisions. She wrote to Norton, "what I most care about is to have his corrections of the Bothie," and "I am now very anxious to have from America the copy of the Bothie with his corrections." Norton promised to send off the proof sheets of the text set up in America from the corrected copy, and by 10 April 1862 Mrs. Clough reported to him that these American proofs were in the hands of the English printers.

For The Bothie, therefore, it is clear that the nearest we can now get to the missing corrected copy is the Boston text, even though the Boston printers were lavish with their added punctuation. Where the English text differs from Boston, the English printer is in error. The English text varies in 123 readings from the Boston text — mostly, of course, in accidentals. Only where American practice differed from British (as in putting punctuation before rather than after closing quotation marks) does the English text agree with 1848 against Boston. In the overwhelming majority of cases, and in all where any difference of sense is involved (including all substantive variants), Boston agrees with 1848 against the English 1862 text. Substantive variants where the Boston reading should be preferred are at III.150, III.191, IV.8, IV.80, IV.119, V.31, V.67, VII.101, IX.89, and IX.180. At two points, the English edition corrected obvious misprints in Boston: at V.41 ("horse-buck" for "horse-back") and at VI.90 ("cruise" for "cruse"). Here, of course, the English corrections should be accepted. The Boston punctuation, obtrusive though it is, will confirm Clough's alterations to the 1848 punctuation, and be a better guide to Clough's meaning than that of the English text, where either Mrs. Clough or

\[\text{Harvard Library Bulletin}\]

\[\text{326}\]

\[\text{Harvard University - Houghton Library / Harvard University. Harvard Library bulletin. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Library. Volume XX, Number 3 (July 1972)}\]
Sportiswoode’s elaborated considerably. For instance, at IV.89, the English text adds in commas, making nonsense of the first phrase. (Ideally, punctuation for an edition of The Boatie would follow 1848, emending where necessary from Boston.) The text of The Boatie shows the dependence of the English edition on the American one in its simplest and most direct form.

Amours de Voyage

In the case of Clough’s second long poem, the relationship of the texts is slightly more complicated, though again the greater authority lies with the American edition. Amours de Voyage was first published, in a much shortened form, in the Atlantic Monthly in 1858. When Clough was projecting the American book edition, he regretted the extent of his earlier excisions, and sent to Norton two lists of revisions and additions to be made to the text: most of the additions were passages from the earlier, longer, manuscript versions of the poem, now to be restored to their original places.16 Since these lists survive in Norton’s papers, they, together with the printed 1858 text, are the authoritative sources for Clough’s final intentions about the Amours text. As the Oxford editors noted, the 1862 editions simply followed Clough’s instructions, more or less accurately, and drew on no authority not available to a modern editor.17 Neither the English nor the American 1862 edition has here any independent authority.

Nonetheless, Clough’s corrections had to be transmitted from Norton to the English printer somehow. Mrs. Clough asked Norton to send her “another copy of the Amours de Voyage” on 6 February 1862; and again on 5 March.20 By 19 March, however, she had got further into her late husband’s papers, and wrote to Norton: “I have a copy of Amours de Voyage — considerably corrected from the original. I do not know if the one you have is the same as in the magazine.” 21

In fact, the copy she had found seems to have been not a corrected

20 The lists are with his letters to Norton, at Harvard: Harvard b MS Am 1088 (1329, 1330), 24 March and 11 April 1859. I am grateful to Miss Suzanne Flandreau of the Houghton Library for locating them for me.
21 Poems, p. 311. Since the 1951 editors recognized this, it is hard to understand why they chose 1862 as their copy-text.
22 Harvard 1361, 1362.
23 Harvard 1363.
one, but the early manuscript, MS. A, now in the Bodleian. Norton sent in reply at least four packets of proof-sheets, so we may assume that this would include proofs of *Amours de Voyage*. The basic means by which the *Amours* text was transmitted from Norton to England was as proofs of the *Boston* edition as in the case of *The Botbie*—so much is shown by the collation, though the evidence from the letters is less certain. But the letters raise a further question: did Mrs. Clough alter the text she received from America by inserting any readings from her “considerably corrected” manuscript copy?

There is some evidence that she did make such an insertion from MS. A. The Oxford editors noted two lines (II.23–24) which occur in the English 1862 text, but which were not in 1858, or in Clough’s list of corrections. They suggest that the lines were “perhaps inserted by editors in 1852 from MS. A which has exertion corrected to *endeavour* in line 24.” Their suggestion is entirely correct, for the lines do not occur in the *Boston* text, which follows Clough’s corrections. Their insertion was an inspiration of Mrs. Clough’s, and should surely not now be included in the text. Similarly, Mrs. Clough’s chauvinism could not allow Clough’s expression “stupid old England” to pass into the 1862 edition at II.25. “Stupid old England” was the reading of 1858, and it had not been corrected in the letters, so it remained in the *Boston* text. Mrs. Clough looked in MS. A, where a cancelled reading had been “old foolish England,” and corrected the proof-sheets to “poor foolish England,” the reading of the English 1862 text, and of 1851. Again, surely, Clough’s reading should be restored. At II.43, Mrs. Clough substituted “which” for *Boston’s* “these,” another reading taken from MS. A. (A parallel to these borrowings from an earlier version can be seen in Mrs. Clough’s subsequent treatment of *The Botbie*, in 1863 for the second edition of the *Poems*: she reinserted cancelled lines from Book IV of the 1848 text, without, apparently, any special reason for doing so.) There is one further difference between the English and American texts of *Amours* suggesting deliberate alteration by the English editor: the Latin footnote to Letter L.viii has been completely revised.

Most of the variants between the two 1862 *Amours* texts arise like the *Botbie* variants, simply from the process of re-setting the text in England. There are substantive errors in 1862, due to misprinting, at

*Poems*, p. 516.
I. 145, 1. 191, II. 38, II. 42 (Boston had changed 1858's "and" to "are," but kept "most plain"), II. 206, III. 178, III. 189, III. 191, and V. 173. At II. 72, an omission in Boston (of "a") has been followed by the English text. At V. 97 and V. 165 Boston failed to follow the corrections ordered by Clough, and the failure was of course repeated in the English text. At III. 9 and III. 300, the English text rather strangely adopts the spelling "chestnut" for the "chestnut" of 1858 and Boston. At IV. 24, a misspelling by Boston is corrected by London; at V. 199 a misprint in Boston is repeated in London; and at II. 340, the English text prints "Louise" for the "Louisa" of 1858 and Boston. In this last instance, the English text follows Clough's corrections more faithfully than does Boston, but the emendation is one which could have been made without knowing Clough's expressed wish — the printer's reader might have been trying to restore some normality to the chopping and changing spelling which Clough gave to the name, to fit the demands of his metre.

The accidental variants between the two texts confirm that the English text was set from the American one. Of some forty accidental variants, all but three show the Boston text giving the 1858 punctuation, while the English text has changed it without any authorization. The three exceptions suggest that Norton made a final check of the Boston proofs of Amours de Voyage after he had sent copies over to England. At I. 1 and IV. 55, the English text is closer to 1858 than is the Boston text; at I. 155 the Boston text gives the question mark asked for by Clough in his list of corrections, while 1858 and 1862 both have a semicolon. In summary, the Boston edition is a fairer guide to Clough's final intentions for the Amours de Voyage text than is the English edition, but only because it is nearer in the line of transmission to Clough's corrections to 1858, and therefore more faithful to them.

Mari Magno

The Mari Magno tales were composed after preparations had been completed for the American edition; Clough himself never prepared the tales for publication, and the correspondence between Mrs. Clough and Norton about their inclusion in the posthumous edition makes

26 The Oxford editors correct their copy at many of these points, on the evidence of 1858, and the silence of the Clough letters.
clear the difficulty she felt in getting the rough manuscripts ready for the press.\textsuperscript{21} The textual situation, as a result, reverses that of the other two long poems—the American text derives from England. The derivation was not from proof-sheets, but from a manuscript copy made by Mrs. Clough, and differing in many accidentals from that she sent to the English printer. On 5 March 1862, Mrs. Clough was not intending to include the \textit{Mari Magno} tales in 1862 at all, but to send a copy to Norton in case they were suitable for separate publication in the \textit{Atlantic Monthly}: on 19 March she reported that she had “this week” sent \textit{via} Trübner’s a copy of the tales, but not for Norton to print.\textsuperscript{22} On 25 April she wrote to Norton that she wished now to include three of the stories, and sent also “on another sheet” some manuscript notes of revisions to the text which would be necessary to link the three into a sequence such as Clough had planned for his more ambitious collection of eight verse-stories. No doubt these alterations of Mrs. Clough’s are the ones now among Norton’s papers. She commented: “It appears to me that your edition will be far more advanced than ours, and that you may be glad to go on with the printing of the tales before we reach them.”\textsuperscript{23} Ten days later, however, she wrote another letter in which she said: “We have been looking over the Mari Magno and making a few alterations: for it seems to me very obscure. If there is time, these alterations can be made in your edition.” The letter is endorsed by Norton: “corrections made according to directions within. C.E.N.”\textsuperscript{24} Nonetheless, the corrections do not seem to have been carried out uniformly in the published \textit{Boston} edition. Corrections asked for in “The Lawyer’s Tale” (properly “The Clergyman’s First Tale”) lines 21–22, and 272, were not made by Norton. Conversely, a correction in the same tale, at line 270, requested by Mrs. Clough and made in \textit{Boston} by Norton, was not in fact incorporated in the English edition. Neither Mrs. Clough’s linking alterations, nor her later corrections, have any authority, and most of the many differences between the texts of \textit{Mari Magno} in the 1862 editions are simply the result of differences between the manuscript copies made by Mrs. Clough to act as printer’s copy in America and England. In summary, as the Oxford editors showed in 1951, any modern editor of \textit{Mari Magno} must disregard the 1862 editions, and work from Clough’s own manuscripts and dictated copies, rough

\textsuperscript{a} The matter is discussed fairly fully in \textit{Poems}, pp. 551–553.
\textsuperscript{b} \textit{Harvard} 1862, 1863.
\textsuperscript{c} \textit{Harvard} 1866; the corrections are now in \textit{Harvard} b MS Eng 1096 (2).
\textsuperscript{d} \textit{Harvard} 1867.
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though those are. The comparison of the Boston and English editions merely emphasizes the extent to which the printed 1862 texts were the result of heavy editorial intervention, by Mrs. Clough and her advisers in England.

The Minor Poems: I — Ambarvalia

The shorter poems, which opened the American edition and concluded the English one, were printed as one sequence, but fall into two groups when the provenance of their text is considered. The first group were those which had been printed by Clough in his section of Ambarvalia, a joint-volume of poems with his friend Thomas Burbidge, published in 1849; the second group were those which were being printed from manuscript in 1862, though some of them had previously appeared in magazines. Poems from both sources had been prepared and revised by Clough for publication in the projected American edition, but Mrs. Clough added other poems to Clough’s selection, and deleted a few. In general, the Boston text worked from Clough’s authorized revisions for the poems he had planned to include, but the English text, even for those poems, introduces readings from earlier, less authoritative, manuscripts. Some of the readings introduced into the text by Mrs. Clough were, at her wish, also made in the Boston text at a late stage. Neither the Boston text nor 1862, therefore, presents “authoritative” texts of either of the two groups of poems, but the differences between them (which are not apparent from the 1951 textual notes) reveal to what extent the Harvard manuscripts preserve Clough’s latest intentions.

Twenty-six poems from the collection Ambarvalia were included in the 1862 posthumous editions. Fifteen of them were ones which Clough himself had intended to include in the American edition. In all accidental variants (nearly a hundred in the twenty-six poems) 1862 is closer to the printed Ambarvalia text of 1849 than is Boston. Both 1862 texts were presumably, therefore, printed directly from a copy of 1849, and certainly for this section of the book, the English text was not derived from the American. Either the American printer or Norton himself was very free in correcting punctuation; it is possible, though unlikely, that the additional punctuation in Boston came from a corrected copy of 1849 sent by Clough to Norton. If such a copy ever existed, it is, like the printer’s copy of The Botbie, no longer among the Norton papers. In two or three places only is Boston’s
punctuation clearly the better. Boston differs slightly from 1862 in the titling of some poems. Three sonnets are titled sonnet, where 1862 gives no title: in the first instance, Boston has the authority of Clough's 1858 instructions for the innovation. Boston follows 1849 in giving the Greek title to "If when in cheerless wanderings," one of the poems Mrs. Clough had added to those selected by Clough. Both 1862 editions use "Sic istor" as a title for "As at a railway junction," an addition only found earlier in Clough's corrected copy A. In "The Questioning Spirit," Boston misprints "think" as "drink."

The variants in the accidentals and the titling might suggest that the Boston text of the Anbaradla poems was of no value, being merely derivative. The substantive variants show that this is not the case. Substantive variants occur only in two poems, "Qui Laborat, Orni" and "The New Sinai" ("When Israel came out of Egypt"), and in each instance Boston agrees with 1849 against the English 1862, suggesting that Mrs. Clough made innovations in the text of the two poems of which Norton was unaware, and that the alterations were not intended by Clough when he was preparing the American edition in 1858. In "Qui Laborat, Orni," line 13, Boston reads "sure-assured" for 1862's "well-assured," and in line 25 Boston reads "As wilt Thy will, or give or e'en forbear" for 1862's "But, as thou willest, give or e'en forbear"; yet in line 10 Boston shares with 1862 the alteration of 1849's "abide" to "remain." In "The New Sinai," lines 71-77, Boston follows 1849, not 1862, for most readings, but incorporates 1862's revisions in lines 60, 64, 69, and 80. These two poems are the only two for which manuscript corrections were made by Clough in copy B of his separately-bound 1849 poems, and the explanation of the variants in the 1862 texts must be that Mrs. Clough decided to draw on B's readings for 1862, and that the alterations were only partially carried out in the Boston text. The variants are evidence that Clough had not felt the alterations to be authoritative in 1858, and therefore leave Mrs. Clough's use of B as the only external evidence that the copy was intended to be an authoritative source for emendation. Since we know that in other instances (in Amours for 1862, and The Poetic for 1863) Mrs. Clough emended from unauthoritative manuscript sources, there is no firm reason why the B revisions should be incorporated in a modern edition.28

28 On the corrected copies, see Book Collector, XIX (1970), 194-202, and my forthcoming essay on "Intention and Authority in Clough's Anbaradla corrections."
Some of the *Ambrosialia* poems included in 1862 and *Boston* were not intended by Clough for the collected edition. Where such poems vary from the 1849 text, even where the variants are shared by both 1862 editions, the variants are unauthoritative, being the result of Mrs. Clough's editing: for instance, there seems to be no authority in the letters or corrected copies for the omission in 1862 of the first 28 lines of "Are there not then two musics."

**MINOR POEMS: II**

It was among the other minor poems (the "shorter poems" of the 1951 text) that Mrs. Clough made most additions to the selection Clough had planned; it does not seem to have been Clough's intention to include more than a very few of these, yet there are some thirty-five in the 1862 text (thirty-six in *Boston*). There were also some deletions by Mrs. Clough from Clough's lists. "In the Great Metropolis" had been in the first *Boston* proofs of this section, but was removed by Mrs. Clough, originally for insertion into Palgrave's Memoir, and then omitted altogether. Some of the additional poems were sent over from England to Boston in manuscript, and some alterations were conveyed in proof-sheets of the English edition. Mrs. Clough wrote to Norton that "there will be some alterations in the small poems . . . it would probably be better to wait till the proof-sheets can come back from England of the last poems." To let the Boston printers proceed with this section, she altered the arrangement of the book in the English edition, setting up the minor poems as the first section, instead of the last as in *Boston*, so that proof-sheets would be among the first available, and so that *Boston* would get proofs of "all the new small poems" from England. As late as 16 June 1862, Mrs. Clough was writing: "I hope you will have had the proof sheets by this time of the minor poems." The result of all this editorial concern was to leave the minor poems as one of the sections of the 1862 editions least faithful to Clough's wishes. The interchange of proofs sometimes altered a text even when the *Boston* text had originally been based on Clough's latest revision.

For some poems, Mrs. Clough did not have a manuscript available

---

*Harvard 1365 (18 April 1862); Harvard 1370 (19 July 1861).
*Harvard 1363 (19 March 1862).
*Harvard 1366 (25 April 1862).
*Harvard 1368.
in London, and it seems likely that for these the English text derives from the Boston proofs, not from manuscript. Such were “The Song of Lamech,” “Oh, Thou whose image in the shrine,” and “It fortifies my soul.” Mrs. Clough also told Norton that she did not have a copy of “Peschiera” (of which “Altean Parten” is in both 1862 editions simply a subsection); yet she must later have found her manuscript, for she made alterations to the Boston text in line 7 (“sentries’ boxes, yellow, black” changed to “sentry boxes yellow-black”), and in line 28 (“while” changed to “when”), both readings accepted by the Oxford editors on manuscript evidence. A copy of “Blessed are those who have not seen” was sent by Norton to Mrs. Clough, and, though she subsequently asked for it to be omitted, and left it out of the English edition, it remained in the Boston text; in including it, Boston is more faithful to Clough’s wishes.

In other poems, though Mrs. Clough had manuscript available, the Boston text prints the more authoritative version. As early as January 1862, Mrs. Clough had been able to show a copy of “Bethesda, a sequel” to J. A. Froude, for his opinion; he approved of it, and Mrs. Clough printed it, as he had suggested, after “The Questioning Spirit.” But the latest Clough autograph of this poem is in the Norton papers, and Mrs. Clough’s 1862 text does not follow the Norton text. 1862 omits lines 24–27, while Boston includes them. Similarly, in “Hope evermore and believe,” line 14 reads “earth” in Boston and in the manuscripts, but 1862, nonsensically, reads “girth.”

Perhaps the most interesting variants, though, are in the text of “The Latest Decalogue.” This poem survives in two manuscripts, of which Mrs. Clough had one in England (of 24 lines, MS.1), while Norton had the other in America (of 20 lines, MS.2). The Boston proof sheets were set from MS.2. Mrs. Clough, finding that Boston differed from her manuscript, substituted the MS.1 readings for MS.2 readings when preparing the copy for the London printer, but did not insert the four extra lines in MS.1. The changes must have been only partially incorporated in the Boston text, when the English proofs were sent over, for in lines 4, 5, 13–14, and 15 the MS.2 readings survive in the published American edition. This reconstruction of events sounds

— Harvard 1362 (5 March 1862); Harvard 1363 (19 March 1862).
— Bodleian 2108 (20 January 1862).
very complicated, but only so, I think, can the shortening of the English text, and the mixture of readings in the Boston text, be explained. MS.2 is now at Harvard, and is a fair copy with very careful punctuation, an unusual feature of a Clough manuscript: there is a marginal note to lines 13-14, "n.b. observe commas." 36 That this manuscript was used by Norton for Boston suggests that it may be Clough's revised text of the poem, and that Mrs. Clough's recourse to the readings of MS.1 (which dates from 1849) was unauthorized. 37

The Boston variants from 1862 in the text of these minor poems sometimes preserve Clough's intentions, but in most cases the interchange of proofs ensured that the two 1862 editions had a unanimity, whether of truth or error. The policy decided on by the Oxford editors (to follow manuscript for the minor poems rather than either 1862 text) is clearly the right one. The divergences between the English and American editions chiefly emphasize that for many of the minor poems Mrs. Clough did not have any firm idea of her husband's latest intentions.

Conclusions

Clough's literary remains were unusually complicated and disorganized. Small wonder, then, that the posthumous editions were not perfect, when a recently-widowed and young Victorian mother was left to grapple with an extremely complex task. The Oxford Poems of 1851 were the product of thirty years work, while less than eight months elapsed between Clough's death in Florence and the publication of the English edition of 1862. "It has been difficult to me from the work being somewhat new," Mrs. Clough confided in Norton after her task was completed, "and I have not been very strong, and have suffered a good deal from my head often when the thing has to be done in a particular time." 38 But the posthumous editions were not the product of Mrs. Clough's unaided skill. The variance between the American and English editions, together with the external evidence of the letters from Norton's papers at Harvard, shows that the 1862 text derives for two major sections, and some minor ones, from the preparatory

35 It is among Clough's 1859 revisions of Amours de Voyage: Harvard 1330.
36 MS.1 was dated by M. A. F. Berrie in British Museum Quarterly, XXVII (1963-64), 9-112; cf. Notes and Queries, CXIII (1957), 378-379.
37 Harvard 1368 (10 June 1862).
rations that Clough had himself made for an edition of his works, as transmitted through the Boston proofs. It is too sweeping to say that "the posthumous editions have little or no authority against the manuscripts," as R. M. Gollin has said. The editions must be evaluated section by section, for the provenance and authority of the sections varies.

The case demonstrates nearly the influence of the Atlantic on nineteenth-century textual transmission, and also the potential importance of American editions in the editing of English authors. What Mrs. Clough wrote to Norton in 1862 was true of Clough's texts as well as of his thought: "at least in some ways he has been more deeply understood, more treasured at any rate, with you than with us."  

Because of the origins of the American edition of 1862, it is possible for a cautious modern editor to find in the posthumous editions guidance to the use of the extant manuscripts, guidance not provided nearly so reliably by the English edition. In the American edition of 1862, a modern editor will find for The Botbie an authoritative text which cannot now be recovered from any other source.

"Harvard 1363 (16 March 1862)."
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