

## A Text of “Resurrection. Imperfect.”

Lara M. Crowley

### Resurrection. Imperfect.

Sleep sleep old Svnne, thou canst not haue repast  
As yett the wound thou tookst on Frydaie last.  
Sleepe then and rest: the world may beare thy staie.  
A better Sun rose before thee today,  
Who not content to enlighten all that dwell 5  
On the Earth's face, as thou, enlightened Hell,  
And made the darke fires languish in that vale  
As att thy presence here our fires grow pale,  
Whose bodye havinge walkd on Earth, and now  
Hastinge to Heauen would that hee might allowe 10  
Himselfe vnto all Stations, and fill all,  
For these three daies become A Mynerall.  
Hee was all Gould, when hee lay downe, but rose  
All tincture, And doth not alone dispose  
Leaden, and Iron wills to good, but is 15  
Of powre to make, even sinfull flesh like his.  
Had one of those whose credulous Pietie  
Thought, that A Soule, one might discerne, and see  
Go from a Bodie, att this Sepulcher ben<sup>n</sup>,  
And issuing from the Sheete, this bodie seene 20  
Hee would haue Iustly thought his bodie a Soule  
If not of any Man, yett of the whole.

**Emendations of the copy-text (Dolau Cothi manuscript):**<sup>1</sup> 4 today] to daie. 6 enlightened] enlightenedst. 23 omitted] Desunt Cætera.

---

<sup>1</sup>I have listed all verbal emendations. I also have made a few minor changes in punctuation necessary for modern readers.

**Sources Collated:**<sup>2</sup> BL Add. MS 18647 (B7), Cambridge Add. MS 8468 (C9), Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R. 3. 12 (CT1), Trinity College, Dublin, MS 877 (DT1), Harvard MS 966.3 (H4), Harvard MS 966.5 (H6), South African Library, Cape Town, MS Grey 7 a 29 (SA1), National Library of Wales, Dolau Cothi manuscript (WN1), 1633 edition (A), 1635 edition (B), 1639 edition (C), 1649 edition (D), 1650 edition (E), 1654 edition (F), 1669 edition (G).

When I taught “Resurrection. Imperfect.” to undergraduates for the first time in fall 2009, class discussion commenced, unprompted, with a heated debate among students on whether or not this poem is complete. Approximately one third of the students took the traditional approach that the title word “Imperfect” and the Latin end tag *Desunt Cætera*—or “the rest is lacking”—indicate that the poem is unfinished. But most remaining students argued that Donne was merely playing with the contemporary practice of labeling incomplete poems as “Imperfect” in order to make a statement about the resurrection being an unfinished, or “Imperfect,” process prior to the second coming. These students unknowingly echoed Ruth E. Falk’s argument regarding the title and the tag: “The resurrection of the soul, as represented by Christ, is perfect, but the resurrection of man is an unfinished task, and will remain so until the end of the world.”<sup>3</sup> To fan the flame, I introduced into the debate Raymond-Jean Frontain’s contention that the poem is complete and that its seeming incompleteness actually conveys humankind’s inadequate comprehension

---

<sup>2</sup>Sigla in this essay are those of *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*, gen. ed. Gary A. Stringer, 4 vols. to date (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995– ). I appreciate Stringer’s helpful suggestions for this edition, as well as ideas proposed by members of the John Donne Society at the 2010 conference. I also am grateful to Judith Scherer Herz for inviting me participate in the panel on this poem, Timothy D. Crowley for his feedback, and Stringer, Mary Farrington, and others associated with the Digital Donne project for the digital copies of manuscripts that made this work possible. Most versions were clear and legible, but, until all transcriptions are checked against copies in original manuscripts, there is room for error. I also thank my students at Texas Tech University for offering rich food for thought on this poem.

<sup>3</sup>Falk, “Donne’s ‘Resurrection, Imperfect,’” *Explicator* 17 (1958): item 24.

of this mystery: we as humans are “imperfect” ourselves in our capacity to fully understand resurrection.<sup>4</sup> For several previously reluctant students, this argument proved persuasive, but from there we had a stalemate.

Students who believed this poem to be unfinished argued that the *combination* of the title and the end tag proved persuasive. Yet, neither the word “Imperfect” nor the tag appears in all manuscripts, though both phrases are present in all seventeenth-century printed editions. In fact, *Desunt Cætera* appears in only one of eight extant seventeenth-century manuscript copies. How might early readers have interpreted this poem had “Imperfect” and *Desunt Cætera* been absent from early printed copies? And, whether this poem is finished or not, might such an untagged version of the poem have garnered more critical attention through the years than this supposed verse “fragment” has received? Kate Gartner Frost, in the third and most recent scholarly argument for this poem as complete, claimed “Resurrection. Imperfect.” is “perhaps the least studied of John Donne’s divine poems because it has generally been perceived as an unfinished effort. But ‘Resurrection, imperfect’ is not incomplete. Rather, it is a finished poem concerned with unfinished time.”<sup>5</sup> Frost, like Frontain, declares, “the appearance of incompleteness is deliberate.”<sup>6</sup> As these scholarly arguments and this lively student debate attest, this poem presents a vexed textual case in which, more than in some others, its editorial history and exegetical history are intimately intertwined. Thus, this newly edited text of “Resurrection. Imperfect.” takes all manuscript and printed versions into account, not claiming to

---

<sup>4</sup>Frontain, “Donne’s Imperfect Resurrection,” *Papers on Language and Literature: A Journal for Scholars and Critics of Language and Literature* 26 (1990): 539–545.

<sup>5</sup>Frost, “*Magnus Pan Mortuus Est*: A Subtextual and Contextual Reading of Donne’s ‘Resurrection, Imperfect,’” in *John Donne’s Religious Imagination: Essays in Honor of John T. Shawcross*, ed. Raymond-Jean Frontain and Frances M. Malpezzi (Conway: University of Central Arkansas Press, 1995), pp. 231–261; quotation on p. 231. Frost adds, “My reading has convinced me that the poem is connected to the liturgy of Holy Saturday and to the subject of the Harrowing of Hell and Christ’s consequent ‘hasting to heaven’ through the levels of the cosmos” (p. 231).

<sup>6</sup>Frost, p. 244.

replace the “old Synne” with “A better Sun,” of course, but at least with an informed one.<sup>7</sup>

Twentieth-century editors of Donne’s poetry have considered anywhere from two to eight extant manuscript versions of “Resurrection. Imperfect.” which appear in Group II and Group III manuscripts only.<sup>8</sup> The poem is not present in the Westmoreland manuscript, nor does it appear in any of the traditional Group I manuscripts. Herbert J. C.

---

<sup>7</sup>For my edition of this poem, I have chosen to employ similar methods to those used by editors of *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*. For more on my editorial process, see Lara M. Crowley, “Establishing a ‘fitter’ Text of Donne’s ‘The Good Morrowe,’” *John Donne Journal* 22 (2003): 5–21. I recognize and appreciate challenges to these and similar editorial practices by scholars such as Jerome J. McGann (*A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983]) and D. F. McKenzie (*Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* [London: British Library, 1986]). Thus, I (like *Variorum* editors) have endeavored to present all available information in order to provide the reader with the opportunity to recreate all versions of Donne’s poem. In addition, I continue to reassess my editorial methods and to analyze poems within their social and textual contexts. See Crowley, “Manuscript Context and Literary Interpretation: John Donne’s Poetry in Seventeenth-Century England” (PhD diss., University of Maryland, College Park, 2007).

<sup>8</sup>For an overview of early twentieth-century editors’ attempts to group manuscripts containing Donne’s verse and to identify the sources for those groups, see any introduction to *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*. For a reassessment of these practices, see Ernest W. Sullivan, *The First and Second Dalhousie Manuscripts: Poems and Prose by John Donne and Others. A Facsimile Edition* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1988), especially pp. 7–10. He discusses Helen Gardner’s claim in *John Donne: The Divine Poems* (ed. Helen Gardner, 2nd ed. [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978]) that a group of Donne manuscripts labeled Group I derives from Donne’s own collection, the result of his request to Goodyer in 1614 “to borrow that old book” (Donne, *Letters to Severall Persons of Honour [1651]*, ed. M. Thomas Hester [Delmar, New York: Scholars’ Facsimiles & Reprints, 1977], p. 197; from Sullivan, *The First and Second Dalhousie Manuscripts*, p. 7). For more on scribal practices generally, see Peter Beal, *In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and Their Makers in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998); Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); and Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press, 1995).

Grierson, following his normal practice, bases his text of this poem on the 1633 printed edition, and he includes “*Desunt cætera.*” without noting this end tag’s absence in the five manuscripts that he lists.<sup>9</sup> Helen Gardner, who also includes the tag without a gloss, in spite of listing six manuscripts that do not contain it, specifically calls the poem “unfinished” in her “Textual Introduction.”<sup>10</sup> John T. Shawcross lists all eight known manuscript copies while calling the poem “incomplete,” and later twentieth-century editors echo this notion.<sup>11</sup> Donald R. Dickson, in his recent edition, adds the following significant note: “*Imperfect* implies that the poem is incomplete.”<sup>12</sup> The word “implies” could suggest an element of doubt, although no further analysis appears. In addition, while Dickson includes the Latin end tag, he notes its absence in most manuscripts: “Of the eight known copies of this poem, only the Dolau Cothi ms. records the final phrase (*Desunt cætera*) which all subsequent editors print.”<sup>13</sup>

As recent editors note, “Resurrection. Imperfect.” appears in two Group III manuscripts: Harvard MS 966.5 (H6, according to sigla provided by *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*) and Cambridge Add. MS 8468 (C9).<sup>14</sup> These manuscripts seem to descend

<sup>9</sup>Grierson, ed., *The Poems of John Donne*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912), p. 334. Grierson skips the poem entirely in his commentary (vol. 2).

<sup>10</sup>Gardner, ed., *John Donne: The Divine Poems* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), p. lxvii.

<sup>11</sup>Shawcross, ed., *The Complete Poetry of John Donne* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1967), p. 353. C. A. Patrides, for example, reiterates that the poem is called “‘imperfect’ in that the poem is unfinished” (*John Donne: The Complete English Poems* [1985; rpt. London and Rutland, VT: J. M. Dent, 1994], p. 353).

<sup>12</sup>Dickson, ed., *John Donne’s Poetry* (New York and London: Norton, 2007), p. 147.

<sup>13</sup>Dickson, p. 147.

<sup>14</sup>H6 (folio 11v [p. 16]) is also known as the O’Flahertie manuscript. This quarto manuscript of 200 leaves was completed in 1632. The manuscript contains approximately 169 poems by Donne, as well as his paradoxes and problems, the epitaph on his wife, the prose characters, and a letter, all in a single hand. It is the largest extant manuscript collection of Donne’s poems and was likely prepared for print. C9 (folio 90r), or the Luttrell manuscript, is a quarto manuscript of 125 leaves, prepared circa 1632. This manuscript contains

from a common lost progenitor (*X* in Appendix 2). They contain a number of verbal and structural similarities: for example, like the printed versions, neither manuscript version contains indentation. Unlike the printed versions, both are entitled “The Resurrection. Imperfect”—with “Imperfect” far to the right of the first part of the title, a point to which we will return. In terms of variants from this edited text, the H6 and C9 versions read “fire growes” instead of “fires grow” in line 8 and “any” instead of “one” in line 17.<sup>15</sup> In addition, both manuscript versions have parentheses surrounding “that hee might allow / Himselfe vnto all Stations and fill all” in lines 10–11 and the number “3” in lieu of “three” in line 12. The two manuscript versions differ from each other only in one instance: H6 contains “this body” in line 21, as do most printed editions, where C9 contains “his body.” Neither manuscript copy contains *Desunt Cætera*.

These verbal variants seem relatively insignificant in terms of literary interpretation and could represent accidental changes, as opposed to purposeful authorial or scribal revisions. The case is similar for the Group II texts. Group II manuscripts containing “Resurrection. Imperfect.” are the National Library of Wales Dolau Cothi Manuscript (WN1); Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R.3.12 (CT1); British Library Additional MS 18647 (B7), likely copied from CT1; Trinity College, Dublin, MS 877 (DT1), likely prepared by the same scribe who prepared CT1; and Harvard MS 966.3 (H4), likely copied from DT1.<sup>16</sup> In

---

140 Donne poems, his epitaph to his wife, and a letter, all written in a single hand, as well as one other Donne poem added later in another hand (Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, vol. 1, part 1 [London: Mansell; New York: Bowker, 1980], p. 252). Also see *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*, 2:429–431.

<sup>15</sup>Spelling and punctuation in references to verbal similarities between the C9 and H6 versions reflect the H6 copy. For a complete list of verbal variants, see Appendix 1.

<sup>16</sup>WN1 (pp. 125–126) is a compilation of 129 Donne poems in a single hand, dating from circa 1622–1633. This quarto manuscript consists of 100 leaves, lacking pp. 109–124. CT1 (p. 198), also known as the Puckering manuscript, is a folio manuscript of 250 pages containing 121 Donne poems and his paradoxes and problems in a single hand. It was owned in the mid- to late-seventeenth century by “E. Puckering.” B7 (folio 90r–v), or the Denbigh manuscript, is a folio manuscript of 109 leaves prepared circa 1625–1633. It contains 121 poems

addition, the final manuscript containing the poem is South African Library, Cape Town, MS Grey 7 a 29 (SA1).<sup>17</sup> Although SA1 has not been categorized as a Group II manuscript, *Variorum* editors suggest that, generally, “the texts in SA1 derive from a subfamily comprising B7 and CT1”; the SA1 version of this poem offers no verbal variants that might contradict this notion.<sup>18</sup>

There are many similarities among manuscript copies in the CT1/B7/DT1/H4 group. All four versions contain slightly indented even-numbered lines, and, while H4 lacks “Imperfect” altogether, the other copies have significant space between “Resurrection” and “Imperfect” in the title. In addition, all four manuscript versions contain “laid” instead of “lay” in line 13, although CT1 and B7 have “when laid,” while DT1 and H4 have “when he laid”—much closer to the more common “when he lay.”<sup>19</sup> None of the manuscripts contain *Desunt Cætera*. There are, however, some differences between CT1/B7 versions and DT1/H4 versions. CT1 and its “child” B7 have “became” instead of “become” in line 12 and, like C9, have “his” instead of “this” in line 21. In addition, CT1 has the erroneous reading “whose” in line 22—a mistake that B7’s scribe must have recognized and corrected since the final couplet clearly should rhyme “Soul” with “whole,” not “whose.” B7,

---

by Donne and his paradoxes and problems in a single hand. The manuscript was owned by the Feilding family, Earls of Denbigh and Desmond, until 1851. DT1 (folio 134) is also known as Dublin manuscript I. It contains 143 poems by Donne and his paradoxes and problems, mostly in a single hand, and was prepared circa 1623–1625. The collection also contains Dublin MS II within the single volume. H4 (folio 112 [p. 223]), or the Norton manuscript, is a folio manuscript of 137 leaves, prepared circa 1623–1625. It contains 143 Donne poems and his paradoxes and problems in a single hand and was owned in 1895 by Charles Eliot Norton (Beal, *Index*, 1.1:250–251).

<sup>17</sup>SA1 (p. 94) is a quarto manuscript of 158 pages (plus an index), prepared in the 1630s. This miscellany of epitaphs and poems in several hands contains 54 Donne poems in a single hand and was once owned by antiquary Sir Henry Spelman (1564?–1641) (Beal, *Index*, 1.1:257).

<sup>18</sup>*The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*, 8:21.

<sup>19</sup>Spelling and punctuation in references to verbal similarities between the B7 and CT1 versions reflect the CT1 copy. Similarly, in references to similarities between the DT1 and H4 versions, spelling and punctuation reflect the DT1 copy.

on the other hand, has the variant (and likely scribal error) “dale” for “vale” in line 7. Again, DT1 was copied, according to Peter Beal, by the same scribe who prepared CT1.<sup>20</sup> Yet, there are some differences. DT1 and its “child” H4 have “fire” instead of “fires” in line 7, which could represent a minor mistake. In addition, DT1 contains “had” for “at” in line 19, though H4 has “at,” suggesting perhaps that H4’s scribe saw another copy of the poem with this reading or that he provided an alternate reading, one that happened to be provided more frequently. But the most significant difference between these two manuscripts, DT1 and H4, and the others previously discussed is “enlightenedst” for “enlightened” in line 6. This strange variant seems too significant a change to be mere error on the part of this scribe who included “enlightened” in CT1.

We cannot be certain which manuscript the CT1/DT1 scribe completed first, if he did in fact complete one full manuscript before beginning its “sibling.” But, whichever version came first, one cannot help but wonder if this scribe made these alterations purposefully or accidentally. In a conversation on this topic, Gary Stringer suggested it seems unlikely that the CT1/DT1 scribe would have included “enlightenedst” in DT1 but then changed it to “enlightened”—the exact same version found in the earlier Group III readings—in CT1 by chance. Thus, the likely scenario seems to be that this scribe prepared the CT1 version but then later prepared the DT1 version with its changes, perhaps because he had encountered another copy of this poem and incorporated some of its alternate readings into DT1.

This possibility allows one to make some sense of how WN1 fits into a potential stemma for this poem. Naturally, any stemma proves conjectural because modern editors lack many elements of the puzzle; thus, as an editor, I attempt to interpret extant evidence to the best of my ability, always clarifying which conclusions seem nearly certain and which conclusions must remain hypotheses. My hypothesis regarding the WN1 version attends to its lack of indentation—just like the two Group III manuscripts, but unlike the other four Group II manuscripts. In addition, the two words in the WN1 copy’s title are close together, as they are in early printed versions, which also lack indentation. While this version has “his” for “this” in line 21, it more significantly has

---

<sup>20</sup>Beal, *Index*, 1.1:251.



“enlightenedst” for “enlightened” in line 6, like DT1 and H4. Thus, I surmise this WN1 text descends from a missing version (Y in Appendix 2) along the same branch as the other Group II texts from what *Variorum* editors call the “Lost Original Holograph”; however, this missing version (Y) does not include the indentation and past-tense version “laid” that the CT1/DT1 progenitor (Z in Appendix 2) likely maintained. It seems likely that, after the CT1/DT1 scribe copied the CT1 version, he encountered WN1 or a cognate version that also maintains the readings “enlightenedst,” “becomes,” and “when he lay.” Though the CT1/DT1 scribe chose to maintain “laid,” he included “when he” and the other variants in his DT1 version. Naturally, one cannot be certain about such a process, particularly since we do not even know how many contemporary manuscript copies we lack. But this conclusion is congruent with evidence known about this poem and about these manuscripts generally.

The other major variant that WN1 maintains, which the CT1/DT1 scribe did not adopt if he in fact encountered WN1, is the end tag “*Desunt Cætera*.” It seems that compilers of the 1633 printed collection based their version of “Resurrection. Imperfect.” on WN1, or on a lost cognate manuscript version, as *Variorum* editors have shown for Donne’s epigrams.<sup>21</sup> Subsequent seventeenth-century printed versions of this poem contain no verbal variants from the 1633 printed version.

So which version of this poem best approximates Donne’s original text? While we cannot say with certainty, particularly because of the complications found in the Group II texts, we can say that the verbal variants do not afford reason to speculate that authorial revision took place. Surely, Donne could have revised or prepared distinct versions of this poem for various occasions, but extant evidence does not warrant providing different versions. Because C9 and H6, the Group III manuscripts containing the likely earliest texts, often demonstrate scribal errors, such variants as “fire growes” and “any” are probably errors. Regarding Group II texts, the indentation pattern and the past tense of “lay” found in the CT1/DT1 subgroup suggest changes made to a lost earlier Group II version (Y) that, like the Group III versions, lacked indentation and maintained the present tense of “lay.” It seems that WN1 descends from this lost version, for WN1 does not contain other

---

<sup>21</sup>*The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*, 8:21–24.

verbal readings found in either CT1/B7 or in DT1/H4, such as “became” and “fire.” Thus, the text found in WN1 likely represents the extant version of “Resurrection. Imperfect.” closest to Donne’s Lost Original Holograph.

For these reasons, the WN1 version of “Resurrection. Imperfect.” serves as the copy-text for this edition.<sup>22</sup> This manuscript was owned by Richard Lloyd circa 1700 and belonged to the Johns family of Dolau Cothi until approximately 1944. It now resides in the National Library of Wales. The manuscript consists of 129 Donne poems, all composed in the same hand and dated between 1622 and 1633.<sup>23</sup> Because seventeenth-century editions of this poem are likely based on WN1 or a cognate manuscript, this copy-text appears quite similar to twentieth-century edited texts, with the exceptions of the two variants “enlightenedst” in line 6 and “his” in line 21, as well as the Welsh spellings and some punctuation differences. Because one Group III text and several Group II texts also maintain “his,” we lack sufficient cause to emend “his” to “this.” In fact, “this body” likely was a scribal corruption of “his body,” one that can be ascribed to the appearance of “this body” in the previous line. However, the awkward “enlightenedst” causes a more significant editorial problem, because it was probably a scribal change introduced into the Group II line—one that made its way into WN1 and one that the CT1/DT1 scribe made for DT1. Therefore, there is sufficient cause to emend “enlightenedst” to its probable original form, “enlightened,” as the 1633 editors likely decided as well.

---

<sup>22</sup>See any “Introduction” to *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne* for an explanation of the process and the necessity of choosing a copy-text. While the 1633 printed version of this poem is quite similar to the Dolau Cothi manuscript version, I have chosen this manuscript copy-text due to the manuscripts’ chronological closeness to Donne’s verse composition. Plus, because it is unlikely that a holograph collection of Donne’s poems existed, the printed editions were mainly or solely based on manuscript copies. In fact, Stringer believes that the Dolau Cothi manuscript was one of several manuscripts employed by the 1633 printers. Although this Dolau Cothi manuscript exemplar is not a holograph (and cannot be treated as such), it seems to be the closest extant version to Donne’s original text, based on material evidence currently available.

<sup>23</sup>*The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*, 2:XCII.

Now we are left with only two verbal mysteries, which recall my students' debate: the issues of "Imperfect" and *Desunt Cætera*. Since "Imperfect" sits far to the right of "Resurrection" in B7, C9, CT1, DT1, and H6 and is absent altogether in H4, one must wonder whether or not it was originally intended as part of the title. Its presence in most manuscripts suggests that it is probably authorial, but perhaps it was merely a scribal afterthought in an early version—a scribe's assumption that the poem seems unfinished. If it is authorial, what might its spatial separation from "Resurrection" imply? One could easily argue on either side of this issue regarding the poem's finished status, for "Imperfect" as a side note could emphasize either that Donne was following the scribal practice of placing such a note to the right of an incomplete poem or that Donne was playing with this practice in a witty title. While the varying placement of "Imperfect" in different versions' titles proves curious, we lack ample evidence to justify emending the copy-text in order to remove the word or to add additional space between the title words.

As for the authority of *Desunt Cætera*, Frost believes the end tag to be authorial but recognizes that textual evidence is unclear: "That this tag is an integral part of the lyric, or for that matter is even Donne's own composition, is open to debate. . . . The manuscript evidence is inconclusive."<sup>24</sup> The tag seems to extend the message already suggested by "Imperfect." One might even wonder about the fact that the only manuscript containing this tag happens to contain a copy of the poem that extends onto two pages. Perhaps this Dolau Cothi scribe—believing that "Imperfect" implies a poem fragment, whether it actually does or not—merely added the end tag because he worried that the manuscript reader might not remember from the previous page that this poem is "Imperfect." He set the Latin end tag apart, not only on its own line, but with a box drawn around it.

Naturally, if the poem is in fact complete and Donne is playing with the word "Imperfect," he easily could have included the Latin tag as well for the same literary effect, as Falk suggests. Thus, determining whether or not this tag was authorial arguably contributes little to the question regarding the finished or unfinished state of this poem. Its appearance does, however, help to explain why most readers through the years have

---

<sup>24</sup>Frost, p. 243. Frost adds, "the Latin tag is a final twist of Donne's wit" (p. 244).

believed it to be unfinished. Purely from the standpoint of textual versions, the Latin tag's absence in the earlier Group III texts and in all other Group II texts suggests that it seems to have been added by a scribe to WN1 or to a lost progenitor, just as "enlightenedst" was offered in lieu of "enlightened." The fact that early printers happened to base their text on WN1 or on a cognate version should not sway modern editorial decisions regarding the tag's inclusion. Extant textual evidence does not provide sufficient grounds to include *Desunt Cætera* in an edition of this poem.

Thus, this edited text of "Resurrection. Imperfect." is based on the Dolau Cothi manuscript version but with two verbal emendations and some necessary, though minor, punctuation changes. Textual editing is an *imperfect* practice, one that would be made easier if a Donne holograph remained, although even then we only could say with certainty that Donne composed such a draft at some point in his literary career. This edited text of "Resurrection. Imperfect." provides a reasonable approximation of the poem Donne composed—completed or not—based on analysis of extant manuscript copies and early printed versions. *Desunt Cætera*.

*Texas Tech University*

## Appendix 1

### Variants from this edited version of “Resurrection. Imperfect.”:

title Resurrection] The Resurrection C9 H6; Imperfect] omitted H4. 2 tookst] hadst SA1. 4 today] to daye B7 C9 CT1 DT1 H4 H6 SA1 WN1 A–G. 5 to enlighten] t'enlighten B7 C9 CT1 DT1 H4 H6 SA1 A–F. 6 the Earth's] th'Earths DT1 H4; enlightened] enlightenedst DT1 H4 WN1. 7 fires] fire DT1 H4; vale] dale B7. 8 fires grow] fire growes C9 H6. 10 would that] would (that C9 H6. 11 all] all) C9 H6. 12 three] 3 C9 H6; become] became B7 CT1 SA1. 13 when hee lay] when hee laid DT1 H4, when layd B7 CT1. 14 alone] a lone H4. 17 one] any C9 H6. 19 att] had DT1. 21 his] this DT1 H4 H6 A–G. 22 whole] whose CT1. 23 omitted] Desunt Cætera WN1 A–G, ffinis./ DT1 H4, finis I D. SA1.

## Appendix 2

Following is an approximate stemma for “Resurrection. Imperfect.” based on extant manuscript and printed evidence. Dashed lines represent conjectural relationships between manuscripts, while solid lines represent near-certain relationships. Although SA1 has a connection to the CT1/B7 group, I cannot be certain about the nature of this relationship. In addition, as previously explained, the scribe of CT1/DT1 likely encountered WN1 or a cognate manuscript prior to copying the version of this poem found in DT1.

