

PART I

Life Writing / Writing the Life

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-42939-9 — D. H. Lawrence In Context
Edited by Andrew Harrison
Excerpt
[More Information](#)

CHAPTER I

*Biographies**Michael Squires*

It is rare that biographers of major modern writers find new material; they typically reinterpret what is available. Yet D. H. Lawrence, whose work very closely reflects his life, provides a different case. With the publication of dozens of new works after his death, biographers have had many opportunities to reassess his life in relation to new work. Three important novels were long delayed in reaching book form – *John Thomas and Lady Jane*, the second version of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, appeared in 1972; the autobiographical *Mr Noon* in 1984; and *Quetzalcoatl*, a version of *The Plumed Serpent*, in 1995. They, along with other discoveries and fresh historical contexts, enabled richer insights to be formulated. The cruxes in Lawrence's biography fall into four areas: his formative years, his marriage to his wife Frieda, his sexual orientation, and his decision later in his career to rewrite whole works.

In some ways Lawrence, who died in 1930, seems almost our contemporary. He left a teaching career that did not fulfill him, left a country he disliked, chose a wife from an aristocratic class far above his own, and then freed himself from as many constraints as he could. Highly intuitive, he let his inner self, as far as possible, direct the shape of his career as a writer. Early, he taught himself to challenge fixed concepts and lived his life in the same way, often unfixing himself, moving from place to place on the basis of a recommendation, putting down soft roots. He never stayed anywhere for long. His biographers have especially sought to understand his internal compulsions as they collided with the circumstantial events he experienced.

Lawrence's literary talent developed slowly. His formative years reveal an insecure boy who preferred sentimental romantic fiction and the company of lively girls. The recollections of friends such as Jessie Chambers, William Hopkin, and Helen Corke (collected in Edward Nehls's essential three-volume *D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography*) testify to Lawrence's vitality, creativity, and energy. He relished country walks, bicycle tours, and holidays on the English coast. His first published story appeared in

1907 when he was twenty-two, and two years later came a set of poems in the *English Review*. By Easter 1915 he had written four novels; two of them – *Sons and Lovers* and *The Rainbow* – still rank among the best in English literature.

Lawrence's biographers have gradually reassessed his provincial upbringing. They have now gauged the extent to which Lawrence's education gave him access to a world of ideas without his having to sacrifice his unique understanding of the sensuous world around him. He had the benefit of books, and of a grammar school and university education, but not the shackles of a conventional education to degree level. Recent studies, such as James Moran's *The Theatre of D. H. Lawrence*, have identified aspects of Eastwood's working-class culture that helped shape Lawrence's sensibility.¹ Lawrence read a great deal on his own, and then, while observing the constrained lives around him, interrogated the received notions of what could be said and done. He used his writing to analyze and control the personal conflicts caused by his uncomfortably (even crippling) close relationship with his mother, Lydia. At first he aspired to her middle-class norms of 'getting on', but his London publishers soon urged him to write about the rough mining life he knew most intimately: the life of his own family. In *Sons and Lovers*, which followed in 1913, Keith Sagar observes that 'the [early] reviewers recognized and praised the sincerity, authenticity, vividness and vitality of the novel'.²

But that vitality was also fragile. New material unearthed by John Worthen and others shows Lawrence succumbing to exhaustion and then collapse. In December 1910, as he was slowly separating himself from his family in Eastwood and applying himself to his work as an elementary school teacher in Croydon, his mother died. His long-time friend, William Hopkin, remembered that after her death 'he was so terribly affected I thought he would commit suicide'.³ A bout of pneumonia, lasting several months, left him both weak and adrift. Having given up his teaching position to try to heal himself, he floundered. He was, John Worthen writes, 'restless, rootless and unattached'.⁴

For all his biographers, Lawrence's meeting in 1912 with Frieda Weekley provided the watershed event in his life. The wife of a university professor, she has elicited both their surprise and distress: surprise that Lawrence was drawn to someone so different from women, like Jessie Chambers, whom he might have married, and distress that a woman who embraced revolutionary turn-of-the-century ideas would have snipped Lawrence's English roots and urged him to escape. 'I hate England and its hopelessness' (*IL* 459), he would write in October 1912. Frieda offered

him independent views and an easy, if combative, temperament. She also soothed his frustration with English strictures. She readily accommodated his shifting moods and excitedly praised his work. In 2008, in *D. H. Lawrence and Frieda*, I cited newly available letters that showed Frieda helping Lawrence to appreciate her many differences in outlook and to turn them into modes of discovery. The couple's 'crosscut of temperaments' enabled Lawrence to refine his genius.⁵

After 1912, influenced by Frieda, Lawrence's creative work changed radically. In the early 1900s, cultural innovations of all kinds had arisen – cubism in painting, atonality in music, relativity in physics, and (in London) window-smashing demonstrations for the cause of women's suffrage. Such cultural ferment had already altered Frieda, who had spent time in Munich (from 1907 on) soaking up the fresh attacks on male dominance, government control, chastity, and Christianity. Janet Byrne suggests that Frieda was profoundly changed by 'the manic onslaught of ideas' that she heard in the bohemian coffeehouses of Schwabing.⁶ She eased Lawrence's progress from English repression and tragedy, in florid works like *The Trespasser* (1912), to something more original, as he redefined womanhood. '[E]verything in her life', writes Elaine Feinstein, 'had confirmed her sense of her own worth as a woman'.⁷ Her self-assertion energized his work. A recently published inventory of her complete letters, full of sharp observation, offers evidence of her stature.⁸

The past, however, haunted both Lawrence and Frieda. When they departed together for Germany in May 1912, both left behind some wreckage – Lawrence's friends and family in shock, Frieda's husband and three children mourning their loss. Thereafter, Lawrence and Frieda moved every year or two, sometimes every month or two. It was a pattern dictated partly by their marginalized social status (they could not marry until 1914) and partly by Lawrence's need for fresh material. An erotically charged story like 'Honour and Arms' (later 'The Prussian Officer'), written in 1913, could not have been written in Eastwood in early 1912 while Lawrence was living with his sister Emily and her family and when Lawrence knew nothing yet about German psychiatry and its account of repressed sexual impulses. Lawrence's new voice – full of sensuousness and passion and violent energy – had burst upon the British reading public. 'I do write because I want folk – English folk – to alter, and have more sense' (*IL* 544), he acknowledged in 1913.

When he and Frieda first moved to Italy (1912–13) – a country that he imagined might 'wake me up' (*8L* 7) – they gained critical distance from England. Biographers such as Keith Sagar point, for instance, to the radical

reassessment of Lydia Lawrence which Frieda demanded.⁹ In 1907, in Munich, Frieda had taken Dr. Otto Gross, a serial womanizer, as her lover. He was a man who had assailed monogamy and sacrificial modes of mothering. (Lawrence's mother would never have considered leaving her husband.) Under Gross's influence, Frieda scoffed at codes of restraint, insisting on her right to freedom: 'approving or disapproving', she wrote later, 'are not activities of my nature'.¹⁰ Catherine Carswell, an early biographer, astutely calls Frieda 'a rebellious creature'.¹¹

Frieda's influence on *The Rainbow* (1915) was immense, especially on its fearless conception of females complementing males in both opposition and solidarity. Looking back to an agrarian past, but also bravely forward, *The Rainbow* is very much a transitional work. Ursula Brangwen, chafing against the institutions she encounters (the university, a teacher training course, her religious instruction, a colliery 'like some gruesome dream' [R 321]), scrutinizes – as Lawrence did – the core of human understanding. She sees that passion is the truest form of spiritual energy. As the novel balances imposed forms of learning with subversive self-awareness, Lawrence, said one reviewer, defied 'all conventions'.¹² Stripping away conventional reticence, he exposed men and women in their physical and emotional nakedness.

Two momentous events preceded the publication of *The Rainbow*: Lawrence's marriage to Frieda and the outbreak of World War I. Both occurred in the summer of 1914, within a few weeks of each other. Unable to travel from England back to Italy after the war started, the Lawrences eventually moved to an isolated cottage at Higher Tregerthen in Cornwall. In April 1916, greatly disillusioned, Lawrence began a new novel entitled *Women in Love*. Furiously creative, it scrutinized his contemporary world in bold, dark, brutal ways. William York Tindall says that as Lawrence's notions of society took shape, 'capitalism and science seemed to have embraced each other in a disorderly dance of death'.¹³ Frieda judged the new book 'infinitely the biggest thing he has done'.¹⁴ The Lawrences' stormy marriage, affected by wartime dislocations that intensified their conflicts, paralleled a larger crisis in European values. In *Women in Love* he flushed out the rottenness he sensed, in which the claims of intuition and love had been displaced by what he called 'the great process of decomposition' (WL 496). His new theme – of systemic sickness – slowly shaped the inspired language that poured out of him. In scenes of stark originality, his novel explodes with destructive energy as the characters gradually recognize their anger, lust, cruelty, and misused power. The language of dominance and submission, of subterranean feelings breaking through the

mind's fractures, reflects passions in his own marriage. No writer had mapped the intensity of Gudrun's grudge against a caged rabbit, or Birkin's angry stoning of the moon's image, or Gerald's fury when Gudrun rejects him. David Ellis says that 'if Lawrence had not had Frieda's opposition to contend with, he would have needed to invent it'.¹⁵

In marriage, Frieda's resistance, like Gudrun's and Ursula's, could be energizing but also suffocating. After 1916, Lawrence turned to male friendships for relief, and hoped that they would also provide him with a sense of completion and fulfillment. Two men, John Middleton Murry and William Henry Hocking, were candidates for his affection. Although Murry was frightened by Lawrence's advances, Frieda believed that Lawrence cared for Murry 'more than any other man'.¹⁶ She was, she remembered, distressed in 1916 when Murry stayed with her and Lawrence 'and L[awrence] was more interested in you than in me'.¹⁷ But she also believed that Lawrence could not clarify the kind of love he sought. Murry, fearful and insecure, fled within eleven weeks of his arrival in Higher Tregrethen. Hocking was another matter. Unmarried, he lived nearby, farming the adjacent fields near the Atlantic coast, and he did not flee.

Lawrence's wartime friendships with these two men complicated his marriage. All along, an aspect of his sexuality lay mostly hidden, appearing indirectly in 'The Prussian Officer,' a story about an officer's perverse passion for his young male orderly, with its 'hint of homosexuality turned rotten', to quote one biographer.¹⁸ However, the new freedoms being expressed everywhere in the new century brought new opportunities for sexual expression. In *Women in Love*, written largely in 1916 and 1917, Lawrence had imagined a highly charged wrestling match between Gerald and Birkin that reveals a possible sexual matrix in 'the physical junction of two bodies clinched into oneness' (WL 270). This distance between desire and discipline, between sexual compulsion and social restraint, has invited Lawrence's biographers to account for his narrative choice.

Early biographers like Richard Aldington (1950) and Witter Byner (1953) do not mention his sexual orientation; Murry alone says that 'Lawrence was incapable of loving a woman.'¹⁹ Yet after Lawrence's suppressed 'Prologue' to *Women in Love* was published in 1963, the boundaries of male friendship required more comment. For those who assumed that by nature Lawrence was vigorously heterosexual, this was a difficult document, describing Rupert Birkin being physically aroused by a man's body: 'it was for men that he [Birkin] felt the hot, flushing, roused attraction which a man is supposed to feel for the other sex' (WL 501). Few biographers have doubted that Lawrence had, in the 'Prologue', described

some of his own emotions, hitherto obscured. The writer who had celebrated male-female passion now invited uncertainty, especially in an era when homosexuality was not widely discussed. Harry T. Moore, another early biographer, excused Lawrence from the 'charge of homosexuality' by asserting that, with Murry, Lawrence wanted only a deep feeling that he had trouble defining.²⁰ Jeffrey Meyers (1990), after reviewing Lawrence's earlier novels, concludes that Lawrence found men's bodies 'more beautiful' than women's, 'longed for' homosexual experience, and from 1916 to 1917 attached himself 'emotionally' to the handsome William Henry Hocking, then consummated the bond.²¹ Brenda Maddox (1994) cautiously agrees: 'It is possible . . . that in the fine summer of 1917, lying in the bracken and talking about sex, Lawrence and Hocking consummated their love'.²²

Later biographers, however, have recognized that the spectrum of a man's sexual expression is wide. Mark Kinkead-Weekes, aware of the conflicting evidence, agrees that Lawrence was probably 'sexually attracted' to Hocking but judges a homosexual act between them 'unlikely' because it would have had 'a marked effect' on his work. And it didn't. Kinkead-Weekes worries that our culture has 'no language for the whole spectrum' of a man's sexual feeling for another man apart from its 'fulfilment' in specific sexual acts.²³ Later, Lawrence was himself reticent, reportedly telling a friend named Maurice Magnus in 1920 that he had '[a]rrived too late' to respond to 'bisexual types', and accepted chagrin as the price of his delay.²⁴

Frieda, who knew him best, must have the last word. After Lawrence's death, in an extraordinary letter to Murry, she characterized the unusual bond between Lawrence and William Henry: 'And [about] William Henry, I am *sure*, it was not really nasty there, though I admit abnormal, Lawrence was so *direct* and he was *fond* of him – And I *fought* him out of it, the homosexuality – I got him back – But it was a deep and tragic experience to him'.²⁵ In Frieda's view, the relationship was abnormal in its intensity but did not include sexual intercourse. What it did include she did not know, but its effects on Lawrence were 'deep and tragic' and may have made him, afterward, more cautious. Although Frieda 'got him back', the emotional cost to the marriage was high.

The novels that followed *Women in Love* are more loosely constructed and demanded less of Lawrence's concentration. In his final decade, he published novels that became more episodic (*The Lost Girl*, *Aaron's Rod*, *Kangaroo*) and then more explicit (*Lady Chatterley's Lover*). The artistic risks that Lawrence incurred have made biographers increasingly uneasy

about his later work, but have also elicited new understanding of the complexities of his later life.

In 1919 Lawrence left England and never lived there again. He became, he said, ‘more disconnected with everything’ (4L 165). He became a steady traveler, going to four continents, always trying to leave behind the baggage of the past. That baggage consisted of any failed relationship (Edward Garnett, John Middleton Murry, Thomas Seltzer, Robert Mountsier), any sort of personal betrayal (Katherine Mansfield, Murry, Ottoline Morrell, Mabel Dodge Luhan), and any bond with a sexual component (Jessie Chambers, Helen Corke, possibly Hocking, Rosalind Baynes, Dorothy Brett). What was left? The friendships that endured (with S. S. Kotliansky, Earl Brewster, Catherine Carswell, Aldous Huxley, and Giuseppe Orioli) possessed the necessary ingredients of integrity, intelligence, loyalty, and respect. In later years the Lawrences lavished money on trips. The point was not the expense but the opportunity, not the logistics of moving but the inspiration to sweeten the marriage, and to reignite Lawrence’s imagination. Frequent travelers, forced to jettison baggage, take only essentials. One way for a writer to leap over the barriers of the past is to rewrite a work from its beginning, reimagining it as he goes. As late as *Women in Love* and *Studies in Classic American Literature* (both drafted between 1916 and 1919), Lawrence was still mostly revising, not wholly rewriting, works that dissatisfied him.

When he left England for Italy on 14 November 1919, with passport in hand, his priorities changed. He reconsidered the creative process. He had broken away from England so cleanly that he could neither look back on the corruption of the past nor revisit the tomb of his earlier self. His peculiar response was to rewrite a whole work, as he did when he gathered up 200 pages of ‘The Insurrection of Miss Houghton’, which he had composed earlier, and reimagined it in 1920 as *The Lost Girl*. His biographers all admire the gift of inspiration that his travels gave him – what G. M. Hyde calls a haunting dream of ‘starting again’²⁶ – but have also lamented his decision to wholly rewrite his novel ‘Quetzalcoatl’ into *The Plumed Serpent* in 1924. He rewrote partly because he had come to realize that his earlier works – in which he had warmed to Ursula’s intriguing female power and Gudrun’s brutal willfulness – had too much shaped his new character, Kate Burns. She resists male power as expressed in a new Quetzalcoatl religion, and at the novel’s end departs from the intoxication of Mexico. Later, that all changed.

As his marriage to Frieda again grew strained in summer 1923 – and they separated – he came to resist her attempts at dominance. In a recently

published letter to Frieda, of 19 September 1923, he wrote that he wanted now 'to make a change in the human direction'.²⁷ He had gradually realized that, in order to make his character Kate more docile in the presence of the novel's heroes, Ramón and Cipriano, he would have to wholly recast the book. He was 'leaving behind' a character he no longer admired. Only strong men can awaken the second Kate from her despondency, as she pleads with the gods 'to save her' (*PS* 103). Craving empowerment, she is ennobled by Ramón's fervor. In yielding her body to his lieutenant, Cipriano, she sheds her former self. No work by Lawrence, David Ellis concludes, 'divides his admirers as sharply as *The Plumed Serpent*'.²⁸

The main problem, however, is not the grand religious artifice of the novel but Lawrence's decision to cast off too much baggage, which includes a skeptical, spirited woman. Indeed, Lawrence had tired of Frieda's opposition. About this time Witter Bynner reported that Frieda said to him, 'He likes to have me oppose him in ideas, even while he scolds me for it'.²⁹ John Worthen believes that Lawrence's current domestic crisis 'could not get into the novel',³⁰ but it does. The adoring Kate Leslie comes to resemble the real-life adoring Dorothy Brett, whom Frieda – minding the competition – had in January 1924 banished from Oaxaca, Mexico, where the Lawrences had gone for the winter. Worthen insightfully claims that Lawrence rewrote the book 'in an almost trancelike way', immersed as he was in imagining his book's new religious rituals.³¹ Yet Lawrence was also powerfully – if only imaginatively – resisting Frieda. Their separation had occurred only a few months before he rewrote the novel, and a lot of suppressed hostility had built up. Before he quite finished the book, a serious illness almost killed him.

From Oaxaca onward, illness dominated Lawrence's life and work. Yet his last years offered him a superb challenge. Though plagued by the fear of tubercular hemorrhage, he roused himself to undertake the writing and publication of a novel that has distressed all of his biographers. In 1926, after Lawrence, along with Frieda, had settled briefly in Spotorno, Italy, two themes presented themselves: the General Strike in England and the suspicion of his wife's adultery. The recent strike seemed to Lawrence 'like an insanity' (*SL* 552): the conflicts between owners and workers enraged him.

Worse, the man who in October 1925 had rented them a Spotorno house (33-year-old Angelo Ravagli) had become increasingly and suspiciously attentive to Frieda, who in turn found him enchanting. Long before May 1926, when the Lawrences moved again, to the Villa Mirenda outside Florence, Lawrence would have sensed their developing passion.

At the Mirenda, in October, the two themes came together in a way that cunningly disguised Lawrence's and Frieda's story. That story has now been fully told.

The difficult experience of rewriting *The Plumed Serpent* in 1925 had cost Lawrence his health. His slow recovery, Frieda wrote, 'made him deeply, almost religiously happy'.³² A year's rest gave Lawrence the courage and confidence that he might produce another major work. The novel that followed, eventually entitled *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, came to him in three versions (1926, 1927, 1928), each different but each more incisively realized.

He began the first version of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in an exploratory mode. He imagined a romance, episodic at this point, between a woman with a title and her husband's lowly gamekeeper. Connie Chatterley's forays away from a house where her husband is an invalid writer are Frieda's, as is Connie's budding love for a married man. The biographical connection is clear. Five years later Frieda could say to Murry: 'Can you see, how Connie is *me*, though outwardly younger -'.³³ This early draft barely tests the waters of erotic fiction, then uncharted by mainstream publishers. Inspired by the keeper's god-like body, Connie's orgasm, her first ever, fills her with 'unspeakable pleasure' (*FLC* 35). As male and female fuse into profound connection, she cleanses her mind of inherited ideas based on class. The novel's first version tries out sex as a relief from depression, then as a revelation of joy, then as both physical recovery and spiritual redirection. At the end, however, Lawrence cannot imagine a future for the pair, only their pale hope of being together.

The second version, finished in 1927, was not available to biographers until 1972. Brenda Maddox finds it 'beautifully written, perhaps on a par with *The Rainbow*'.³⁴ It freshly analyzes the story's assumptions about sex and society, exploring the way a vulnerable woman like Connie is unable to 'open her heart' and so, in response, develops an 'exquisite hatred' (*FLC* 254) of a social system that denies her body's life. The deeper Lawrence goes to define her diminished selfhood, the more committed he becomes to rescuing her. And that rescue required explicit sex scenes, mostly of Connie responding to the keeper's 'profound, passionate pleasure' (*FLC* 332) in her. To the English novel, Lawrence contributed sustained descriptions of intercourse, ever more intense as the book progresses.

Although the narrator complains often about class hatred and systemic insanity, the second version is tender, patient, and lovingly crafted. In the sexual scenes – now neatly sequenced – Lawrence grows more daring. In a night of sensual passion, Connie feels the keeper's 'anger' inside her body

as ‘part of her own revolt’ (*FLC* 475) against boundaries and repression. Although the second version, says Derek Britton, offers a ‘tender, lyrical evocation of the mystery of the phallus’,³⁵ Connie’s hope of living with the keeper remains tentative. Lawrence cannot yet envision their happiness.

The final version puzzles biographers. Brenda Maddox finds it difficult and subversive.³⁶ In the hot Italian summer of 1927, Lawrence again nearly died. After picking peaches outdoors, he came in, then cried out, terrified. His lungs had hemorrhaged. For many months, as he recovered his strength, his last novel lay untouched at the Mirenda. But the tissue of his lungs would not heal, and he realized that rewriting could not wait. In October, the Lawrences returned to the Mirenda. He was irritable and caustic now, ‘disgusted with everything’ (*6L* 212).

In this state of disgust, he began the third and final version of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, finishing it in six weeks. It is quite a different work. Though much remains, much is new, and all of it bears the weight of his rage. John Worthen thinks that in this version Lawrence ‘aimed to wage a kind of artistic terrorism’.³⁷ Probably not. Instead, Lawrence aimed to mount a forceful critique of British society in which compassion and tenderness are the antidotes to capitalism and its excesses. The final version equally mixes diatribe and romance as it explores the biographical nuances of the Lawrences’ recent life together – the willful invalid writer, the fine adulterous wife, the married gigolo for whom Connie may eventually buy ‘some small farm’ (*LCL* 298), just as Frieda bought Angelo Ravagli out of the Italian army soon after Lawrence died. As Andrew Harrison comments, Lawrence deftly gauged the changes in himself while he observed the changes in Frieda ‘as her affair with Ravagli gained momentum’.³⁸

Lawrence’s rage had allowed him to write a powerful but polemical final novel designed to rediscover ‘the flow of our sympathetic consciousness, and . . . reveal the most secret places of life’ (*LCL* 101). He told Dorothy Brett that he was determined to publish the novel himself, privately, and then ‘fling it in the face of the world’ (*6L* 293). The ‘flinging’ is the problem. No biographer or critic is entirely satisfied with *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* in its final form. However, it succeeded in opening up sexuality as a topic of serious literature and in shaping our modern view of industrialization and mechanization as injurious to workers and the environment.

Since Lawrence’s death in 1930, his biographers have gained fresh understanding of his formative years, of Frieda’s character and its effect on his work, of his sexual orientation, of his insistence on moving from place to place, and of his surprising willingness to reimagine a completed work. These aspects of his life have been clarified by the new information

made available in the extensive Cambridge Edition of his letters and works, and by recently discovered details about Frieda. All of it has enhanced and refined the narrative that biographers have created to provide a more complete understanding of the man. As an artist, Lawrence often changed direction in order to reflect the tensions that existed in his personal life and in his culture. The way he negotiated these tensions has fascinated readers for a hundred years. We now know that his writing more closely reflects his life than is the case with other writers of his generation.

Notes

- 1 See James Moran, *The Theatre of D. H. Lawrence: Dramatic Modernist and Theatrical Innovator* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), pp. 21–33.
- 2 Keith Sagar, *D. H. Lawrence: Life into Art* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1985), p. 95.
- 3 Edward Nehls, ed., *D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography*, 3 vols. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957–9), I, p. 72.
- 4 John Worthen, *D. H. Lawrence: The Early Years, 1885–1912* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 348.
- 5 Michael Squires, *D. H. Lawrence and Frieda: A Portrait of Love and Loyalty* (London: André Deutsch, 2008), p. 175.
- 6 Janet Byrne, *A Genius for Living: The Life of Frieda Lawrence* (New York: HarperCollins, 1995), p. 65.
- 7 Elaine Feinstein, *Lawrence and the Women: The Intimate Life of D. H. Lawrence* (New York: HarperCollins, 1993), p. 101.
- 8 Lynn K. Talbot, 'From Old Germany to New Mexico: An Overview of Frieda Lawrence's Letters', *D. H. Lawrence Review* 37.2 (2012): 72–249.
- 9 Keith Sagar, *The Life of D. H. Lawrence: An Illustrated Biography* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), p. 59.
- 10 Unpublished letter, Frieda Lawrence to John Middleton Murry, c.7 July 1932, Alexander Turnbull Library.
- 11 Catherine Carswell, *The Savage Pilgrimage: A Narrative of D. H. Lawrence* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1932), p. 32.
- 12 Unsigned review in the *Standard*, reprinted in *D. H. Lawrence: The Critical Heritage*, ed. R. P. Draper (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970), p. 90.
- 13 William York Tindall, *D. H. Lawrence and Susan His Cow* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939), p. 163.
- 14 Quoted in Squires, *D. H. Lawrence and Frieda*, p. 34.
- 15 David Ellis, *D. H. Lawrence: Dying Game, 1922–1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 266.
- 16 Frieda Lawrence, *The Memoirs and Correspondence*, ed. E. W. Tedlock (London: Heinemann, 1961), p. 407.
- 17 Quoted in Kathleen Jones, *Katherine Mansfield: The Story-Teller* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), p. 429.

- 18 Anthony Burgess, *Flame into Being: The Life and Work of D. H. Lawrence* (London: Heinemann, 1985), p. 85.
- 19 John Middleton Murry, *Son of Woman: The Story of D. H. Lawrence* (New York: Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith, 1931), p. 79.
- 20 Harry T. Moore, *The Priest of Love: A Life of D. H. Lawrence* (London: Heinemann, 1974), p. 260.
- 21 Jeffrey Meyers, *D. H. Lawrence: A Biography* (London: Macmillan, 1990), pp. 208, 210, 212.
- 22 Brenda Maddox, *D. H. Lawrence: The Story of a Marriage* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994), p. 239.
- 23 Mark Kinkead-Weekes, *D. H. Lawrence: Triumph to Exile, 1912–1922* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 379–81.
- 24 Letter from Maurice Magnus to Norman Douglas, 28 October 1920, quoted in Maddox, *D. H. Lawrence: The Story of a Marriage*, p. 269.
- 25 Unpublished letter, Frieda Lawrence to John Middleton Murry, [conjecturally dated January 1931], Alexander Turnbull Library.
- 26 G. M. Hyde, *D. H. Lawrence* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990), p. 15.
- 27 John Worthen and Andrew Harrison, 'Further Letters of D. H. Lawrence', *Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies* 3.1 (2012): 15.
- 28 Ellis, *D. H. Lawrence: Dying Game*, p. 219.
- 29 Witter Bynner, *Journey with Genius: Recollections and Reflections Concerning the D. H. Lawrences* (London: Peter Nevill, 1953), p. 62.
- 30 John Worthen, *D. H. Lawrence: The Life of an Outsider* (London: Allen Lane, 2005), p. 320.
- 31 *Ibid.*, p. 319.
- 32 Quoted in Michael Squires, *D. H. Lawrence's Manuscripts: The Correspondence of Frieda Lawrence, Jake Zeitlin and Others* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1991), pp. 173–4.
- 33 Unpublished letter, 6 April [1931], Alexander Turnbull Library.
- 34 Maddox, *D. H. Lawrence: The Story of a Marriage*, p. 423.
- 35 Derek Britton, *Lady Chatterley: The Making of the Novel* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), p. 3.
- 36 See Maddox, *D. H. Lawrence: The Story of a Marriage*, pp. 425–31.
- 37 Worthen, *D. H. Lawrence: The Life of an Outsider*, p. 367.
- 38 Andrew Harrison, *The Life of D. H. Lawrence: A Critical Biography* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2016), p. 359.