ST. MAWR AND OTHER STORIES

D. H. LAWRENCE

EDITED BY
BRIAN FINNEY

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York NY 10011–4211, USA
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, VIC 3166, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

http://www.cambridge.org

Library of Congress catalogue card number: 82-14584

British Library cataloguing in publication data

Lawrence, D. H.
St. Mawr and other stories. –
(The Works of D. H. Lawrence)
I. Title II. Finney, Brian
823'.912[F] PR6023.A93

ISBN 0 521 22265 6 hardback
ISBN 0 521 29425 8 paperback

Transferred to digital printing 2001

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The short fiction and Lawrence's American sojourn

The short fiction collected in this volume was written between 1922 and 1925 when D. H. Lawrence lived in the USA and Mexico.[1] The pieces are of greatly varying length: 'The Overtone', a short story; *St. Mawr*, a short novel; 'The Princess', a long short story; 'The Wilful Woman', a fragment of a novel (titled by Keith Sagar); and 'The Flying-Fish', a short story fragment.[2] With the exception of 'The Overtone', these stories make use of American settings and reflect the impact that the new landscape and its peoples had on Lawrence's outlook and writing during this period. Equally, in all these stories except 'The Overtone' modern men and women, whether from the Old World or the New, are brought into stark contrast with the impersonal, ageless landscape of the American continent and its inhabitants. Even 'The Overtone', with its English setting, mirrors the animistic vision which Lawrence discerned in the American Indians and which he embodied in the figure of Pan, who also appears in *St. Mawr*.

Almost a year before his arrival in the USA, Lawrence had been invited to come to Taos, New Mexico in November 1921 by an American admirer of his work, Mabel Dodge Luhan. Born in 1879 the only child of a rich banker, Charles Ganson, she had been married first to Carl Evans, who was killed in an accident, and by whom she had a son, John; next to Edwin Dodge, whom she divorced after ten years; and then to Maurice Sterne, a painter. A patroness of the arts who had recently established her own art colony at Taos, she was currently living with an American Indian called Antonio Luhan (whom she later married) after the break-up of her third marriage. Lawrence made definite plans to go to Taos, but then hesitated; he left Europe for America via Ceylon and Australia, so that he did not reach Taos until September 1922.

[1] The dating of 'The Overtone' is necessarily conjectural; see pp. xxi–xxiii below.

[2] In keeping with the Cambridge edition policy of adhering to the contents and order of the collections of DHL's short fiction published in his lifetime, and adding the uncollected and unfinished pieces, this volume derives from *St. Mawr Together with The Princess* (Martin Secker, 1925). One other story 'The Woman Who Rode Away' belongs with this group because of date of composition and setting, but it was collected in *The Woman Who Rode Away and Other Stories* (Secker, 1928), which forms the basis of another short fiction volume.

The first fictional piece that he wrote after his arrival was 'The Wilful Woman', the opening segment of a novel based on Mabel Luhan's life, which he had agreed to undertake in collaboration with her. For both the Lawrences she proved too forceful a woman to work with or live near. The novel was quickly abandoned and in early December the Lawrences moved out of 'Mabeltown', as he dubbed her colony in Taos, to stay at Del Monte Ranch some miles away in the Rocky Mountains. There they remained until mid-March 1923. During this first period of his stay in the United States Lawrence wrote several articles about his experience of life in America,[3] rewrote *Studies in Classic American Literature* and added a number of poems to *Birds, Beasts and Flowers* which he prepared for publication.

Restless again by the spring of 1923, Lawrence left New Mexico with Frieda for Mexico City and Chapala, Mexico where he settled for over two months while he wrote 'Quetzalcoatl', the first version of *The Plumed Serpent*. Then in July they left for New York from where Frieda sailed for England to see her children after a serious disagreement with Lawrence, while he, unwilling to return to Europe, went back to Mexico via Los Angeles. Between September and November he revised Mollie Skinner's novel as *The Boy in the Bush*. Finally in late November he capitulated to Frieda's pressure to return and took the boat from Vera Cruz back to England.

His stay in Europe between December 1923 and March 1924 was a dismal failure. By late March he was back in Taos with Frieda and the Hon. Dorothy Brett ('Brett' as she was known to her friends), the daughter of the second Viscount Esher. Born in 1883, she had been a student at the Slade School of Art in London and was an artist; she was the only one, among the several friends who had been invited, to accept Lawrence's invitation to join him in starting a new life together in New Mexico. With her bobbed hair, trousers and ear-trumpet she was destined to provide the model for numerous characters in Lawrence's subsequent writing. By 4 April he had written three stories, 'Jimmy and the Desperate Woman', 'The Last Laugh' and 'The Border Line', in which, he confessed to his agent, Curtis Brown, he had worked off some of the depression into which his visit to Europe had thrown him.[4] In the same letter he continued, 'I want to go on doing stories – I hope cheerful ones now – for a while.'[5]

[3] E.g. 'Indians and an Englishman'; 'Taos'; 'Certain Americans and an Englishman'; 'Model Americans', a review of Stuart Sherman's *Americans*; and 'Au Revoir, USA'.

[4] These stories were published in *The Woman Who Rode Away and Other Stories*. Lawrence's reaction against the Old World is evident in 'London Letter' (see p. xxii below) and 'Letter from Germany', which were also written at this time.

[5] Letter to Curtis Brown, 4 April 1924.

On 5 May the Lawrences moved up to the ranch on Lobo Mountain (subsequently renamed Kiowa Ranch) that Mabel had given to Frieda (in exchange for the manuscript of *Sons and Lovers*). At once he was plunged into major repair work on the ranch cabins which occupied him full-time for the next month. After his return to the USA he wrote several articles, including 'Pan in America': its similarity to 'The Overtone' (a story using the same Pan motif) suggests that the story was written at around this time. When building work was virtually complete in early June, Lawrence turned his attention to writing three long short stories in succession: 'The Woman Who Rode Away', *St. Mawr* (really a short novel) and 'The Princess'.

On 11 October 1924, three days after 'The Princess' was finished, the Lawrences left the ranch for Oaxaca, Mexico, where they wintered from 9 November to 25 February 1925. By the end of January Lawrence had finished re-writing 'Quetzalcoatl', besides writing several articles that were to be included in *Mornings in Mexico*. Then in early February he caught influenza and malaria from which he almost died. After his arrival in Mexico City later that month the doctor diagnosed tuberculosis and advised him to return to the ranch rather than risk crossing the Atlantic. It was during his period of recuperation that Lawrence wrote 'The Flying-Fish', which remained unfinished.

In late March 1925 he returned to Kiowa Ranch where he remained until September. During this final phase of his American sojourn he wrote his biblically-based play, *David*; revised 'Quetzalcoatl' as *The Plumed Serpent*; and wrote numerous articles, many collected in *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*. Finally, in September 1925, he left America. Although he continued to think of the ranch as a permanent home, he never returned.

'The Wilful Woman'

On 11 September 1922 the Lawrences reached Taos where they were lent an adobe house by Mabel Luhan. She had been anxious for Lawrence to write an American novel. She records that on the evening of 18 September Lawrence asked her to collaborate with him on such a book. In her highly-coloured memoir of him she states:

> He said he wanted to write an American novel that would express the life, the spirit, of America and he wanted to write it around me – my life from the time I left New York to come out to New Mexico; my life, from civilization to the bright, strange world of Taos; my renunciation of the rich old world of art and artists, for the pristine valley and the upland Indian lakes.[6]

[6] Luhan 52.

The following morning Lawrence visited Mabel Luhan in her home to begin the collaborative work. When it became apparent that the project entailed morning visits, however innocent on Lawrence's part, passing through Mabel's bedroom to the sun-roof where she was dressed in nothing but a housecoat, a jealous Frieda soon intervened. Frieda later recalled: 'I did not want this. I had always regarded Lawrence's genius as given to me. I felt deeply responsible for what he wrote. And there was a fight between us, Mabel and myself: I think it was a fair fight.'[7]

Fair or not, she had her way. On 21 September, the day after Frieda's intervention, Mabel made one further attempt to revive the project on Frieda's terms: 'I did try it once in her house. I went over there in the morning, and he and I sat in a cold room with the doors open, and Frieda stamped round, sweeping noisily, and singing with a loud defiance. I don't think that anything vital passed between Lawrence and me.'[8]

On the next day, the 22nd, Mabel had to go away, and Lawrence subsequently sent her a note informing her: 'I have done your "train" episode and brought you to Lamy at 3 in the morning.'[9] In fact the surviving opening fragment of this novel breaks off with her waiting at Wagon Mound at 8 p.m. for the arrival of the train three hours later that would take her on to Lamy.[10] Lawrence's note also asked Mabel for notes on the following episodes in her life:

1. The meeting with Maurice [Sterne].
2. John [Evans], M[aurice]. and you in Santa Fe
3. How you felt as you drove to Taos
4. What you *wanted* here before you came
5. First days at Taos.
6. First sight of Pueblo
7. First words with Tony [Luhan]
8. Steps in developing intimacy with Tony
9. Expulsion of M.
10. Fight with Tony's wife.
11. Moving in to your house

A further page of jottings seemingly written down by Lawrence during one of his meetings with her has been found.[11]

[7] Frieda Lawrence, "*Not I, But the Wind...*" (Santa Fe, 1934), p. 152.

[8] Luhan 64–5.

[9] Letter to Mabel Dodge Luhan, *c.* 6 October 1922.

[10] Tedlock (*Lawrence MSS* 51) speculates that an additional mauscript has been lost, but the final deleted passage (see textual apparatus 203:9) corresponds with Lawrence's note.

[11] The jottings on a one-page autograph manuscript located at UCB, are the following:

ash in the room
you can say what you like we've got to get our
force with a man

In the event Mabel's attempt to write about her past life for Lawrence's benefit came to nothing: 'I was not a *writer*', she explained. 'I was accustomed to the personal equation.'[12] So the novel died a natural death.

The untitled seven-page fragment of autograph manuscript that has survived offers a glimpse of one of Lawrence's first attempts to write about America after his arrival there.[13] It was first published in 1971 in the Penguin edition of *The Princess and Other Stories*, edited by Keith Sagar; he invented the title, 'The Wilful Woman'. (Lawrence repeatedly accused Mabel Luhan of exercising too much will-power of the kind shown by the heroine of this extract.)[14] That title is retained here to avoid further confusion in identifying this fragment which is printed in Appendix I.

'The Overtone'

While there is no external evidence for dating 'The Overtone', internal evidence makes it likely that it was written in the spring of 1924, most

---

she saw overlying body in light—
Mabel dreamed Maurice's face & an Indian face
coming through with steady glow
leaves all round—
transport & fear—anticipation—transfer

---

travelling
hotel—8.30—⟨big men⟩ men—Their guilt sense
suspicion

---

broken-hearted
Tony—smell of wood—Maurice hectic, waiting
to be nice, making it—dignity romance—
Maurice & John over telephone—Where are you—Sarah's
—Who is Sarah? (both at it)
Use M. as thing—having expected to be made better—get
force from a man (relieve head)

Pointed brackets indicate a deletion. The first deleted word after 'hotel—8.30—' may at one time have read 'bag', and the first word in the sixth line from the end may read 'Lamy' (instead of 'Tony').

Written upside down on the sheet to the right of the section beginning 'she saw overlying' is the following:

In that hour of dusk between
vespers and nones
When no good woman

[12] Luhan 66.

[13] Located at UCB.

[14] E.g. letters to Mabel Luhan of 17 October 1923 and 9 January 1924.

probably between 4 April and 5 May 1924. Nevertheless, the dating of this story must remain conjectural.

The internal evidence concerns Lawrence's use of the Great God Pan in 'The Overtone' as a counterforce to Christ and modern civilisation. Pan first appeared in Lawrence's earliest novel, *The White Peacock*, and continued to feature sporadically throughout his career, reappearing in his final work, *Apocalypse*.[15] But for a short period in his life Pan became a major motif in his prose writing. In her study of the myth of Pan in modern times, Patricia Merivale claims that there is what she terms a 'Pan cluster' which 'is made up of images from virtually every work Lawrence wrote between 1924 and 1926'.[16] Lawrence's unhappy stay in Europe during the winter of 1923–4 re-kindled his interest in Pan as an antidote to a civilisation suffering from the ill-effects of an ascetic Christian ethos. The 'London Letter' that he wrote to Willard Johnson on 9 January 1924 opens this phase by lamenting that 'When Jesus was born, the spirits wailed round the Mediterranean: Pan is dead.'[17] He goes on to evoke Pan's modern metamorphosis as the centaur or horse in the American Southwest where the spirit of Pan still lives on. One can discern here the germ of the idea for *St. Mawr* which he was to write in the summer of 1924. His further association in the letter of the Pan-like horse with American Indians anticipates his essay 'Pan in America' written between May and June 1924:[18] there Pan is shown to survive in the Indian tribes which live in such intimate relationship with the natural world.

The three stories that Lawrence wrote between January and April 1924 all hinge on a conflict between Pan or one of his present-day adherents on the one hand and cerebral, life-denying anti-heroes on the other. One of the three, 'The Last Laugh', introduces Pan in person; he lures the anti-hero into uncharacteristic sexual promiscuity (one of Pan's attributes), desecrates a Christian church in a snowstorm, and finally punishes those characters who deny the Pan-like qualities in themselves. The fiction of this period is infused with references to the Pan legend. *The Plumed Serpent* identifies Cipriano with 'The everlasting Pan' (chapter XX). In *St. Mawr* the spirit of Pan first resides in St. Mawr himself and more dimly in Lewis, the groom; later it is transferred to its more potent manifestation in the New Mexican landscape. The minor character Cartwright, by contrast, is portrayed as a 'fallen Pan'.[19]

'The Overtone' shows a clear affinity to this 'Pan cluster'. Renshaw, the

[15] *Apocalypse and the writings on Revelation*, ed. Mara Kalnins (Cambridge, 1980).
[16] *Pan the Goat-God* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), p. 194.
[17] 'Dear Old Horse, A London Letter', *Laughing Horse* (May 1924), [p. 4].
[18] Letter to Mabel Luhan, ?12 May 1924.
[19] See below 67:10–14.

husband, like Cartwright, is a fallen Pan: 'Pan was dead in his own long, loose Dane's body.'[20] His wife is identified by Renshaw with Christ at whose birth Pan died. She anticipates heroines like Dollie Urquhart in 'The Princess' whose sexual frigidity destroys the Pan-spirit in their men. The third character in 'The Overtone', Elsa Laskell, means to reconcile in herself the Renshaws' conflicting loyalties. One of Pan's nymphs, she is determined to seek out a true faun of Pan's as her mate, while giving the Christ-ethos its due.

There is no mention of this story by name in Lawrence's correspondence, nor was it published during his lifetime, nor has the kind of paper used for the twelve pages of autograph manuscript[21] been found elsewhere among his letters or other writings. The manuscript shows that he subsequently revised the original version in different ink, rewriting between the lines two major paragraphs and several shorter passages, and adding in smaller writing on the last page an additional ending;[22] in it Elsa Laskell's monologue is slightly extended, after which the narrative reverts to a more naturalistic conclusion. Since the story ends at the foot of a page where Lawrence had begun and then crossed out a new sentence, we cannot know whether he intended to continue it, or whether, as seems more likely, he simply decided to bring the story to its present end. The only evidence for dating the revision occurs where the introduction of Renshaw's 'inner sun' thematically anticipates 'The Flying-Fish' and 'Sun', both written in 1925.[23]

The only surviving typescript is a twenty-one-page carbon copy with corrections in an unknown hand.[24] It was apparently transcribed from the manuscript after Lawrence's death for the first published appearance of the story in *The Lovely Lady*, which Martin Secker, his principal British publisher since 1921, brought out in London in January, and Viking Press, New York, in February 1933. Textual collation reveals a number of identical discrepancies between the typescript and both first editions,[25] leading to the conclusion that one publisher used the proofs supplied by the other. All the evidence points to its having been Secker's proofs which were sent on to Viking. In the first place Secker was responsible for compiling *The Lovely Lady*. Secondly his edition appeared a month earlier than Viking's. Thirdly certain differences between typescript and first editions involve the capitalising of references to Christ, an alteration more likely to have been made by Secker in England.[26] Comparison of the autograph manuscript and typescript with

[20] See below 13:16.
[21] Located at UT.
[22] See note on 7:35 and pp. 16:38ff.
[23] See 11:6–13.
[24] Located at University of New Mexico.
[25] E.g. 5:8, 6:5, 9:1 etc.
[26] E.g. 15:21, 24, 26, etc; cf. *St. Mawr* 42:28, 29, 43:5, 16.

the first editions also shows that two lines of dialogue were omitted by Secker and Viking (9:24–7), whether deliberately because it was thought that they were too sexually explicit or inadvertently it is impossible to say. The autograph manuscript is the only authoritative text since it represents the final state in which Lawrence left the story.

St. Mawr

On about 5 June 1924 Lawrence informed Mabel Luhan: 'I began to write a story.' On 18 June he wrote to Miss Nancy Pearn, of the London office of his agent Curtis Brown, who specialised in placing work with periodicals. After discussing 'those three difficult stories' he had written earlier in the year, he continued: 'I shall send you soon a couple more – one is finished, one is being done again.'[27] The two most likely candidates are 'The Woman Who Rode Away' and *St. Mawr*, one of which he began about 5 June and one of which he was rewriting on 18 June.

Although the order in which these two stories were begun cannot be determined, it is known that Lawrence wrote two versions of *St. Mawr*. Powell's 1937 descriptive catalogue of Lawrence manuscripts records two autograph manuscript versions of *St. Mawr*, one 129 pages long, complete and as published, the other being 41 pages (numbered 17–58) of an earlier version.[28] Both were destroyed in the fire which burnt down Aldous Huxley's house in 1961.[29] As for 'The Woman Who Rode Away', Powell and Tedlock list only one autograph manuscript, now unlocated,[30] and we know from Mabel Luhan's memoir that she was shown it on 23 June 1924.[31] Only two weeks later on 7 July, Lawrence was able to send to his agents in London and New York the two typescripts of this story which had been produced for him by Dorothy Brett.[32] The available evidence, therefore, suggests that the story that was finished by 18 June was 'The Woman Who Rode Away' and the one 'being done again' was *St. Mawr*.

Whether or not it was the story he began by 5 June, the first version of *St. Mawr* was probably finished during the first half of June, i.e. it was being *rewritten* by the 18th. Brett began to type *St. Mawr* almost immediately after

[27] The letter is addressed to 'Miss Pearse'; for the 'difficult' stories, see p. xviii above.
[28] Lawrence Clark Powell, editor, *The Manuscripts of D. H. Lawrence: A Descriptive Catalogue* (Los Angeles, 1937), p. 12, item 14A.
[29] Sybille Bedford, *Aldous Huxley: A Biography* (1974), ii. 274.
[30] Powell, *Manuscripts of D. H. Lawrence*, p. 13, item 15; Tedlock, *Lawrence MSS* 53–4.
[31] Luhan 237–8; the date of the visit is fixed by a letter to Thomas Seltzer of 23 June 1924.
[32] Letter to Curtis Brown, 7 July 1924.

finishing 'The Woman Who Rode Away' by 7 July;[33] she must have been typing the *second* version from Lawrence's manuscript because Powell's description suggests that Lawrence revised an autograph manuscript, not a typescript. Thus the second version was begun before 18 June and was well advanced by 7 July.

Lawrence appears to have revised the original first sixteen pages of manuscript and then rewritten the next section anew (what had been pp. 17–58 in the original manuscript). What we cannot know is whether the first version stopped at p. 58 (and was therefore a *short* story), or, alternatively, if Lawrence reverted to writing on the original manuscript with p. 59. If the latter were true, and Powell's brief description is unhelpful in this respect – then the length of the first version will never be determined.[34] It is possible, since Lawrence coupled the two stories in his letter to Nancy Pearn of 18 June, that they were both long; this would indeed have helped to make them both '*very* difficult to place'. On 23 July, he referred to *St. Mawr* in a letter to Martin Secker as his 'second long-short story', indicating that he was still thinking of it as similar in length to 'The Woman Who Rode Away'. On 30 July he informed Miss Pearn that he was 'just winding up *St. Mawr*, a story which has turned into a novelette nearly as long as *The Captain's Doll*'.

On the other hand, judging from its position in her narrative, Brett's description of the point which Lawrence had reached in rewriting the story also belongs to the end of July: 'You are full of your new story, of Mrs Witt... You read out the scene of the tea-party, of the tart Mrs Witt, the scandalized Dean and his wife, and the determined Lou.'[35] This may suggest that Lawrence thought that he was 'winding up' the story having reached the equivalent of page 100 of the typescript, which eventually ran to 181 pages. If so, at this time he did not envisage continuing the story by following Lou Carrington and Mrs Witt to America. He still conceived of *St. Mawr* as a satire on English society, epitomised in the rural life in Shropshire (where he had spent three days from 3–5 January 1924 with Frederick Carter in Pontesbury) and the urban social whirl of London. According to Harry Moore, Lawrence based Cartwright on Carter and several other minor characters on people he met at Pontesbury.[36]

[33] Brett 123; cf. Luhan 244, and letter to Curtis Brown, 7 July 1924.

[34] See the introduction to *The Trespasser*, ed. Elizabeth Mansfield (Cambridge, 1982): DHL on several occasions incorporated manuscript pages from the first version into the second when his revision was not extensive.

[35] Brett 137. Since Brett gives no dates in her memoir and writes in brief, unconnected episodes, it is often difficult to pinpoint the time accurately.

[36] Harry T. Moore, *The Priest of Love: A Life of D. H. Lawrence* (New York, 1974), pp. 348,

Lawrence was ill at the beginning of August, which explains why he was still writing to Secker on 8 August: 'I've nearly got to the end of my second "novelette –" – a corker.' In fact he was to take another month to finish it. This delay may have been the result of the combination of his poor health, his twelve-day trip to the Snake Dance (13–25 August) and, possibly, his decision to add the long American coda, a decision perhaps not taken until after the Snake Dance trip. One can only speculate whether this trip induced Lawrence to extend the story and shift its setting to the American Southwest, where, as he wrote to Middleton Murry on his return, 'This animistic religion is the only live one[,] ours is a corpse of a religion' (30 August 1924). This sentiment equally underlies Lou's decision at the end of *St. Mawr* to keep herself for the wild spirit of the New Mexican landscape. Finally, in answer to an enquiry from Secker about the state of his 'novelette', he replied on 13 September: 'Yes, the novelette *St. Mawr* is finished and Brett is typing it out. It's good – a bit bitter – takes place in England, then moves to this ranch – some beautiful creation of this locale and landscape here. But thank God I don't have to write it again. It took it out of me.'

Dorothy Brett took much of the rest of September to complete the typing which was done probably in sections as it was written. It was far from a professional job. When he was just over half-way through the second version, Brett reports Lawrence complaining: '"Why, oh why can't you spell the same way I do, when it is in front of your nose!"' 'Why not, indeed?' Brett continues. 'I never knew and I never did spell the same way you did.'[37] The surviving ribbon copy typescript of *St. Mawr* shows the care with which Lawrence corrected it. It is 181 pages long,[38] and contains over 180 single-word substitutions, the alteration or addition of about 55 short phrases and the interlinear rewriting of 8 passages, involving some 50 lines of typescript.

On 30 September Lawrence recorded in his diary: 'Sent to Barmby (Curtis Brown) – *St. Mawr*: also MSS. of the same... Sent the copy of *St. Mawr* to Curtis Brown, London.'[39] To both Curtis Brown and Martin Secker he suggested publishing *St. Mawr* with 'The Woman Who Rode

391; cf. Nehls, ii. 316, 318, 514–15. Moore also stated Lou Carrington was modelled on Jan Juta's fiancée, Elizabeth Humes, a southern American girl DHL had probably met in Capri, 1919–20, and Mrs Witt partly on Miss Humes's mother and partly on Mabel Luhan.

[37] Brett 138.

[38] The typescript is in the collection of Mr George Lazarus. The pages are numbered 1–178; Brett made five errors in typing the page numbers, necessitating the addition of 'A' to four pages (38A, 125A, 128A, 138A) and one amalgamation ('19 and 20').

[39] Tedlock, *Lawrence MSS* 98. A. W. Barmby was the manager of the New York office of Curtis Brown.

Away' and 'The Princess' (which he had begun to write by the end of the month). Simultaneously he offered as an alternative title 'Two Ladies and a Horse', an option not taken up.[40]

Lawrence was not exact in his terminology when referring to manuscripts and typescripts. So it is not possible to identify 'the copy' in his diary entry above with the carbon *copy* of the typescript. Indeed, the similarities in the revisions in the ribbon copy typescript and Secker's text suggest that the former was used by the English printer.[41] (Lawrence characteristically made different revisions in typescript copies, refining whichever copy was corrected later; so the missing carbon copy typescript may have had some different readings.)

On first reading *St. Mawr* Martin Secker wrote back to Curtis Brown: 'I now quite agree with you that it would be a pity to include any other material which would otherwise be available for another collection of stories in the future, and I will therefore produce this as a full-length novel.'[42] On learning of Secker's response Lawrence readily agreed to the separate publication of *St. Mawr*.[43] Then on 8 December Secker wrote to Curtis Brown that, on second thoughts, he wanted to make the volume consistent in size and style with his other Lawrence publications, and could hardly charge seven shillings and sixpence for a book only 160 pages long: 'I feel strongly that the best way to treat *St. Mawr* is to make it the first story of a collection of three, or possibly of only two, if the length of this latter is fairly substantial.'[44] 'Secker is good at changing his mind!' Lawrence commented on 10 January 1925. In the same letter he informed Curtis Brown that he had authorised Barmby to let Knopf, and not Seltzer, publish *St. Mawr* on its own.[45] But by 29 January it was Lawrence who was changing his mind: 'Barmby sent the Knopf agreement for *St Mawr*', he informed Curtis Brown. 'I too would rather this story were published by itself, although it is short.' But by then the die was cast. Knopf went ahead with

[40] Letters to Curtis Brown, 30 September 1924 and Secker, 2 October 1924. Nor apparently did Secker like the titles suggested by DHL in his letter of 17 November to Curtis Brown.

[41] The typescript has a note on the first page ('Corrected typescript of') in the hand of Laurence Pollinger, who worked for Curtis Brown, London, indicating that it was the copy sent to London. It also has a few pencil markings throughout probably made by the printer.

[42] 24 October 1924, UIll.

[43] Letters to Curtis Brown, 6 and 17 November 1924.

[44] Martin Secker, *Letters from a Publisher: Martin Secker to D. H. Lawrence and Others 1911–1929* (1970), p. 34.

[45] Although Thomas Seltzer had been DHL's American publisher since 1920, he was teetering on the verge of bankruptcy; so DHL was looking for a more secure publisher and turned to Alfred Knopf.

his volume of *St. Mawr* as a separate publication, while Secker prepared to publish *St. Mawr Together with The Princess.*

Early in February while in Oaxaca Lawrence caught influenza and malaria, which brought on an attack of tuberculosis after his arrival in Mexico City later that month. During the illness he received duplicate sets of proofs for *St. Mawr* from Secker.[46] Although Secker intended Lawrence to return one set of corrected proofs to him and the other to Knopf, in the event it appears that Lawrence returned corrected proofs only to Secker on 23 March just before leaving for the USA.[47] It further seems likely that Knopf sent Lawrence final proofs of his own edition,[48] since Lawrence wrote to Blanche Knopf after his return to Kiowa Ranch the following month (18 April 1925): 'I didn't correct the St. Mawr proofs very well – felt too sick. Am better. – But there were only typographical errors, a clerk can find them. I didn't know you wanted a revised set of *Secker* proofs.' This suggests that the Knopf corrected proofs were not entirely trustworthy; neither set of proofs has been located.

The similarity of wording and punctuation in the Knopf and Secker texts leads to the conclusion that one was set from the proofs of the other. It appears likely that it was Knopf who set his proofs from Secker's uncorrected proofs. Knopf attempted several times to delay the publication date, while Secker sent his proofs to Lawrence in late February.[49] The inference from Lawrence's letter of mid-April to Blanche Knopf quoted above is that proofs of Knopf's own edition were subsequently sent to Lawrence. That Knopf set from uncorrected Secker proofs is further substantiated by the examples of Lawrence's punctuation which appear in Knopf's text but which were probably deleted at a late stage from the Secker text.[50] Knopf must have wanted the duplicate corrected Secker proofs as an easy, quick method of obtaining corrections for his own setting, but when Lawrence failed to forward them, Knopf must have decided to send a set of his own proofs to Lawrence. Thus the Knopf edition includes some revisions not made in

[46] Letter from Secker to Alfred Knopf, 29 January 1925, UIll.

[47] Letter to Secker, 20–3 March 1925.

[48] See note to 59:29 below.

[49] For Knopf's attempts to delay, see letters from Secker to Knopf, 29 January 1925 and to Curtis Brown, 4 February 1925, UIll. On Secker's proofs, see letter from Secker to Knopf, 6 March 1925, UIll: 'About ten days ago I posted to [DHL] sets of proofs of "St. Mawr".'

[50] E.g. see entries in textual apparatus for 54:11, 55:39, 56:10. Secker removed most of DHL's dashes that followed final punctuation, but some of them must have been included in his first proofs because Knopf incorporated them into his edition. Secker probably deleted several of the remaining dashes during proof revision. It is unlikely that Knopf would reintroduce these dashes exactly where DHL had had them, or that Knopf would have incorporated only a few of DHL's dashes if he had been setting independently from DHL's typescript (or checking against it). It is also unlikely that DHL added dashes in proof.

Secker's proofs, although, because Lawrence was still unwell, these are few. On 28 April Secker informed Knopf that he would send him three advance copies 'directly we receive stock'.[51] It is possible that these would have reached Knopf in time to affect his printing.

A week before publication Secker received an order from W. H. Smith and Son for 200 copies of *St. Mawr* 'provided that certain words are deleted from page 65'. These words made up the short sentence: 'Even our late King Edward.' This sentence follows the Dean's derogatory remarks about 'goaty old satyrs' whom he finds 'somewhat vulgar'. Secker complied with the request and 200 copies were altered.[52] *St. Mawr Together with The Princess* was published by Martin Secker on 14 May 1925. *St. Mawr* was published on its own by Alfred A. Knopf on 5 June 1925.

A comparison of the English and American editions of *St. Mawr* with the corrected ribbon copy typescript shows that both English and American compositors made numerous silent alterations to Lawrence's spelling and punctuation which have been perpetuated in subsequent editions. Further specifically American house-styling is evident in Knopf's edition. The only authoritative text for *St. Mawr* is therefore the corrected typescript, which is used as the base-text in this edition. But where this differs from the English and American first editions in more than punctuation and where they are in agreement with each other, it has normally been assumed that Lawrence himself incorporated the change in the proofs he returned to Secker.

'The Princess'

During Lawrence's brief visit to London in the winter of 1923–4 he stayed at 110 Heath Street with Catherine Carswell and her husband. She has recalled how he was confined to bed there with a cold between 17 and 20 December 1923.[53] On being reproached by Lawrence for her current failure to write anything, Catherine Carswell told him of a novel she had in mind:

> The theme had been suggested to me by reading of some savages who took a baby girl, and that they might rear her into a goddess for themselves, brought her up on a covered river boat, tending her in all respects, but never letting her mix with her kind, and leading her to believe that she was herself no mortal, but a goddess.[54]

A short while after this conversation Lawrence called her back to his sickroom and produced a written outline of such a novel, going on to suggest

[51] Letter from Secker to Knopf, UIII.

[52] Letter from Secker to Messrs W. H. Smith and Son, 8 May 1925, UIII. See 64:40 below.

[53] Carswell 199–200; cf. letters to Mabel Luhan, 17 December 1923 and Secker, 20 December 1923.

[54] Carswell 201.

that they might collaborate on it. Mrs Carswell soon gave up the attempt at writing the beginning, but she retained and subsequently printed Lawrence's outline, which bears an obvious resemblance to 'The Princess':

A woman of about thirty-five, beautiful, a little overwrought, goes into a shipping office in Glasgow to ask about a ship to Canada. She gives her name Olivia Maclure. The clerk asks her if she is not going to accept the Maclure invitation to the feast in the ancestral castle. She laughs – but the days of loneliness in the Glasgow hotel before the ship can sail are too much for her, and she sets off for the Maclure island.

The Maclure, who claims to be chief of the clan and has bought the ancestral castle on his native isle, is a man about forty-five, rather small, dark-eyed, full of energy, but has been a good deal knocked about. He has spent ten years in the U.S.A. and twenty years in the silver mines of Mexico, is somewhat grizzled, has a scar on the right temple which tilts up his right eye a little. Chief characteristic his quick, alert brown eyes which seem to sense danger, and the tense energy in his slightly work-twisted body. He has lived entirely apart from civilized women, merely frequented an occasional Indian woman in the hills. Is a bit cranky about his chieftainship.

Olivia arrives a day too soon for the festival, at the patched-up castle. Maclure, in a shapeless worksuit, is running round attending to his house and preparations. He looks like a Cornish miner, always goes at a run, sees everything, has a certain almost womanly quickness of perception, and frequently takes a whisky. He eyes Olivia with the quick Mexican suspicion. She, so distraught, is hardly embarrassed at all. Something weighs on her so much, she doesn't realize she is a day too soon, and when she realizes, she doesn't care.

As soon as he has sensed her, he is cordial, generous, but watchful: always on the watch for danger. Soon he is fascinated by her. She, made indifferent to everything by an inward distress, talks to him charmingly, but vaguely: doesn't realize him. He, a man of forty-five, falls for the first time insanely in love. But she is always only half conscious of him.

She spends the night in the mended castle – he most scrupulously sleeps in the cottage below. The next day, she is mistress of the absurd feast. And at evening he begs her not to go away. His frantic, slightly absurd passion penetrates her consciousness. She consents to stay.

After two days of anguished fear lest she should go away, he proposes to her. She looks at him very strangely – he is just strange to her. But she consents. Something in her is always remote, far off – the weight of some previous distress. He feels the distance, but cannot understand. After being in an agony of love with her for six months, he comes home to find her dead, leaving a little baby girl.

Then it seems to him the mother was not mortal. She was a mysterious woman from the faery, and the child, he secretly believes, is one of the Tuatha De Danaan. This idea he gradually inculcates into the people round him, and into the child herself. It steals over them all gradually, almost unawares.

The girl accepts from the start a difference between herself and the rest of people. She does not feel quite mortal. Men are only men to her: she is of another race, the

Tuatha De Danaan. She doesn't talk about it: nobody talks about it. But there it is, tacit, accepted.

Her father hires a poor scholar to be her tutor, and she has an ordinary education. But she has no real friends. There is no one of her race. Sometimes she goes to Glasgow, to Edinburgh, to London with her father. The world interests her, but she doesn't belong to it. She is a little afraid of it. It is not of her race.

When she is seventeen her father is suddenly killed, and she is alone, save for her tutor. She has an income of about three hundred a year. She decides to go to London. The war has broken out – she becomes a nurse. She nurses men, and knows their wounds and their necessities. But she tends them as if they were lambs or other delicate and lovable animals. Their blood is not her blood, their needs are not the needs of her race.

Men fall in love with her, and that is terrible to her. She is waiting for one of her own race. Her tutor supports her in the myth. Wait, he says, wait for the Tuatha De Danaan to send you your mate. You can't mate with a man. Wait till you see a demon between his brows.

At last she saw him in the street. She knew him at once, knew the demon between his brows. And she was afraid. For the first time in her life, she was afraid of her own nature, the mystery of herself. Because it seemed to her that her race, the Tuatha, had come back to destroy the race of men. She had come back to destroy the race of men. She was terrified of her own destiny. She wanted never again to see the man with the demon between his brows.

So for a long time she did not see him again. And then her fear that she would never see him any more was deeper than anything else. Whatever she wanted, she wanted her own destiny with him, let happen what might.[55]

The outline ends at this point, but Lawrence did tell Catherine Carswell that it couldn't have a happy ending.[56]

Evidently the idea remained in Lawrence's head throughout the next nine months, during which he returned to New Mexico with Frieda and Dorothy Brett. It is quite possible that Lawrence had at least partly modelled the heroine of this outline on Brett whom he was seeing frequently during December 1923. Catherine Carswell first identified Brett as the sitter for the Princess of the published story.[57] Brett herself has given an account of a one-day expedition which she made about 30 August 1924 to the Lobo peaks of the Rocky Mountains with Lawrence, Rachel Hawk and other riders from the Hawks' dude ranch.[58] Mr and Mrs A. D. Hawk owned Del Monte Ranch, Questa, where the Lawrences stayed during the winter of 1922–3 and it is likely that their son William and his wife Rachel provided the models for the Wilkiesons in 'The Princess'. In her account of the one-day excursion

[55] Ibid. 202–4.
[56] Ibid. 201.
[57] Moore, *Priest of Love*, p. 393.
[58] Brett 149–52; cf. letter to Margaret King, 31 August 1924.

Brett recalls how they reached a plateau from which could be seen far below in the valley 'a tiny green lake, blue green and dark: Columbine Lake, round which the drama of your story "The Princess" is written'.[59] She also records meeting three Indian huntsmen that day who, like the two who appear in the story, deny having shot any game despite suspicious-looking bulks in their saddle bags.

A letter written to Martin Secker on 13 September 1924, informing him that *St. Mawr* was finished and that Brett was typing it, makes no mention of 'The Princess' when suggesting that *St. Mawr* might be published together with 'The Woman Who Rode Away'. The first mention of this story comes in a letter to Curtis Brown on 30 September. In both this letter and one Lawrence wrote to Secker on 2 October he suggests publishing 'The Princess', a 'story I am doing', together with 'The Woman Who Rode Away' and *St. Mawr*: 'They are all sad. After all, they're true to what is.'[60] On 8 October he recorded in his diary that he had finished 'The Princess',[61] and the same day he informed Curtis Brown that on the weekend of the 11th he would be sending him the typescript which was being produced, presumably by Dorothy Brett.

Knopf, Lawrence's new American publisher, chose to publish *St. Mawr* on its own, while Martin Secker preferred to publish *St. Mawr* together with 'The Princess'. On 4 February 1925 Secker learned that Curtis Brown had sold the magazine rights of 'The Princess' to the *Calendar of Modern Letters*, a new critical journal edited by Edgell Rickword and Douglas Garman. Secker readily agreed to postpone publication of *St. Mawr Together with The Princess* until mid-May so that the story could appear in the March, April and May numbers of the *Calendar*.[62] Instead of sending Secker Lawrence's corrected typescript or a copy of it (as Secker twice requested[63]), in early March Curtis Brown sent him the *Calendar*'s proofs of 'The Princess' which had been set up from the corrected typescript.[64]

On receiving the proofs of *St. Mawr* on 23 March Lawrence noted the absence of any proofs of 'The Princess'.[65] It is highly unlikely that he was sent any by the *Calendar*: on 6 April 1925 Lawrence wrote to Edward McDonald to say that he hadn't seen 'The Princess' but would ask for relevant copies of the *Calendar*, which he did in a letter to Curtis Brown

[59] Brett 151.
[60] Letter to Catherine Carswell, 8 October 1924.
[61] Tedlock, *Lawrence MSS* 99.
[62] Letter from Secker to Curtis Brown, 4 February 1925, UIll.
[63] Ibid., and letter from Secker to Curtis Brown, 28 February 1925, UIll.
[64] Letter from Secker to Curtis Brown, 3 March 1925, UIll.
[65] Letter to Secker, 20–3 March 1925.