

LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER

A PROPOS OF "LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER"

D. H. LAWRENCE

EDITED BY
MICHAEL SQUIRES



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>

This, the Cambridge Edition of the text of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* and *A Propos of "Lady Chatterley's Lover"* now correctly established from the original sources and first published in 1993, © the Estate of Frieda Lawrence Ravagli 1993. Introduction and notes © Cambridge University Press 1993. Permission to reproduce this text entire or in part, or to quote from it, can be granted only by the Literary Executor of the Estate, Laurence Pollinger Ltd, 18 Maddox Street, Mayfair, London W1R 0EU. Permission to reproduce the introduction and notes entire or in part should be requested from Cambridge University Press. Acknowledgement is made to William Heinemann Ltd in the UK and the Viking Press in the USA, who hold the exclusive book publication rights for the work as published (copyright 1933, 1959, 1960 and 1929, 1930, 1931, 1953) in their respective territories for the authorisation granted to Cambridge University Press through the Frieda Lawrence Ravagli Estate for use of the work as published in preparing the new scholarly text.

First published in paperback 2001

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data

Lawrence, D. H. (David Herbert), 1885-1930.

Lady Chatterley's Lover; A propos of Lady Chatterley's lover /

D. H. Lawrence; edited by Michael Squires.

p. cm. - (The Cambridge edition of the letters and works of D. H. Lawrence)
2nd work originally published: London: Mandrake Press, 1930.

i. Squires, Michael. ii. Lawrence, D. H. (David Herbert), 1885-1930.

A propos of Lady Chatterley's lover, 1993.

iii. Title: Lady Chatterley's lover. iv. Title: A propos of Lady Chatterley's lover. v. Series: Lawrence, D. H. (David Herbert), 1885-1930.

Works. 1979.

PR6023.A93L3 1993

823'.912-dc20 91-8194 CIP

ISBN 0 521 22266 4 hardback

ISBN 0 521 00717 8 paperback

CONTENTS

General editors' preface	<i>page</i> vii
Acknowledgements	ix
Chronology	xi
Cue-titles	xv
Introduction	xvii
<i>Lady Chatterley's Lover</i>	xix
1926–8 Composition	xx
The three versions	xxiv
1928–30 Publication, distribution, early reception	xxviii
1930–72 History after Lawrence's death	xxxiv
The typing of the novel	xl
Editorial procedures	xlv
Chapters I–V	xlv
Chapters VI–XII	xlix
Fragment of chapter XII	l
Chapters XIII–XIX	li
Conclusions	liv
<i>A Propos of "Lady Chatterley's Lover"</i>	lv
Composition	lv
Publication, distribution, reception	lvii
Editorial procedures	lix
<i>LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER</i>	I
<i>A PROPOS OF "LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER"</i>	303
Explanatory notes	337
Dialect glossary	373
Textual apparatus	375
Line-end hyphenation	448
Appendix: <i>Lady Chatterley's Lover</i> and the landscape of the English Midlands	451

INTRODUCTION

Lady Chatterley's Lover

Lady Chatterley's Lover, Lawrence's last novel, provides the final treatment of themes and motifs which had appeared in his work from the earliest period onwards. In his first novel *The White Peacock*, in the early short stories 'The Shades of Spring', 'Second-Best' and 'Daughters of the Vicar', and in *The Lost Girl*, Lawrence had introduced and reworked the theme of the well-bred girl, the lady or the woman of courage and character who loves – across a class barrier or a barrier of strangeness – a farmer, a working man or a foreigner, because she senses in him some quality that she lacks. In *The White Peacock* and 'The Shades of Spring', a gamekeeper is first a strong voice and then the object of love, preferred to an intellectual. In *Sons and Lovers*, 'Daughters of the Vicar', 'Odour of Chrysanthemums', to name only some important early works, Lawrence had recreated the mining countryside and the mining communities of his own childhood. In his early maturity, the period of *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*, *The Lost Girl*, the first part of *Mr Noon* and *Aaron's Rod*, he returned to the same scenery, the same life, as the locus of a sharply felt tension. The industrial life he had known so intimately was not just 'background'; it was a set of determining forces which could undermine spontaneous life and create a mechanical social existence. Now, towards the end of his life, Lawrence turned once more to this set of preoccupations. In 1926, having travelled widely since the early twenties, he finally settled for some time at the Villa Mirinda, a few kilometres beyond the outer suburbs of Florence, and in October began his last – and most notorious – novel, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. He spent the next three years writing its three versions, then publishing and distributing the final version.

1926–8 Composition

Tired, ill and recovering from the depression caused by his last visit to the English Midlands where he had spent his childhood and youth, Lawrence gladly returned on 4 October 1926 to Italy, where he and his wife Frieda savoured the last of *vendemmia*, the grape harvest going on around the Mirenda. Lawrence felt disinclined to work, telling his sister-in-law Else Jaffe on the 18th that he felt he would ‘never write another novel’,¹ but the journey to England and his boyhood haunts, as well as the vigour of the autumn harvest, roused him and stirred his creative flow. As the days cooled, suddenly, about 22 October, Lawrence began to write, steadily filling the two ruled manuscript notebooks that hold the first version of the novel.² By the 26th he had reached page 41, for at the top of that page he wrote, ‘Smudges made by / John, the dog, near the / stream behind San Polo Mosciano! / 26 Oct 1926.’ Analysis of his handwriting shows four earlier breaks – on pages 11, 21, 30 and 40 – so he probably started writing four days before the 26th, averaging 2,273 words per day. On the 28th he wrote to his niece Margaret King: ‘the day has been perfectly radiant . . . I sat in the woods all morning, doing a bit of writing’ (v. 564). Shrinking from sustained work, he at first thought of his narrative as ‘shortish’,³ but he appears to have written quickly, perhaps completing 150 pages in two weeks. On 15 November he told Martin Secker, his English publisher, that the new novel, set in the Derbyshire coal-mining districts, was ‘already rather improper’.⁴ During the quiet November days Lawrence laboured, sometimes ‘wish[ing] things were a little more convivial’, as he confided to his old friend from New Mexico, Mabel Dodge Luhan, on the 23rd (v. 580). He soon finished the first version, having the novel’s end already in sight by 25 November. Since the manuscript of version 1 (originally of

¹ *Letters*, v. 559 (subsequent references to *Letters* will usually be given in brackets in the text).

² The manuscripts of all three versions (Roberts E186a, b and c), along with the typescript of version 3 (Roberts E186d), are located at UT. Version 1 (Roberts E186a) originally had 413 pages: 1–71, 78–236 (87–90, 137–8, 195–6 and 224–5 are now missing), 236, 237–67, 267, 268–84, 287–354, 356–420.

³ *Letters*, v. 563: confirmed by the fact that at some date before 16 October DHL used pages of the second notebook to draft music for his play *David*. He probably thought the new fiction would not get so far.

⁴ *Letters*, v. 576. Martin Secker explained to Curtis Brown on 25 November 1926: ‘I suggested some time ago that it would be as well if he gave us an English background for a change, and I was pleased to hear that his new book is to have a Derbyshire setting’ (Secker Letter-Book, U111).

413 pages) reveals twenty-six 'certain' breaks and ten 'possible' breaks,⁵ each certain break and a few possible breaks probably representing a new day's work, then Lawrence appears to have averaged fourteen pages, or 3,200 words, per day.⁶ If he wrote six days a week, he would have finished the first version around the 25th, just before he began painting *Boccaccio Story* on the 27th.

All that is known about Lawrence's working practice supports the generalisation that he usually avoided detailed structural revision, and preferred rewriting, sometimes producing draft after draft until he was satisfied. From the beginning he had done so; and in 1920 he rewrote *The Lost Girl*, in 1921 'The Fox' and in 1924–5 *The Plumed Serpent*, in what he called his 'usual way' of composing.⁷ Although Lawrence's letters rarely comment on his new novel's early drafts, he apparently began the second version about 1 December. The interlinear revisions of version 1 are inserted in the same black ink that appears on the opening pages of version 2, suggesting the possibility of virtually continuous composition. If version 1 had flowed rapidly from his pen, version 2, inscribed in two ruled manuscript books containing together 580 pages, apparently demanded more intense imaginative concentration and greater rhetorical calculation. The manuscript shows sixty-six 'certain' breaks.⁸ On 14 December Lawrence told S. S. Koteliensky, one of his oldest friends, that he was 'patiently doing a novel' (v. 601). Five days later he wrote to Dorothy Brett, his loyal admirer who had remained in New Mexico: 'I sat out in the wood this morning, working at my novel – which comes out of me slowly, and is good, I think, but a little too deep in bits – sort of bottomless pools' (v. 605). As a diversion from concentrated work, Lawrence turned again to painting large, startling canvases. On 9 January 1927 he was still 'slowly pegging at a novel' (v. 620), he wrote to Nancy Pearn, who negotiated serial rights at Curtis Brown's in London, and on the 20th he told Koteliensky that, although he felt depleted, he continued to write 'in

⁵ Certain breaks in version 1 occur on the following pages of the manuscript: 11, 21, 30, 40, 47, 57, 68, 102, 108, 121, 135, 151, 165, 176, 187, 192, 212, 226, 256, 265, 277, 303, 344, 348, 381, 409. Possible breaks occur on pp. 5, 24, 45, 53, 249, 329, 337, 354, 373, 377.

⁶ In composing *The Lost Girl* DHL averaged about 2,800 words per day; in composing *Mr Noon* he averaged between 2,445 and 3,000 words per day. See introductions to *The Lost Girl*, ed. John Worthen (Cambridge, 1981), p. xxviii and *Mr Noon*, ed. Lindeth Vasey (Cambridge, 1984), p. xxiv.

⁷ Letter to Laurence Pollinger, 25 July 1929.

⁸ These breaks appear on the following pages of the manuscript: 4, 15, 24, 26, 28, 42, 49, 63, 69, 74, 77, 86, 92, 100, 109, 118, 127, 132, 134, 144, 152, 166, 172, 185, 192, 198, 204, 211, 217, 223, 236, 243, 251, 256, 271, 276, 279, 285, 299, 326, 336, 351, 361, 366, 374, 376, 383, 386, 397, 399, 415, 421, 424, 429, 437, 441, 455, 468, 477, 490, 494, 513, 525, 534, 549, 564.

sudden intense whacks' (v. 628). By 6 February the novel was 'three parts done', he announced to his American friends Earl and Achsah Brewster, and 'so *absolutely* improper, . . . and so really *good*', he added with new enthusiasm, 'that I don't know what's going to happen to it' (v. 638). Then on the 25th he told Nancy Pearn: 'I've done all I'm going to do of my novel for the time being' (v. 647). It seems fairly certain that Lawrence thus announced the completion of version 2 in less than three months. He may have been dissatisfied with it, for a month later, on 22 March, he told her he 'must go over it again' (vi. 21).

But first he wanted a change of scene. Brewster having agreed to be his walking companion, Lawrence left the Mirenda on 28 March 1927 to spend a week or so exploring the Etruscan tombs and artifacts, in preparation for *Sketches of Etruscan Places* – and to decide the fate of his novel, which he was loath even to have typed. By 27 May he had resolved, he told Secker, not to publish *Lady Chatterley's Lover* 'this year' (vi. 68). The summer drowse soon fell over him, and he ceased to bother about his work. After a terrifying haemorrhage in July – and weeks of convalescence in Germany – Lawrence grew depressed: 'I'm not going to do much work of any sort this winter –' he declared to his sister Emily on 17 October; 'that's a vow I make –' (vi. 192). And to Koteliansky he wrote on 31 October: 'I feel I don't want to work – don't want to do a thing – all the life gone out of me. Yet how can I sit in this empty place and . . . do nothing!' (vi. 204).

However, in a brief surge of vitality, Lawrence finally determined to rewrite the novel once more – and this time to publish it. For one thing, he needed money. But about this time, too, he recognised that if his publishers, Martin Secker in England and Alfred Knopf in the USA, shrank from the novel's 'improper' sexual detail, he would have to publish the book himself. The idea of private publication had occurred to him a decade earlier, when he had tried to interest Cyril Beaumont in publishing *Women in Love* and in printing 'little order-forms, saying the work was in hand' (iii. 220). Moreover, on 17 November 1927, when Lawrence went in to Florence, he met the author Norman Douglas and probably his bookseller friend Giuseppe ('Pino') Orioli, which may explain his remark to Curtis Brown on the 18th: 'friends in Florence urge me to print it privately, here in Florence, as Norman Douglas does his books . . . Production is cheap, and myself and a friend [Orioli] could easily do all the work ourselves. And I should make – with the gods – a few hundred pounds . . . a windfall for me' (vi. 222). That he lacked money is certain: 'I haven't got any', he had confided to Aldous and Maria Huxley on 30 October (vi. 202); and he had told Brewster on 8 November that money

from his writing 'comes in slowly, much more slowly than anybody would imagine' (vi. 209). 'It is not cheap, being ill and doing cures', he reminded Curtis Brown on 18 November (vi. 222). By publishing his novel privately, he hoped to preserve both his artistic autonomy and his financial independence. He may also have realised that his failing health would leave him unable to write.

Ready at last to rewrite – the weather having cooled, a plan of publication having emerged – Lawrence probably began the third version around 26 November 1927, soon after a chance encounter with the immensely rich novelist Michael Arlen in Florence on the 17th;⁹ Arlen also visited him two days later. The meetings prompted Lawrence to transform Arlen into the playwright Michaelis, a character who appears early in the third version of *Lady Chatterley*. On the 16th he had written to his sister Emily that his health had improved temporarily: 'I . . . feel like getting a grip on life again' (vi. 215). And he wrote no letters from 23 to 30 November. The date 3 December 1927 appears on the fly-leaf of the manuscript notebook into which the first fifty-seven leaves of the final version were later set in;¹⁰ yet the ink on the fly-leaf, while not matching the ink on the first leaf of the manuscript, does match the ink on the first page (114) of the original notebook. Lawrence probably wrote the date 3 December when he continued the novel in the notebook;¹¹ and on 8 December he told Koteliensky in the first surviving reference to version 3, 'My novel I'm writing all over again' (vi. 233). Once he started, he wrote with extraordinary speed, almost without correction, filling two ruled notebooks having together 724 pages. But he was often ill, too. Norman Douglas remembers how bad he looked at the time – 'like a ghost'.¹² Although sometimes remaining 'in bed, and feeling limp' (vi. 236), he must have worked steadily throughout December, and on the 18th told his German friend Max Mohr: 'I have been very busy writing out my new novel, for the

⁹ Given the number of pages DHL averaged per day, he probably began version 3 around 26 November. If he wrote 6 days a week, he would have composed pp. 114–707 in 32 days (3 December–8 January, with four days off), producing 19 pages per day. Assuming the same rate of composition, he would have composed pp. 1–113 in 6 days (26 November–1 December, with the 2nd off). For Arlen see Explanatory note on 20:25.

¹⁰ For a fuller description of the manuscripts see E. W. Tedlock, *The Frieda Lawrence Collection of D. H. Lawrence Manuscripts: A Descriptive Bibliography* (Albuquerque, 1948), pp. 20–7. See also Michael Squires, ed., *D. H. Lawrence's Manuscripts: The Correspondence of Frieda Lawrence, Jake Zeilin and Others* (London and New York, 1991), pp. 20–6, 234–50, 300–1.

¹¹ Roberts E186c. Three years earlier, when Lawrence began rewriting *The Plumed Serpent*, he also wrote the current date on the fly-leaves of his first and his second notebooks. See *The Plumed Serpent*, ed. L. D. Clark (Cambridge, 1988), pp. xxxi–xxxii.

¹² Letter to Faith Mackenzie, 20 January 1928, quoted in Squires 8.

third time. I have done half of it now. It is so “shocking”, the most improper novel in the world! . . . As a matter of fact, it is a very pure and tender novel’ (vi. 238).

On the same day he wrote to the Brewsters’ daughter Harwood that he had spent ‘yesterday and today doing a picture which I have just burnt’ (vi. 240). By 23 December the novel was still ‘half done’ (vi. 247), and he and Frieda were busy buying gifts for the neighbouring peasants, decorating the Christmas tree and visiting friends. But by 6 January 1928 Lawrence had completed, he told Brett, ‘all but the last chapter’ (vi. 255); two days later he had finished the novel (vi. 260).

But even before Lawrence had completed the book, its troubles began. On 20 December 1927 he had approached Nellie Morrison, a fellow writer in Florence whom he had first met in 1921, asking her to ‘consider typing’ his novel; he had warned her that it might seem ‘improper’, insisted on paying ‘regular rates’ and pleaded, ‘I should die if I had to do it myself now’ (vi. 245). She had agreed but, shocked, felt by 8 January she could not continue past the fifth chapter (vi. 259). So Lawrence asked the novelist Catherine Carswell, an early admirer and a loyal ally in London, to help. She agreed, engaging several friends to assist her, while Maria Huxley typed ‘the “worst” bits of the novel’ (vi. 273), the last seven chapters, in Les Diablerets, Switzerland. (The ‘Typing of the Novel’ below analyses the typescript and its many difficulties.)

In Les Diablerets, Lawrence – with Frieda – joined the Huxleys for a holiday in the Alps, where Lawrence in late January and February 1928 spent his mornings correcting both Maria Huxley’s typescript and, as batches arrived, the typescript from London. He also expurgated the two duplicate copies for publication by Secker and Knopf, leaving the unexpurgated typescript to serve as setting-copy for his private edition in Florence. ‘I am determined to do it’, he wrote to Orioli on 6 February about what he called ‘our Florence edition’: ‘I hope you are still willing to help me’ (vi. 289).

The three versions

By writing three complete and distinct drafts, Lawrence created for himself rich opportunities for reshaping scenes, adjusting narrative proportions, reconceiving characters and heightening central themes. A brief comparison of the versions shows their extraordinary reworking.¹³

To facilitate analysis, each version can be considered as having three

¹³ A fuller comparison appears in Squires 30–55. The chapter citations that follow refer only to the corrected numbering of version 3.

major sections, which might be subtitled 'negation', 'regeneration', 'resolution and escape' and which correspond to chapters I-IX, X-XVI, XVII-XIX in version 3. In all three versions, the introductory section, 'negation', takes Connie Chatterley to the point where she finds refuge in the gamekeeper's hut. The long middle section, 'regeneration', begins in all versions when the keeper, after giving her a key to his hut, becomes her lover. The final section, 'resolution and escape', varies more between versions, but begins when she leaves Wragby for a holiday in London and then in France.

Lawrence greatly expanded the introductory section with each writing, from 51 to 160 to 277 manuscript pages – more patiently drawing together Connie and the keeper; dramatising the oppressive milieu that imprisons her; and adding new characters, notably Michaelis and Tommy Dukes, to make Connie's relationship with Mellors seem more inevitable. Connie's father, for example, added to version 2, advises his ailing daughter to meet people, and Clifford to help her. Although Lawrence condenses this material in version 3, he provides his own response to her father's advice by introducing Michaelis, thereby offering Connie a false sensual connection as a contrast to her fulfilment later in the novel. At the same time, by showing Clifford and his Cambridge friends intellectualising sex and by exposing Michaelis's emotional selfishness, Lawrence uses the theme of sexual exploitation to control his additions.

Many early scenes – Connie escaping to the wood and meeting the keeper and his daughter; Connie taking a message to the keeper; Connie examining her body in the mirror; Lady Eva advising Connie – follow Lawrence's usual pattern: origination in version 1, expansion in version 2, then condensation *and* expansion to create version 3. But within this pattern Lawrence introduces a slant that alters the novel's tone and texture. In the scene where Connie escapes to the wood (chap. VI), for instance, Lawrence adds to version 3 a seventeen-paragraph segment in which Connie meditates on her entrapment; the newly cynical tone deepens Connie's plight but also implies the narrator's own forceful stance. In the scene where Connie takes a message to the keeper (chap. VII), Lawrence gradually draws more attention to the gamekeeper (named 'Parkin' in versions 1 and 2, 'Mellors' in version 3) and then sharpens the additions to version 3: 'Suddenly she hated [the mental life] with a rushing fury, the swindle!' (71:4). Connie matures with each version, so that her realisations in version 3, reflecting her greater despair, naturally focus more criticism on her world.

Just as Lawrence unifies the early scenes in order to explore negation

and its disintegrating effect on Connie's sensibility, so he makes a counterforce of tenderness and salvation inevitable. In version 3 he uses nature to hint at Connie's readiness for sensual regeneration when a young pine sways against her, 'rising up' (86:26). The phallic hunt is still only implicit when she stumbles into the keeper's secret clearing, itself a 'sanctuary' from Wragby Hall nearby (chap. VIII). Although the first section is complete, Lawrence chose to pause before dramatising Connie's regeneration, and so added, in versions 2 and 3, the narrator's exposé of misused power (chap. IX), creating a cultural nadir to parallel Connie's personal nadir when, after Michaelis, her 'whole sexual feeling ... collapsed' (54:37-8). The novel here reaches its point of greatest moral and spiritual depression.

The regenerative section, which opens just before Connie and the keeper first make love and closes with their last mating in the wood, is the novel's longest and most stable section, comprising only a third of version 1 but about half of the later versions. Whereas the introductory section was steadily expanded from version to version, the regenerative section developed less consistently. Some scenes were eliminated or condensed; others remained; still others were enlarged or were altogether new. As Lawrence rewrote version 1 he organised his material so as to advance the relationship between Connie and the keeper in stages. The early stage leads to Connie's first 'natural' orgasm; the middle stage defines her affair against Clifford's sterility, Tevershall's ugliness and Mrs Bolton's memories, then culminates at the keeper's hut in rapturous sexual fulfilment for Connie; and the final stage advances the lovers beyond daytime love – to a night of intercourse, and finally to a nighttime episode of anal intercourse that makes Connie 'a different woman' (246:38-9). When the lovers express their full sexual selves, Lawrence brings the regenerative sequence to completion.

In expanding and condensing the scenes of this section, Lawrence typically progresses from statement (version 1) to fuller development (version 2) to a slanted reshaping (version 3). The powerful scene in chapter XIII where Connie and Clifford (he in his motorised chair) go to the wood illustrates the process. It fuses the themes of nature, the machine, verbal manipulation and sensual awareness as it records the failure of the chair and the frustration of Connie and the keeper. Version 1 develops the scene mildly, Clifford educating Connie, their philosophical disagreements marked by civility. In version 2 Connie challenges Clifford with her questions; he responds with irritation; their mask of propriety slips; and whereas in version 1 Connie simply walks behind Clifford's broken

machine, in version 2 she helps the keeper push the heavy chair, touching his hand. Version 3, newly hostile in tone, reveals Clifford's vehemence, Connie's obstinacy and the narrator's antagonism. Lawrence intensifies the final version so as to alienate the reader from Clifford and to increase sympathy for Connie and Mellors.

The final section, 'resolution and escape', puts the earlier sections into perspective, drawing away from their intense immediacy. In all versions Lawrence divides the final section into two: Connie's departure from Wragby for a holiday, an episode which remains unchanged, and her return to England, which changes greatly. Once Connie has left Wragby she can reassess her commitment to the keeper, while their liaison, which becomes a Tevershall scandal, means that the lovers can no longer live on Clifford's estate. In detailing the scandal Lawrence gradually draws back from placing the keeper in a lower class, so that instead of physical violence, Lawrence adds to version 3 details that implicate Connie in the scandal and require her departure from Wragby. In the early versions Lawrence leads Connie only to the borders of a break with Clifford, but in the final version her strengthened commitment to the keeper justifies both her plea for a divorce and their eventual hope of living on a small farm. Once Lawrence imagines Mellors outside class boundaries, the novel's central struggle is no longer between Connie and the keeper but between their commitment to each other and the external forces that conflict with it. The class struggle in versions 1 and 2 yields to a divorce struggle in version 3.

The novel's final scenes are wholly transformed. The first version is episodic and uncertain; the second is truncated and anguished; the third integrates both the motifs of version 1 – such as the need for human contact – and the exchange of letters in version 2. In writing version 3, for example, Lawrence takes the scene in 1 where Connie tells Clifford about her pregnancy and vigorously reworks it so that, in version 3, she confronts Clifford with the news that she loves not Duncan Forbes, her alibi, but Mellors. By closing the final version with an eloquent letter from Mellors to Connie, Lawrence shapes both the opening and the closing of the novel into long, distancing perspectives. The closing letter, tentative yet hopeful, offers to resolve the novel's tensions.

Probably in proof, Lawrence continued to shape the narrative, making two major alterations. At the end of chapter XII Lawrence rewrote part of the description of Connie and Mellors's last lovemaking at the game-keeper's hut, so that Connie now becomes 'deeper and deeper disclosed' until she is reborn 'a woman' (174:13, 20). In chapter XV Lawrence

cancelled much of Mellors's visionary lecture to Connie about the workers' need to strive 'for summat else' (219:15), and eliminated such ideas as shared ownership of the mines and communal dancing and singing.

1928–30 Publication, distribution, early reception

Early in March 1928 Lawrence, roused by the challenge of getting *Lady Chatterley's Lover* into print, returned from Switzerland to Florence to begin the task of publishing the novel himself in a limited edition of 1,000 copies. Having revised and expurgated the two duplicate copies for Secker and Knopf, he had kept the revised but unexpurgated copy for his private Florence edition. On 9 March came the great moment: Lawrence and Orioli carried the unexpurgated typescript to an old-fashioned printer's shop, the Tipografia Giuntina, where the workmen, speaking only Italian, still set type by hand (vi. 314). The Giuntina also printed leaflets announcing the novel's title ('LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER /OR /JOHN THOMAS and LADY JANE'), its price (£2 for England, \$10 for America) and its proposed publication date (15 May 1928). For less than £1 they also printed 1,500 order-forms, which Lawrence on 13 March began sending to his friends, stressing the novel's 'phallic reality'.¹⁴ But when Secker, who had received the typescript sent to Pollinger for him on 5 March (vi. 308), announced that he could not publish even an expurgated edition,¹⁵ Lawrence angrily realised that his own Florence edition, certain to be considered indecent by the authorities, would have to go into the world without legal protection of its copyright; he would be vulnerable to pirates.

On 1 April, Orioli brought the first of the proofs to the Villa Mirenda, and by the next day Lawrence had corrected forty-one pages; he reported that they were thick with error. The printer set 'dind't, did'nt, dnid't, dind't, din'dt, didn't like a Bach fugue', Lawrence told Huxley (vi. 353), and fifteen years later Frieda remembered the 'thousands and thousands of mistakes' that plagued the text.¹⁶

¹⁴ See Squires 12 and *Letters*, vi. 334, 320.

¹⁵ On 14 March 1928 Secker wrote to Pollinger: 'I am returning the Lawrence typescript herewith which is of course quite unpublishable. I have written to Lawrence fully on the matter, so that he is acquainted with our decision, and I have no doubt that Knopf will share our views. The proposed semi-private mode of publication is the only practicable one' (Secker Letter-Book, U111).

¹⁶ Frieda Lawrence, draft introduction to *The First Lady Chatterley*, c. 20 October 1943, p. 7, UCLA.

On 16 April Lawrence wrote to Orioli that he had 'done the proofs [of the first half] once – now am going over them again' and had done 'rather more than half' by the 24th (vi. 369, 377). Then came a troublesome delay. The specially made paper which Lawrence had chosen failed to arrive, and since the printer had only enough type to set half of the book at once, he could not break up the type and set the second half until the first half was printed. Lawrence became irritated: 'I can't get on with my novel and send it out', he complained to his former patroness Lady Ottoline Morrell on 8 May (vi. 394). When the special paper at last arrived in mid-May, the Giuntina printed one thousand copies of the first half, then two hundred more copies on ordinary paper. The printer 'really won't be long', Lawrence reported to Koteliansky on 16 May (vi. 401). By the 24th Lawrence had received 'the last of the proofs' of the second half (vi. 407), correcting some proofs twice; the printer, though inaccurate, was quick. Having received revised proofs by 31 May, Lawrence finished by 4 June (vi. 415, 418). By the 7th he had signed and numbered the thousand sheets for the limited edition (vi. 420), then departed with Frieda and Earl and Achsah Brewster for Switzerland. On the 25th he wrote to Brett that 'The first 200 copies of *Lady C.* are to be ready to be sent off today –' (vi. 436). On the 28th his copy arrived, and Lawrence was delighted: 'I do really think it is a handsome and dignified volume – a fine shape and proportion', he wrote to Orioli (vi. 440).

Since 13 March, Lawrence and Orioli had been sending out announcements and order-forms to likely purchasers in Britain and the USA, collecting returned order-forms and cheques and sending receipts. Lawrence had also been coping with customers annoyed by the book's delay – the original announcement had promised 'Ready May 15th 1928'. By late May, however, he and Orioli had 'at least 450 orders from England ... but not many from America' (vi. 408). Now, in Switzerland at the end of June, Lawrence confronted the problems of distributing copies, collecting money from bookshops (which, unlike individuals, did not pay in advance) and gathering new orders, all without awakening potential censors. The completed order-forms had been returned to Lawrence c/o Orioli's bookshop in Florence, but Orioli kept them as records of the person and address to whom he should send the book; he sent Lawrence the cheques, money orders and promises to pay. From the start, Lawrence had managed the financial side of the business, paying the printer, paper-supplier and binder, and at intervals passing on to Orioli his promised 10%. Lawrence kept a Memorandum Book of his accounts, with lists of the names (and banks) of those who had paid and those who had

not, and the number of copies either ordered or paid for.¹⁷ The actual paying-in of cheques into Lawrence's Florentine bank account was usually done by Orioli; a stream of letters, names, cheques and paying-in slips ('bordereaux' Lawrence called them, e.g. vi. 420) flowed between them.

While Lawrence was at the Villa Mirinda during April and May, he had played an active part in the project; but having left in June, he had to work with Orioli entirely by correspondence: first from Switzerland, then from Baden-Baden and in the autumn from southern France. As copies came from the binder – about twenty a day – Orioli mailed them registered book post, first to the USA (from which many orders had been received in June) and then to Britain. Orioli sent, for example, two copies per parcel in early July to the London booksellers William Jackson (who had ordered seventy-two copies) and to the American library and literary agents Stevens & Brown, in London; individuals also began receiving their copies.

Before long, however, booksellers began to refuse their copies on the grounds that their orders had been 'provisional' or that 'it was a book which we could not handle in any way';¹⁸ and Lawrence was forced to ask London friends to help. Enid Hilton, the daughter of his old Eastwood friends Willie and Sallie Hopkin, collected the seventy-two copies from Jacksons and hid them in her guest room; Koteliensky (in spite of his dislike for the book) retrieved thirty-six copies from Stevens & Brown as well as six copies from Foyles. Koteliensky forwarded his copies to Richard Aldington who, living in the country, was less at risk of a police raid than Lawrence's London friends. Aldington also took over thirty-two copies from Enid Hilton; the others she managed to post or to deliver 'in the evening or at weekends',¹⁹ working like Aldington from lists of English purchasers. She also received help from Laurence Pollinger of Curtis Brown Ltd, Lawrence's London agent. 'You are a jewel distributing those books so well', Lawrence told her on 17 August 1928 (vi. 511).

Whereas the copies destined for England were getting through, with orders either filled directly or by Enid Hilton and Aldington, the USA Customs authorities were quick to confiscate many of those Orioli sent. To the Philadelphia area, for example, he had sent three copies on 7 July,

¹⁷ Located at NWU: see too Squires 221–3.

¹⁸ Letter from Alan Steele to Orioli, 29 July 1928; letter from B. F. Stevens & Brown Ltd to Orioli, 25 July 1928, UCLA (*Letters*, vi. 480 n.).

¹⁹ Letter from Enid Hilton to ed., 18 June 1979.

three on the 10th, seven on the 25th and eleven on the 28th.²⁰ Friends cabled, however, that he should wait before sending more. 'But some copies have got in', Lawrence wrote to Koteliensky on 30 August: 'we know of about 14. But Orioli sent 140 or so' (vi. 530). Mabel Luhan had, for example, got her copy by late July (vi. 498), and the New York bookseller Lawrence Gomme (who had advised Lawrence to mail the books in individual parcels) received at least some of the ten copies he had ordered. But many copies were stopped and confiscated.²¹ By the end of August Lawrence believed that it was 'useless to mail copies to America' (vi. 525). He briefly contemplated the idea of authorising an edition photographically reproduced in the USA; then dropped the idea on the advice of the New York branch of Curtis Brown. Still, copies sold fast in Europe, and occasional copies (mailed with different wrappers and title-pages, vi. 525, 561) got through to America; though that offered small comfort to those American purchasers who had paid in advance for their copies but never received them. 'I think we shall fairly easily sell out the whole edition', Lawrence wrote to his bibliographer Edward McDonald on 6 September (vi. 549). Only two months after its publication, the novel had earned Lawrence nearly £700 (\$3,500) after the payment of all expenses. With only two hundred copies of the edition of one thousand still unsold, Lawrence and Orioli (operating through the bookshop Davis & Orioli) more than doubled their price in mid-September to 4 guineas or \$21.

Responses to the novel were beginning to appear. Although Koteliensky thought it 'a pity I ever published such a book' (vi. 469), friends such as Arabella Yorke, Aldington, David Garnett and Alfred Stieglitz all sent letters of praise. On 1 September Herbert J. Seligmann published a laudatory review in the *New York Sun's* first edition, calling the book 'daring beyond all description', its achievement 'magnificent beyond praise'.²² The editors expunged the review from later editions. John Rayner reviewed the novel in the English magazine *T. P.'s Weekly*, for the week ending 29 September; he admired its prose, defended its realism and found it 'a fine novel' (p. 683). Lawrence wrote to Enid Hilton about the review: 'Imagine *T. P.'s* coming out so comparatively bravely!' (vi. 576). As summer ended, Lawrence – despite his failing health – went to the

²⁰ Letter from Orioli to Harold Mason, 17 August 1928, UT. Orioli added: 'The book in England has gone very well and all copies order[ed] have been delivered without any trouble.'

²¹ Lucy Wood Collier to Lawrence Gomme, 13 August 1928; Lawrence Gomme to Lucy Wood Collier, 20 August 1928 (UN, Acc. 846/7 and 846/23).

²² Squires 190.

island of Port-Cros on the French Riviera, to stay with friends. About 30 October a bundle of violent press clippings arrived from England, assailing *Lady Chatterley*. The *Sunday Chronicle* (14 Oct. 1928) called the novel 'one of the most filthy and abominable ever written' (p. 1). More outraged, *John Bull* (20 Oct. 1928) called it an 'evil outpouring': even the 'sewers of French pornography' could not match its 'beastliness' (p. 11); on 19 January 1929 the same journal, roused to a frenzy by the novel's 'indescribable depravity', would exhort the British customs to impound 'such trash' (p. 9). Lawrence responded with a symbolic burning of his attackers: as his friends, amused, read him each review, he piled more and more branches on the fire. 'Nobody likes being called a cesspool', he exclaimed.²³ Not long after, he experienced two days of heavy haemorrhaging.

A vicious press and ill health were not his only problems. He soon heard that pirated copies of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* had surfaced in Philadelphia and London. Fear that they might endanger the sale of the 200 copies on ordinary paper quickly gave way to anger that the pirated editions – which were very expensive – made the author not a penny: Lawrence felt 'done in the eye'.²⁴ 'We must sell the two hundred at a guinea, to undersell them', he wrote to Orioli on 5 December. 'If only, if only we had 2000 of the cheap edition . . . to cut out the pirates!' he lamented on 10 December. Needing a new strategy, he determined to issue an inexpensive edition of the novel in Paris – 'a good centre owing to absence of censor-nonsense and presence of large numbers of English and Americans', his friend Aldous Huxley had advised him. Huxley also made enquiries for him about the necessary photographic process.²⁵ But for some time Lawrence tried without success to find someone to handle the cheap edition – Sylvia Beach (whose bookshop had produced and now sold Joyce's *Ulysses*), the Pegasus Press, Nancy Cunard, the Librairie du Palais Royal. His frustration, and his anger with the pirates, were matched only by his rage at the news that copies of the second impression of 200 – as well as the manuscript of his poems *Pansies* – had not arrived in England. On 19 January 1929 Pollinger wrote that Scotland Yard officials had, the previous day, seized the six copies of the novel addressed to him from Italy.²⁶ Lawrence was furious and insulted: 'the brutes are putting their ridiculous foot down', he remarked to Enid Hilton on the 21st.

²³ *D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography*, ed. Edward Nehls (Madison, 1959), iii. 260.

²⁴ Letter to Dorothy Brett, 10 December 1928.

²⁵ Huxley to DHL and C. H. C. Prentice, 12 and 18 December 1928, *Letters of Aldous Huxley*, ed. Grover Smith (1969), pp. 304–6.

²⁶ Letter to DHL, UCLA.