

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-22869-5 - The Rainbow: Part I
D. H. Lawrence Edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

THE
CAMBRIDGE EDITION OF
THE LETTERS AND WORKS OF
D. H. LAWRENCE



Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-22869-5 - The Rainbow: Part I
D. H. Lawrence Edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

THE WORKS OF D. H. LAWRENCE

GENERAL EDITORS

James T. Boulton

† Warren Roberts

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-22869-5 - The Rainbow: Part I
D. H. Lawrence Edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

THE RAINBOW

Part I

D. H. LAWRENCE

EDITED BY
MARK KINKEAD-WEEKES



Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-22869-5 - The Rainbow: Part I
D. H. Lawrence Edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521228695

This, the Cambridge Edition of the text of *The Rainbow* now correctly established from the original sources and first published in 1989, © the Estate of Frieda Lawrence Ravagli 1989. Introduction and notes © Cambridge University Press 1989. 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 1915, 1916, 1924, 1926, 1927, 1930, 1934) 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 1989
First paperback edition 1989

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

ISBN 978-0-521-22869-5 Hardback
ISBN 978-0-521-29689-2 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

CONTENTS

General editors' preface	<i>page</i> vii
Acknowledgements	ix
Chronology	x
Cue-titles	xv
Introduction	xvii
The Composition of <i>The Rainbow</i> : New beginnings	xix
‘The Sisters’ (first version, March–June 1913)	xx
‘The Sisters II’ (second version, August 1913–January 1914)	xxiii
‘The Wedding Ring’ (third version, February–May 1914)	xxv
<i>The Prussian Officer</i> and ‘Study of Thomas Hardy’ (June–November 1914)	xxix
<i>The Rainbow</i> (fourth version, November 1914–March 1915)	xxxvi
The revisions of <i>The Rainbow</i> (March–August 1915)	xxxviii
The prosecution and suppression of <i>The Rainbow</i>	xlv
Text	li
The manuscript and the typescript	li
The proofs and the first edition	lv
The first American edition	lvii
Subsequent editions	lxi
The Cambridge edition	lxii
Reception	lxix
<i>THE RAINBOW</i>	i
Appendixes	
I Fragment of ‘The Sisters’	461
II Fragment of ‘The Sisters II’	471
III Report and letter on ‘The Wedding Ring’	481
IV Chronology of <i>The Rainbow</i>	489
Explanatory notes	495
Textual apparatus	537
A note on pounds, shillings and pence	671

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-22869-5 - The Rainbow: Part I

D. H. Lawrence Edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

D. H. Lawrence is one of the great writers of the twentieth century – yet the texts of his writings, whether published during his lifetime or since, are, for the most part, textually corrupt. The extent of the corruption is remarkable; it can derive from every stage of composition and publication. We know from study of his MSS that Lawrence was a careful writer, though not rigidly consistent in matters of minor convention. We know also that he revised at every possible stage. Yet he rarely if ever compared one stage with the previous one, and overlooked the errors of typists or copyists. He was forced to accept, as most authors are, the often stringent house-styling of his printers, which overrode his punctuation and even his sentence-structure and paragraphing. He sometimes overlooked plausible printing errors. More important, as a professional author living by his pen, he had to accept, with more or less good will, stringent editing by a publisher's reader in his early days, and at all times the results of his publishers' timidity. So the fear of Grundyish disapproval, or actual legal action, led to bowdlerisation or censorship from the very beginning of his career. Threats of libel suits produced other changes. Sometimes a publisher made more changes than he admitted to Lawrence. On a number of occasions in dealing with American and British publishers Lawrence produced texts for both which were not identical. Then there were extraordinary lapses like the occasion when a compositor turned over two pages of MS at once, and the result happened to make sense. This whole story can be reconstructed from the introductions to the volumes in this edition; cumulatively they will form a history of Lawrence's writing career.

The Cambridge edition aims to provide texts which are as close as can now be determined to those he would have wished to see printed. They have been established by a rigorous collation of extant manuscripts and typescripts, proofs and early printed versions; they restore the words, sentences, even whole pages omitted or falsified by editors or compositors; they are freed from printing-house conventions which were imposed on Lawrence's style; and interference on the part of frightened publishers has been eliminated. Far from doing violence to the texts Lawrence would

have wished to see published, editorial intervention is essential to recover them. Though we have to accept that some cannot now be recovered in their entirety because early states have not survived, we must be glad that so much evidence remains. Paradoxical as it may seem, the outcome of this recension will be texts which differ, often radically and certainly frequently, from those seen by the author himself.

Editors have adopted the principle that the most authoritative form of the text is to be followed, even if this leads sometimes to a 'spoken' or a 'manuscript' rather than a 'printed' style. We have not wanted to strip off one house-styling in order to impose another. Editorial discretion has been allowed in order to regularise Lawrence's sometimes wayward spelling and punctuation in accordance with his most frequent practice in a particular text. A detailed record of these and other decisions on textual matters, together with the evidence on which they are based, will be found in the textual apparatus or an occasional explanatory note. These give significant deleted readings in manuscripts, typescripts and proofs; and printed variants in forms of the text published in Lawrence's lifetime. We do not record posthumous corruptions, except where first publication was posthumous.

In each volume, the editor's introduction relates the contents to Lawrence's life and to his other writings; it gives the history of composition of the text in some detail, for its intrinsic interest, and because this history is essential to the statement of editorial principles followed. It provides an account of publication and reception which will be found to contain a good deal of hitherto unknown information. Where appropriate, appendixes make available extended draft manuscript readings of significance, or important material, sometimes unpublished, associated with a particular work.

Though Lawrence is a twentieth-century writer and in many respects remains our contemporary, the idiom of his day is not invariably intelligible now, especially to the many readers who are not native speakers of British English. His use of dialect is another difficulty, and further barriers to full understanding are created by now obscure literary, historical, political or other references and allusions. On these occasions explanatory notes are supplied by the editor; it is assumed that the reader has access to a good general dictionary and that the editor need not gloss words or expressions that may be found in it. Where Lawrence's letters are quoted in editorial matter, the reader should assume that his manuscript is alone the source of eccentricities of phrase or spelling. An edition of the letters is still in course of publication: for this reason only the date and recipient of a letter will be given if it has not so far been printed in the Cambridge edition.

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-22869-5 - The Rainbow: Part I
D. H. Lawrence Edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to Michael Black, James Boulton, Lindeth Vasey and John Worthen for scrutinising text and notes, and for so many helpful suggestions that mere gratitude seems hardly enough. For valuable help in particular matters my thanks go also to Warren Roberts, Carl and Helen Baron, Keith Cushman, Ron Draper, Paul Eggert, David Farmer, Mara Kalnins, John Littlewood, Charles Ross, Claire Tomalin and my Kent colleagues David Ellis, Ian Gregor and Howard Mills. For aid with local history I must thank Michael Brook and Alec Cameron of the Nottingham University Library, Stephen Best of the Nottingham County Library and Michael Jopling of the Ilkeston Library, together with their staff; and for questions of economic history I turned to Theo Barker and Gordon Mingay. Ann Morton guided me to the Home Office files in the Public Record Office; and Janice Price of Methuen kindly hunted for misplaced records. To Nora Haselden, youngest sister of Louie Burrows, and Mary Saleeby Fisher and Elizabeth Hawkins of Greatham, my warm thanks for their kindness and for sharing their memories. I am grateful to the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center of the University of Texas for access to the manuscript and typescript of *The Rainbow*, and the fragments of earlier versions; and I would like to express personal thanks, also, to Mary Hirst, Ellen Dunlap, Lois Garcia, Cathy Henderson and Ken Craven. Marilyn Celeste Atkins did some Hinmann collation for me on the Center's first editions. I am grateful to the Library of Congress for access to the Huebsch papers and Kuttner's report on 'The Wedding Ring'; to the New York Public Library for letters of Doran, Methuen and Pinker in the Berg Collection; and to Sylvia Secker and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign for the Secker Letter-Books. I owe particular thanks to Stephen Holland, Special Collections librarian of the University of Kent at Canterbury, for trusting me with a first edition on extended loan.

My work was greatly helped by a grant from the British Academy.

My wife Joan gives thanks, that we have got somewhere (somehow) over *The Rainbow* – and I give mine to her, for bearing with me, and it, throughout.

November 1987

M.K.-W.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-22869-5 - The Rainbow: Part I
 D. H. Lawrence Edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CHRONOLOGY

11 September 1885	Born in Eastwood, Nottinghamshire
September 1898–July 1901	Pupil at Nottingham High School
1902–1908	Pupil teacher; student at University College, Nottingham
7 December 1907	First publication: ‘A Prelude’, in <i>Nottinghamshire Guardian</i>
October 1908	Appointed as teacher at Davidson Road School, Croydon
November 1909	Publishes five poems in <i>English Review</i>
3 December 1910	Engagement to Louie Burrows; broken off on 4 February 1912
9 December 1910	Death of his mother, Lydia Lawrence
19 January 1911	<i>The White Peacock</i> published in New York (20 January in London)
19 November 1911	Ill with pneumonia; resigns his teaching post on 28 February 1912
March 1912	Meets Frieda Weekley; they elope to Germany on 3 May
23 May 1912	<i>The Trespasser</i>
September 1912–30 March 1913	At Gargnano, Lago di Garda, Italy
February 1913	<i>Love Poems and Others</i>
mid-March 1913	Begins ‘The Sisters’
22 March 1913	‘The Sisters’ – 46 pages
30 March–11 April 1913	At San Gaudenzio
5 April 1913	‘The Sisters’ – 110 pages
19 April–17 June 1913	At Irschenhausen, Germany
23 April 1913	‘The Sisters’ – 145 pages
c. 2 May 1913	‘The Sisters’ – 180 pages
17 May 1913	‘The Sisters’ – 256 pages
29 May 1913	<i>Sons and Lovers</i>
1 June 1913	‘The Sisters’ – 283 pages: ‘nearly finished’
June–August 1913	In England
9 August 1913–17 September 1913	At Irschenhausen
24 August 1913	‘The Sisters II’ – ‘two false starts already’
4 September 1913	‘The Sisters II’ – ‘has quite a new beginning’

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-22869-5 - The Rainbow: Part I
 D. H. Lawrence Edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Chronology

xi

15 September 1913	'The Sisters II' – 100 pages
18 September–4 October 1913	Travels from Germany through Switzerland to Lerici, Gulf of Spezia
November 1913	Begins to work on 'The Sisters II' again
4 October 1913–8 June 1914	At Fiascherino, Italy
2 December 1913	'The Sisters II' – 'writing . . . slowly'
6 January 1914	'The Sisters II' – first half sent to Edward Garnett
19 January 1914	'The Sisters II' – 340 pages
30 January 1914	'The Sisters II' – 150 pages of second half to Garnett
by 7 February 1914	'The Wedding Ring' – 'begun it again'
7 March 1914	'The Wedding Ring' – 'going strong'
3 April 1914	'The Wedding Ring' – 'done two-thirds'
22 April 1914	'The Wedding Ring' – '80 pages more to write'
by 16 May 1914	Finishes 'The Wedding Ring'
8–24 June 1914	Walking tour to Germany
24 June–15 August 1914	In England and, mainly, in London
27 June 1914	Duckworth agree to publish short-story volume in place of the novel
c. 29 June 1914	Signs contract with Methuen for the novel
Late June–mid-July 1914	Revising stories extensively
c. 7 July 1914	Invited to write book on Thomas Hardy
13 July 1914	Marries Frieda Weekley in London
31 July–8 August 1914	Walking tour in Westmorland
4 August 1914	Great Britain declares war on Germany
c. 8 August 1914	Methuen return 'The Wedding Ring'
15 [?] August 1914–2 January 1915	At Chesham, Buckinghamshire
c. 5 September 1914	Begins 'Study of Thomas Hardy'
c. 3–20 October 1914	Revises page proofs of short-story volume intensively
18 November 1914	'Just finishing' with 'Hardy'
26 November 1914	<i>The Prussian Officer</i>
Late November 1914	Begins rewriting 'The Wedding Ring' which will create <i>The Rainbow</i> and leave material for <i>Women in Love</i>
5 December 1914	Sends last of 'Hardy' to be typed
18 December 1914	<i>The Rainbow</i> – 100 pages
5 January 1915	<i>The Rainbow</i> – 200 pages
	<i>The Rainbow</i> – 300 pages

7 January 1915	Divides the novel into two volumes: <i>Women in Love</i> material laid aside until 1916
21 January–30 July 1915	At Greatham, Pulborough, Sussex
1 February 1915	<i>The Rainbow</i> – 450 pages
24 February 1915	<i>The Rainbow</i> ‘very, very near the end’
2 March 1915	Finishes <i>The Rainbow</i> , which Viola Meynell and friend will type
mid-March–May 1915	Revises <i>The Rainbow</i> extensively as batches of typescript arrive
6 March 1915	Visits Bertrand Russell in Cambridge: ‘hated it beyond expression’ . . . ‘one of the crises of my life’
29 May 1915	<i>The Rainbow</i> typing to be finished ‘this very day’
31 May 1915	Sends last of revised typescript of <i>The Rainbow</i> to J. B. Pinker
9 July–mid-August 1915	Revising proofs of <i>The Rainbow</i>
30 July–21 December 1915	To Littlehampton, then in London
29 July–19 October 1915	Revising Italian sketches for <i>Twilight in Italy</i>
5 September 1915	Plan for <i>The Signature</i> announced
20 September–10 October 1915	‘6 papers’ completed (‘The Crown’)
30 September 1915	<i>The Rainbow</i>
3 and 5 November 1915	Police call at Methuen and take copies of <i>The Rainbow</i>
1 November 1915	Third and last of projected six issues of <i>The Signature</i>
13 November 1915	<i>The Rainbow</i> suppressed by Court order
30 November 1915	B. W. Huebsch registers copyright of American first edition of <i>The Rainbow</i> but does not ‘publish’
c. 17 December 1915	Receives a copy of American edition and discovers it is expurgated
30 December 1915–15 October 1917	At St Merryn and Zennor, Cornwall
18 April–c. 27 June 1916	‘The Sisters III’
June 1916	<i>Twilight in Italy</i>
July 1916	<i>Amores</i>
July–November 1916	‘The Sisters III’ rewritten as <i>Women in Love</i>
December 1916–January 1917	<i>Women in Love</i> rejected by Methuen, Secker, Duckworth and Constable
15 October 1917	After twenty-one months’ residence in Cornwall, ordered to leave by military authorities

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-22869-5 - The Rainbow: Part I
 D. H. Lawrence Edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Chronology

xiii

October 1917–November 1919	In London, Berkshire and Derbyshire
26 November 1917	<i>Look! We Have Come Through!</i>
October 1918	<i>New Poems</i>
November 1919–February 1922	To Italy, then Capri and Sicily
20 November 1919	<i>Bay</i>
1920	Huebsch publishes further ‘limited’ edition of <i>The Rainbow</i>
9 November 1920	Private publication of <i>Women in Love</i> (New York)
25 November 1920	<i>The Lost Girl</i>
10 May 1921	<i>Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious</i> (New York)
12 December 1921	<i>Sea and Sardinia</i> (New York)
March–August 1922	In Ceylon and Australia
14 April 1922	<i>Aaron’s Rod</i> (New York)
September 1922–March 1923	In New Mexico
23 October 1922	<i>Fantasia of the Unconscious</i> (New York)
24 October 1922	<i>England, My England</i> (New York)
March 1923	<i>The Ladybird, The Fox, The Captain’s Doll</i>
March–November 1923	In Mexico and USA
27 August 1923	<i>Studies in Classic American Literature</i> (New York)
September 1923	<i>Kangaroo</i>
9 October 1923	<i>Birds, Beasts and Flowers</i> (New York)
December 1923–March 1924	In England, France and Germany
March 1924–September 1925	In New Mexico and Mexico
August 1924	<i>The Boy in the Bush</i> (with Mollie Skinner)
10 September 1924	Death of his father, John Arthur Lawrence
November 1924	Thomas Seltzer publishes <i>The Rainbow</i> with Huebsch text
14 May 1925	<i>St. Mawr together with The Princess</i>
September 1925–June 1928	In England and, mainly, in Italy
7 December 1925	<i>Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine</i> (Philadelphia)
21 January 1926	<i>The Plumed Serpent</i>
February 1926	Secker republishes <i>The Rainbow</i> in England (sheets purchased from Seltzer)
June 1927	<i>Mornings in Mexico</i>
24 May 1928	<i>The Woman Who Rode Away and Other Stories</i>
June 1928–March 1930	In Switzerland and, principally, in France

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-22869-5 - The Rainbow: Part I
 D. H. Lawrence Edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

xiv

Chronology

July 1928

Lady Chatterley's Lover privately published (Florence)

September 1928

Collected Poems

July 1929

Exhibition of paintings in London raided by police; *Pansies* (manuscript earlier seized in the mail)

September 1929

The Escaped Cock (Paris)

2 March 1930

Dies at Vence, Alpes Maritimes, France

post 6 March 1930

Home Office considers whether to prosecute Secker's new printing of *The Rainbow* but decides against doing so

CUE-TITLES

A. Manuscript locations

LC	Library of Congress
NYPL	New York Public Library
UIII	University of Illinois
UInd	University of Indiana
UN	University of Nottingham
UT	University of Texas

B. Printed works

(The place of publication, here and throughout, is London unless otherwise stated.)

Carter, <i>TLS</i>	John Carter, 'The Rainbow Prosecution', <i>The Times Literary Supplement</i> (27 February 1969), 216.
Draper	R. P. Draper, ed. <i>D. H. Lawrence: The Critical Heritage</i> . Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.
'Hardy'	D. H. Lawrence. <i>Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays</i> , ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
<i>Letters</i> , i.	James T. Boulton, ed. <i>The Letters of D. H. Lawrence</i> . Volume I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
<i>Letters</i> , ii.	George J. Zytaruk and James T. Boulton, eds. <i>The Letters of D. H. Lawrence</i> . Volume II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
<i>Letters</i> , iii.	James T. Boulton and Andrew Robertson, eds. <i>The Letters of D. H. Lawrence</i> . Volume III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
<i>Letters</i> , iv.	Warren Roberts, James T. Boulton and Elizabeth Mansfield, eds. <i>The Letters of D. H. Lawrence</i> . Volume IV. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

xvi

Cue-titles

OED

Sir James A. H. Murray and others, eds. *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*. 10 volumes. Oxford University Press, 1884–1928.

Roberts

Warren Roberts. *A Bibliography of D. H. Lawrence*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-22869-5 - The Rainbow: Part I
D. H. Lawrence Edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-22869-5 - The Rainbow: Part I

D. H. Lawrence Edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-22869-5 - The Rainbow: Part I
 D. H. Lawrence Edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

The Composition of *The Rainbow*: New beginnings

Both *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* were to grow out of a flippant little ‘pot-boiler’¹ which Lawrence began in mid-March 1913, at Gargnano on Lake Garda in Italy, as a distraction from a more serious work which was getting out of hand.

After posting the manuscript of *Sons and Lovers* the previous November to Edward Garnett, his literary mentor and reader for Duckworth, he conceived and discarded several ideas for a new novel: ‘Scargill Street’,² suggesting a setting in Eastwood that might be connected with the novel ‘purely of the common people’ he had thought of in August (i. 431); the ‘Burns’ novel whose opening fragment is set in the familiar wooded landscape near The Hags;³ and, in late December, a novel with a plot, ‘further off from me’ (i. 496–7), of which the first-person fragment by ‘Elsa Culverwell’ is probably a survival.⁴ In ‘Elsa’, at least, were a promising new heroine and situation; a way of fulfilling his promise to ‘do a novel about Love Triumphant. . . my work for women, better than the suffrage’ (i. 490), and also of finding that combination of nearness to his concerns and distance from himself, after his prolonged struggle with *Sons and Lovers*, which the earlier notions had suggested but not sustained. By 17 January 1913, having probably dropped the idea of first-person narration as well as changing the names, he had written eighty pages of what was now called ‘The Insurrection of Miss Houghton’, ‘a most curious work, which gives me great joy to write’ (i. 505). The Cullen family of Eastwood had been the models for the household in which Muriel/Miriam

¹ *Letters*, i. 536. (Subsequent references to *Letters* will be given in brackets in the text.)

² See *Letters*, i. 466. In ‘Nottingham and the Mining Countryside’, written September 1929, DHL locates Scargill Street as ‘the steep street between the squares’ in Eastwood, built as housing for miners, just below ‘the little corner shop’ in Victoria Street where he was born (*Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence*, ed. Edward D. McDonald, New York, 1936, p. 134). In *Sons and Lovers*, however, he had used the name for a fictive recreation of Walker Street, where the Lawrences lived 1891–1903.

³ See *Letters*, i. 487, 489. The surviving fragments (Roberts E59.3) are printed in *Love Among the Haystacks and Other Stories*, ed. John Worthen (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 201–11.

⁴ See *The Lost Girl*, ed. John Worthen (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 343–58, and xx–xxii.

had originally been placed in 'Paul Morel', the early version of *Sons and Lovers*.⁵ He now turned to them again for 'Elsa Culverwell' and for the new work, (and eventually for the Houghtons of *The Lost Girl*, though that did not simply complete 'The Insurrection', but was newly conceived and rewritten at Taormina in 1920).⁶ 'The Insurrection' began in almost 'venomous' pleasure (i. 501) which sounds like satire against Eastwood, in keeping with Lawrence's feelings about England from the vantage-point of his new life in Italy.⁷ It was over a hundred pages by 1 February (i. 511), but was already becoming 'a bit outspoken' by 18 February (i. 517); and though more than half-finished by 11 March (i. 526), was then regretfully laid aside after two hundred pages (i. 546). As Lawrence told Edward Garnett it was 'most cumbersome and floundering' but also 'great – so new, so really a stratum deeper than I think anybody has ever gone, in a novel. . . all analytical – quite unlike *Sons and Lovers*, not a bit visualised' (i. 526). Even after he had set it aside it still lay 'next my heart' (i. 546). But it was 'too improper' (i. 536). Anna Houghton's rebellion (Lawrence's answer to the 'acceptance' of Bennett's heroine of the Five Towns)⁸ had clearly deepened through the social to the sexual, and the response to be feared was not merely the 'extreme annoyance' he had cheerfully predicted at the start (i. 505). This was no time to go on with unpublishable work, or what was he 'going to live on, and keep Frieda on withal' (i. 526)?

So he began instead, between 11 and 22 March, a determinedly 'lighter' piece which would be 'quite decent' (i. 530), indeed 'absolutely impeccable' (i. 526).

'The Sisters' (first version, March–June 1913)

'The Sisters' began as 'flippant' (ii. 68), because 'it was meant to be for the "jeunes filles"' (i. 546), and 'jeering' (ii. 165), because both sisters hit at Frieda, 'me, these beastly, superior arrogant females! Lawrence *hated* me just over the children. . . so he wrote this!' (i. 549). But though it did Lawrence 'good to theorise [himself] out, and to depict Frieda's God Almighty in all its glory', releasing rebellious feelings about her

⁵ Roberts E373d, in *Sons and Lovers: A Facsimile of the Manuscript*, ed. Mark Schorer (Berkeley and London, 1977).

⁶ *The Lost Girl*, ed. Worthen, pp. xxvii–xxviii.

⁷ See *Letters*, i. 459–60, 504, 515; and *Twilight in Italy* (1916), which grew out of the experiences recorded in the letters of early 1913.

⁸ 'I hate England and its hopelessness. I hate Bennett's resignation. Tragedy ought really to be a great kick at misery. But *Anna of the Five Towns* seems like an acceptance. . . I want to wash again quick, wash off England, the oldness and grubbiness and despair' (*Letters*, i. 459).

Introduction

xxi

combination of the Prussian aristocrat and Pallas Athene in plaits, this was only 'the first crude fermenting of the book', as he wrote when it was well advanced; 'I'll make it into art now' (i. 550). But the 'theorising' may also have had something of the 'great religion', the 'belief in the blood. . .the mystery of the flame forever flowing. . .and being *itself*', about which he had written to Ernest Collings (artist and illustrator) while at work on 'The Insurrection' (i. 503); and also something of the new religious sense of selfhood, born out of sexual relationship, that informs the 'Foreword' to *Sons and Lovers*, which he had also written in January.⁹ The 'impeccable' novelette (i. 526) had soon not only 'fallen from grace' (i. 546), but had begun to recover some of the seriousness of the abandoned work, without its satire. At quite an early stage, by page 110 on 5 April, the pot-boiler had become 'earnest and painful' (i. 536), changing and deepening as he wrote, and as the fiction came closer to his deepest preoccupations. He took it with him to Germany in April, and letters from Irschenhausen show both the effect and the cause of a new dimension of exploration. 'I am doing a novel which I have never grasped. Damn its eyes, there I am at page 145, and I've no notion what it's about. I hate it. F[rieda] says it is good. But it's like a novel in a foreign language I don't know very well -' (i. 544). It had grown out of flippancy and jeering because 'I can only write what I feel pretty strongly about; and that, at present, is the relations between men and women' (i. 546). By now, early in May, he was at page 180; by 17 May at page 256 'but still can't see the end very clear' (i. 550); and by Sunday 1 June it was 'nearly finished' at page 283 (ii. 20). The following week (ii. 20) he posted the second half to Edward Garnett (who had apparently not cared much for the first half¹⁰), and set off for a visit to England on 19 June.

The novel had been planned at three hundred pages (i. 546), and what was probably its ending has survived as a fragment numbered 291-6, printed as Appendix I.¹¹ It is an early version of what would eventually

⁹ The 'Foreword' - actually, of course, an afterword, and not meant for publication (see *Letters*, i. 510) - is reprinted in *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*, ed. Aldous Huxley (1932), pp. 95-102.

¹⁰ 'I was glad of your letter about the Sisters. Don't schimpf, I shall make it all right when I re-write it. I shall put it in the third person. All along I knew what ailed the book. . .I'll make it into art now' (*Letters*, i. 550).

¹¹ Roberts E.441a, in the possession of UT. The pagination is right, and the paper is very like that used in other writings of the Gargnano period, especially the 'Foreword' to *Sons and Lovers* of January 1913. If the paper is continental, the fragment cannot belong to the *Women in Love* material of 1916, which is unlikely in any case, on stylistic grounds. Nor could it (in that case) relate to the equally unlikely possibility that an early version of *The Rainbow* existed in Spring 1912, when George Neville claims to have discussed 'the

develop into *Women in Love*, beginning with a portrait of Gerald's mother. Then Gudrun, pregnant with Gerald's child, confronts both Gerald and Loerke in England. Gerald now wants to marry her, but though she suspects that this may be only because of the baby, she takes him back. The theme, in the Gerald/Gudrun story, seems to have been the conventional Englishman's inability to submit himself to love, but at the end Gerald has become 'something he had feared he never could be: he had got something he had pretended to disbelieve in'. Only, he is forced to measure and accept the damage that his inability to love has caused. The sister story, of the other 'superior flounder', was, however, to become the more immediately compelling, though Frieda saw herself in both (i. 549). Presumably the mockery was directed through Ella's lover; the letters twice suggest first-person narration (i. 550, ii. 20), though the surviving fragment is told in the third. The difficulty is more apparent than real however, since much of the story of Gerald and Gudrun would have to be third-person narrative in any case, as in *The White Peacock*, where it is easy enough to find sections which would give no hint of first-person narration if they survived as fragments, such as the scene between George and Lettie in chapter vii.¹² It is also possible, if unlikely, that the fragment comes from a revised version. Lawrence was 'rather keen to re-write it in the third person' (ii. 20); but it is not easy to see where he could have found the time, since he was soon very busy creating new stories and revising old ones. Ella must have been a positive character, not to say opinionated, since Frieda refers to one of her own sweeping generalisations as 'Ellaing' (i. 550). But the portrait seems to have become more and more significant to Lawrence, and the problem of understanding how Ella came to be as she was, through some past hurt, would constitute the growing-point towards *The Rainbow*.

bedroom scene' with DHL before his elopement with Frieda, see *D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography*, ed. Edward Nehls (Madison, 1957), i. 154, and G. H. Neville's *A Memoir of D. H. Lawrence*, ed. Carl Baron (Cambridge, 1981), p. 44-5 and Appendix A, pp. 167-71. Little reliance should be placed on DHL's statement in April 1915 that *The Rainbow* was 'nearly three years of hard work' – see footnote 30 below. It remains possible that the lost portion of 'Paul Morel' may have contained some scene that DHL removed, but later worked into *The Rainbow*, as he removed the Cullen family and used them again; yet it seems more likely that the scene which Neville thought would cause trouble – as indeed it did – was the bedroom scene in *Sons and Lovers*, and that his memory deceived him about its location, and what book DHL was finally 'bringing into shape' in March 1912.

¹² Ed. Andrew Robertson (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 208-16.

'The Sisters II' (second version, August 1913–January 1914)

Having written three stories in Germany¹³ which have a new kind of inwardness, Lawrence busied himself in England assembling and revising a number of stories, sketches and poems, and having them typed for submission to periodicals. On 13 August, a week after his return to Germany, he was promising Garnett 'As soon as possible I begin *The Sisters*' (ii. 58); but by 24 August he was calling it 'the devil – I've made two false starts already' (ii. 66). At the end of the month, complaining that he was writing things 'about which I know nothing – like a somnambulist', he had clearly made yet another new start. 'I've begun a novel on the same principle: it's like working in a dream, rather uncomfortable – as if you can't get solid hold of yourself. "Hello my lad, are you there!" I say to myself, when I see the sentences stalking by.'¹⁴ But by 4 September confidence had returned: 'The Sisters has quite a new beginning – a new basis altogether. . . It is much more interesting in its new form – not so damned flippant' (ii. 67–8). Eleven days later, before he left on a walking tour to Switzerland and Italy, he had done a hundred pages and hoped to finish in a month (ii. 74–5). But though he took up 'The Sisters' again in the new home in Fiascherino – 'It is *so* different, so different from anything I have yet written' (ii. 82) – the move had clearly broken the flow, and October went by with little progress (ii. 99). At the beginning of November he began to work on the novel again (ii. 99); a month later he was 'writing. . . slowly' (ii. 118); and on 21 December he promised to send Garnett the first half in a few days (ii. 127) – presumably the two hundred pages he had suggested earlier (ii. 82) – but on 30 December he was still promising (ii. 132). Whereas the first 'Sisters' seemed 'to have come by itself' (i. 546), the second had proved much more recalcitrant. The difficulty went deeper however than the unsettling effect of the move back to Italy and a disinclination to work, for the new novel was demanding a new kind of art. 'It is *very* different from *Sons and Lovers*: written in another language almost. . . I shan't write in the same manner as *Sons and Lovers* again, I think: in that hard, violent style full of sensation and presentation' (ii. 132). He had already thought of a new title, 'The Wedding Ring'; and told Garnett, when he did send the first half on 6 January 1914, how not only the name but 'the whole scheme of the book is

¹³ See *Letters*, ii. 26 and n. 8. The stories were 'Honour and Arms' (later 'The Prussian Officer'), 'Vin Ordinaire' (later 'The Thorn in the Flesh') and 'New Eve and Old Adam'; see *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories*, ed. John Worthen (Cambridge, 1983), p. xxv and n. 33.

¹⁴ Letter to John Middleton Murry, 30 August 1913.

changed – widened and deepened’ (ii. 134). Having reached page 340 he explained:

The Laocoon writhing and shrieking have gone from my new work, and I think there is a bit of stillness, like the wide, still, unseeing eyes of a Venus of Melos. . . There is something in the Greek sculpture that my soul is hungry for – something of the eternal stillness that lies under all movement, under all life, like a source, incorruptible and inexhaustible. It is deeper than change, and struggling. So long I have acknowledged only the struggle, the stream, the change. And now I begin to feel something of the source, the great impersonal which never changes and out of which all change comes. (ii. 137–8)

On 29 January he meant to send a second batch of a hundred and fifty pages the next day (ii. 142), but Garnett’s criticisms of the first half seem to have brought his own dissatisfaction to a head, and by 7 February he had laid the work aside, unfinished, and had begun all over again (ii. 144).

This second version of ‘The Sisters’ appears to have been the original of *The Rainbow*. Again, only a fragment has survived, numbered 373–80,¹⁵ and probably therefore the point at which Lawrence abandoned the work near its end – though it is early in the relationship of Ella and Birkin (if we think in terms of *Women in Love*). The second ‘Sisters’ was not, then, a rewriting of the first, but rather an attempt to get back behind it, into the past of Ella, the prototype of Ursula, in order to discover how she came to be as she was through some deep bruise to her inner being, in an earlier love-affair with Ben Templeman – mentioned at the close of the fragment, which is printed as Appendix II. The ‘new basis’ can also be detected in the style. The writing, at crucial points (such as Ella’s collapse into grief, 475:3 iff.) has developed a new rhythmic quality, a new mode of cumulative interior exploration of the psyche, very different from the overtly dramatic and symbolic modes of *Sons and Lovers* which Frieda had criticised as lacking any ‘Hinterland der Seele’ (‘inner reaches of the soul’, ii. 151). Garnett’s criticisms, however, were that the character of Ella had become ‘incoherent’; that the previous affair with Templeman was ‘wrong’; and that what Lawrence called his new ‘exhaustive method’ meant that ‘the artistic side’ was ‘in the background’, and that the scenes were not ‘incorporated’ enough. Lawrence agreed with the first point, explaining that ‘it came of trying to graft on to the character of Louie [Burrows] the character, more or less, of Frieda’. For the young Ella he had used the rather different personality of the young woman to whom he had been

¹⁵ Roberts E441a, in the possession of UT. The paper is watermarked A.BINDA & C=MILANO, and the identification as ‘Sisters II’ is rendered certain by the girls’ encounter with ‘Ben Templeman’ at the end.

Introduction

xxv

engaged, and whose father and family were to serve as models for the middle generation of Brangwens¹⁶ – but, clearly, the joins were showing. He also agreed with Garnett's second point, while insisting that Ella could not be what she became 'unless she had some experience of love and of men. . . Then she must have a love episode, a significant one. But it must not be a Templeman episode.' He refused however to accept the criticism of the new imaginative mode. 'I have no longer the joy in creating vivid scenes, that I had in *Sons and Lovers*. I don't care much more about accumulating objects in the powerful light of emotion, and making a scene of them.' He felt that his new style, even if its 'flowers' were 'frail or shadowy', was true to himself in a period of transition: 'I prefer the permeating beauty. . . It is not so easy for one to be married. In marriage one must become something else. And I am changing, one way or the other' (ii. 142–3). The new style had to feel, like the new man, for the hidden forces behind the surface drama, in a novel whose end was to be Ella and Birkin finding their true selves, 'the eternal and unchangeable that they are', and ceasing to be 'strange forms half-uttered' (ii. 138).

Nevertheless, Garnett's criticisms confirmed his own sense that the novel 'wasn't quite there', so he wrote on 7 February to Mitchell Kennerley, who he hoped would publish it in America,¹⁷ that he had begun all over again (ii. 144). As he explained two days later:

It was full of beautiful things, but it missed – I knew that it just missed being itself. So here I am, must sit down and write it out again. I know it is quite a lovely novel really – you know that the perfect statue is in the marble, the kernel of it. But the thing is the getting it out clean. (ii. 146)

'The Wedding Ring' (third version, February–May 1914)

Lawrence was obviously intending now to combine 'The Sisters' I and II, but once again he made several false starts. On 9 February he complained of beginning 'for about the seventh time' (ii. 146), and a month later, 'for about the eleventh time' (ii. 153) – amounting, together with the false starts of the previous stage, and the two 'Sisters', to 'quite a thousand pages that I shall burn' (ii. 161) – but by 7 March the book was once more 'on its legs and. . . going strong' (ii. 153). Thomas Dunlop, the British Consul at La

¹⁶ See Explanatory notes on 108:36 and 122:3.

¹⁷ Kennerley became DHL's American publisher with *The Trespasser*, and subsequently published *Sons and Lovers* and *The Widowing of Mrs. Holroyd*, before DHL broke with him over 'The Wedding Ring' and a defective cheque for *Sons and Lovers*, never replaced. See *Letters*, ii. 246 and *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence and Amy Lowell 1914–25*, ed. E. Claire Healey and Keith Cushman (Santa Barbara, 1985), pp. 28–9.

Spezia, offered to type it, though on Moore's evidence the work was probably done mostly by his wife Madge.¹⁸ By 3 April Lawrence had 'done two-thirds' (ii. 161), and by 22 April only some eighty pages remained to be written. He was now certain that both 'The Wedding Ring' and his relationship with Frieda had finally come right, and that there was the closest connection between the one and the other. 'I am sure of this now, this novel. . . Before, I could not get my soul into it. That was because of the struggle and the resistance between Frieda and me. Now you will find her and me in the novel, I think, and the work is of both of us.' He sent Garnett what had been typed, at a point from which, as it happened, 'follows on the original "Sisters" – the School inspector, and so on' (ii. 164). Having the novel typed was itself a mark of confidence that it was ready to be published. On 9 May he was 'about three thousand' words from the end, and Frieda had suggested a change of title to *The Rainbow* (ii. 173), though this was not adopted. On 16 May he told Garnett 'The novel is finished, and I have gone through the sheets' (ii. 174). In fact Frieda had helped him transcribe corrections into the duplicate typescript (see below p. lii), putting herself into the novel literally, as well as with the full backing and inspiration she had promised this version, for the first time (ii. 151).

Though the story still went on into what became *Women in Love*, 'The Wedding Ring' brought the second 'Sisters' much nearer to *The Rainbow* as we have it now. Indeed, Lawrence thought well enough of one section to preserve it later, in the manuscript of *The Rainbow* itself (two portions of typescript running from Ella's first day as a school-teacher to the family's removal to their new house); and though Lawrence heightened it thematically in his revision for *The Rainbow*, he did not change it basically (see below p. lii, and Textual apparatus). Unfortunately, since the episode lies outside Ella's relationships with both her lovers (though 'Charles' Skrebensky is mentioned and has clearly taken the place of Ben Templeman) it reveals nothing of the nature or development of those relationships. It does however show that the affair with Winifred Inger and her later marriage with the younger Tom Brangwen were *not* in 'The Wedding Ring', since references to Winifred had to be put in for the later recension. We also know, from the MS and TS of *The Rainbow* (see below p. xxxviii) how the Cathedral scene was first developed there; and from the typescript that the later relationship of Anna and Will, after the episode with the girl in Nottingham, was an even later development in revision (see below p. lii),

¹⁸ See *Letters*, ii. 152; Harry T. Moore, *The Priest of Love* (New York, 1974), p. 198.

Introduction

xxvii

probably arising out of *The Rainbow's* new conception of the affair between Ursula and Skrebensky after his return from Africa. Even so, 'The Wedding Ring' was 'a magnum opus with a vengeance' (ii. 173), not only because it combined the first with the second 'Sisters'; but also, as the surviving pagination shows, because nearly three hundred of its typed pages (which are unusually long) had been taken up with matters prior to Ella's twentieth year, and her relationship with 'the School Inspector'. The most likely explanation is that Lawrence, seeking to extend the concern with marriage which had suggested 'The Wedding Ring' as a title towards the end of the second 'Sisters' (ii. 132), had gone further and further back into the marriages of Ella's parents, and her grandparents – which might also help to explain his difficulties in deciding how, and where, to begin both the second 'Sisters' and 'The Wedding Ring'.

This is confirmed by a reader's report (for Mitchell Kennerley to whom the second typescript had been sent, ii. 190), by Alfred Kuttner, who had also written a 'psychoanalytic' review of *Sons and Lovers* for *New Republic*.¹⁹ The report – which possibly Lawrence saw – is printed below as Appendix III, with a letter opining that a 'painful' deterioration was going on in Lawrence, but that a 'rigorous Freudian analysis would make Mr. Lawrence both a happier man and a greater artist'. Even though Kuttner found little advance on *Sons and Lovers*, and 'chunks of psychological motivation almost literally transferred' from the earlier novel, he also found 'some very fine writing and in parts a more mature character delineation (Birkin)', and he clearly responded to Ella and Gudrun, feeling that the book did not 'strike its best pace until we deal with them'. Hence 'it must be condensed and foreshortened and it must also be expurgated, not for moral reasons but for artistic effect'. (He instances a sentence from a scene where Gerald is 'raping Gudrun in the boathouse' – perhaps his way of describing an early version of the scene in chapter xxiv of *Women in Love*.) But the real significance of the report lies less in its opinions than in its evidence of what was in 'The Wedding Ring'. He complains that Lawrence 'takes us through practically three generations' though the real interest lies in the sisters, whose story does not come until 'almost half way through'.

The story of Anna's childhood, charming as it is, acts as a kind of false start because she is dropped so sharply as soon as she is converted into a baby machine. . . the whole story of Tom Brangwen's courtship of the Polish woman as well as Anna's marriage could be told in retrospect in much less space if the novel began with Ella's childhood.

¹⁹ 10 April 1915 (Draper 76–80).

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-22869-5 - The Rainbow: Part I
 D. H. Lawrence Edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

xxviii

Introduction

So the new novel contained all three generations, though the earlier stories must have been considerably attenuated, and also without the definition that was to come from the 'Study of Thomas Hardy', since the development up to Ella's school-teaching in 'The Wedding Ring' was still a great deal shorter than the comparable section of *The Rainbow*, probably not much more than half the size. In the typescript of 'The Wedding Ring' Ella begins as a teacher on p. 219, and a typed sheet corresponds to about a page and a third of *The Rainbow's* typescript, so that the 219 pages should have produced about 292; but the corresponding moment in *The Rainbow* comes on p. 552. The calculations can only be approximate, but it is clear that a very substantial expansion has taken place. It would take Lawrence as long to rewrite 'The Wedding Ring' into *The Rainbow* as it had done to write it.

He now thought of his novel as complete, however, and received a lucrative offer for it through J. B. Pinker (ii. 174), who had been agent for Conrad, James, Bennett and Ford Madox Ford. Though he had accepted some of Garnett's criticisms of the second 'Sisters', the criticism of its style seems to have rankled; and the letter of 22 April which expressed his new certainty about 'The Wedding Ring', as he sent off the first batch of typescript, also reproached his mentor for a failure to believe in what he was trying to do, and took him up short on a remark that Lawrence was at liberty to go to another publisher (ii. 164–6). On 5 June, having received Garnett's reaction to 'The Wedding Ring', he tried in a famous letter to formulate the new attitude to 'psychology' and to 'character' which he had been struggling towards, and to which he felt Garnett had been quite unwilling to adjust. The shadow of a coming break is clear; but so is the sense of alignment with the future – though he is also critical of the intellectualism of the Futurists:

I don't agree with you about the Wedding Ring. You will find that in a while you will like the book as a whole. I don't think the psychology is wrong: it is only that I have a different attitude to my characters, and that necessitates a different attitude in you, which you are not as yet prepared to give. . . somehow – that which is physic – non-human, in humanity, is more interesting to me than the old-fashioned human element – which causes one to conceive a character in a certain moral scheme and make him consistent. The certain moral scheme is what I object to. . . You mustn't look in my novel for the old stable ego of the character. There is another ego, according to whose action the individual is unrecognisable, and passes through, as it were, allotropic states which it needs a deeper sense than any we've been used to exercise, to discover are states of the same single radically-unchanged element. (Like as diamond and coal are the same pure single element of carbon. The ordinary novel would trace the history of the diamond – but I say

'diamond, what! This is carbon.' And my diamond might be coal or soot, and my theme is carbon.)

You must not say my novel is shaky – It is not perfect, because I am not expert in what I want to do. But it is the real thing, say what you like. And I shall get my reception, if not now, then before long. Again I say, don't look for the development of the novel to follow the lines of certain characters; the characters fall into the form of some other rhythmic form, like when one draws a fiddle-bow across a fine tray delicately sanded, the sand takes lines unknown. (ii. 182–4)

Three days later he left Fiascherino on his way to England, via Switzerland and Germany, and arrived in London on 24 June. Around 29 June he decided to accept Pinker's agency and the offer which Pinker had arranged with Methuen;²⁰ signed a contract which would give him £300 (£150 on the receipt of the manuscript and £150 on publication); and opened a bank-account. He had been annoyed by Duckworth's 'peremptory' tone when he saw him to discuss Methuen's offer (ii. 189); and the decision made more overt the parting of the ways with Duckworth and with Garnett, though this was temporarily disguised by giving them a collection of stories instead of the novel.

The Prussian Officer and 'Study of Thomas Hardy' (June–November 1914)

Lawrence then set to work assembling, and revising once more, the stories which would become *The Prussian Officer*.²¹ On 8 July he mentioned to Pinker another, apparently minor project. Bertram Christian, a director of the publisher Nisbet's, had asked him to 'do a little book for him – a sort of interpretative essay on Thomas Hardy, of about 15,000 words. It will be published at 1/- net. My payment is to be 1½d per copy, £15 advance on royalties, half profits in America. It isn't very much, but then the work won't be very much' (ii. 193).

On 13 July, at the Registry Office in Kensington, Lawrence and Frieda were married. (Her divorce had been finalised, at long last, at the end of May.) Two days later he asked Edward Marsh – editor of *Georgian Poetry* – to lend him the pocket edition of Hardy's novels and Lascelles Abercrombie's book on Hardy. 'I am going to write a little book on Hardy's people. I think it will interest me. . . I have just finished getting together a book of short stories. Lord, how I've worked again at those stories – most of them –

²⁰ See Methuen to J. B. Pinker, 4 May and two letters on 8 May 1914, NYPL. That Methuen was eager for the book is shown by a further letter on 29 May.

²¹ See *The Prussian Officer*, ed. Worthen, pp. xxvii–xxx.

forging them up' (ii. 198). The claim was justified. There is no clearer way of understanding and evaluating the development of Lawrence's art, between *Sons and Lovers* and 'The Wedding Ring', than by comparing stories like 'Odour of Chrysanthemums' and 'Daughters of the Vicar' with their earlier versions. The metaphor of the forge is a good one because it suggests the transformation, in shape and dimension, made possible by the labour, and the new energy of imagination, that had gone into the creation of the second 'Sisters' and 'The Wedding Ring' in 1914. These have almost entirely disappeared; but the essence of the development between the Lawrence of 1911–12 and the Lawrence of 1914 is clearly visible still, in the difference between the main body of 'Odour of Chrysanthemums' and the new ending, that transforms the whole mode of vision; or in the contrast between the creation of the 'Two Marriages', and the 'hinterland' that opens in 'Daughters of the Vicar' as Louisa washes Alfred's back, and later, as they kiss. Moreover these explorations, with others such as the dance in 'The White Stocking' and, (from newer stories in 1913) the restoration of Bachmann in 'The Thorn in the Flesh', and the violence springing from repressions in 'The Prussian Officer', are all directly related to scenes and themes in *The Rainbow*, of whose new vision and style they were the first published anticipation.

Lawrence was overjoyed when Marsh made him a wedding present of the books he had asked for, but still expected his own work on Hardy to be 'tiny' (ii. 200). At the beginning of August he went on a walking tour in the Lake District – and it was there he heard of the outbreak of war.

By 10 August came a severe blow: Methuen returned the typescript of 'The Wedding Ring'. 'Here is a state of affairs, –' Lawrence exclaimed to Pinker – 'what is going to become of us?' (ii. 206). In a moment, financial security had turned to real embarrassment. Nearly £100 of the £150 for the receipt of the typescript had been spent (ii. 211), the other £150 was now out of reach, and the Lawrences could not go back to Italy or its cheap living. They moved into an inexpensive cottage at Chesham in Buckinghamshire, but from now onwards money worries would be serious and pressing. It was later claimed, at the trial of *The Rainbow*, that Methuen had decided the novel 'could not be published in its then form',²² clearly implying obscenity. This is apparently confirmed by a letter from Pinker to the Secretary of the Society of Authors, after the trial.

I gather that it was suggested that Mr. Lawrence had been unyielding on the question of alterations. This is not the case. When the MS. was delivered the publishers told me that their reader reported it as impossible for publication in its

²² *Daily Telegraph*, Monday 15 November 1915, p. 12.