

WOMEN IN LOVE

D. H. LAWRENCE

EDITED BY
DAVID FARMER
LINDETH VASEY
AND
JOHN WORTHEN



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 *Women in Love* now correctly established from the original sources and first published in 1987, © the Estate of Frieda Lawrence Ravagli 1987. Introduction and notes © Cambridge University Press 1987. 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 plays as published (copyright 1920, 1921, 1922, 1936, 1948, 1950) 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.

Reprinted 1987

British Library cataloguing in publication data

Lawrence, D. H.

Women in Love. –

(The Cambridge edition of the letters and works of D. H. Lawrence)

I. Title II. Farmer, David III. Vasey, Lindeth

823'.912F PR6023.A93

Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data

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

Women in Love.

(The Cambridge edition of the letters and works of D. H. Lawrence)

p. cm. – (The works of D. H. Lawrence)

I. Farmer, David R. II. Vasey, Lindeth III. Worthen, John. IV. Title.

V. Series: Lawrence, D. H. (David Herbert), 1885–1930. Works. 1979.

PR6023.A93W63 1986 823'.912 87-31367

ISBN 0 521 23565 0 hardback

ISBN 0 521 28041 9 paperback

Transferred to digital printing 2001

CONTENTS

General editors' preface	<i>page</i> vii
Acknowledgements	ix
Chronology	xi
Cue-titles	xvi
Introduction	xix
'The Sisters' (first version, March–June 1913)	xxi
'The Sisters II' (second version, August 1913–January 1914)	xxii
'The Wedding Ring' (third version, February–May 1914)	xxiv
<i>The Rainbow</i> and 'The Sisters III' (fourth version, two novels, November 1914–March 1915 and April–June 1916)	xxvi
<i>Women in Love</i> (fifth version, July 1916–January 1917)	xxix
<i>Women in Love</i> (sixth version, March 1917–September 1919)	xxxv
Publication	xxxix
Reception	li
Text	lvi
<i>WOMEN IN LOVE</i>	i
Appendix I: Foreword to <i>Women in Love</i>	483
Appendix II: The 'Prologue' and 'Wedding' Chapters	487
Appendix III: 'Beldover' and the Eastwood Region	519
Explanatory notes	527
Textual apparatus	589
A note on pounds, shillings and pence	633

INTRODUCTION

D. H. Lawrence began the composition of his two greatest novels as a single work named 'The Sisters', the first stages of which he wrote in the spring of 1913. As the writing progressed, the novel grew so dramatically in scope (coming to include a great deal not only about the sisters Ursula and Gudrun Brangwen and their relationships, but about their parents and grandparents) that Lawrence decided eventually to split the book into two volumes. He finished one novel – *The Rainbow* – for publication in 1915, and in 1916 returned to the other, which he rewrote as *Women in Love*; he was, however, unable to find a publisher for it until 1920.

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

In the middle of March 1913, while living at Gargnano on the Lago di Garda, Lawrence began to write a novel¹ which on 5 April he could cheerfully refer to as a 'pot-boiler' (i. 536) then 110 pages long. He badly needed to write a new book; *Sons and Lovers*, finished five months earlier, was accepted but as yet unpublished and he had little other prospect of income. He had also spent a good deal of time that spring writing a novel ('The Insurrection of Miss Houghton') which seemed at that stage to be unpublishable.² By 23 April he had moved to Germany and was up to page 145 of the new book, but complained to his friend Arthur McLeod³ that it was 'a novel which I have never grasped . . . 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 can only just make out what it is about' (i. 544). Around 2 May he told Edward Garnett,⁴ his literary adviser and reader for Duckworth (about to publish *Sons and Lovers*), that he had written 180 pages of a projected 300-page work titled 'The Sisters':

¹ See *Letters*, i. 530; on 22 March it was 46 pages long. (Subsequent references to *Letters*, i., ii. and iii. are given in the text with volume and page number.)

² Totally rewritten in 1920 as *The Lost Girl*; see the Cambridge edition, ed. John Worthen (Cambridge, 1981), pp. xix–xxiv.

³ McLeod had been a fellow-teacher of DHL's at Davidson Road, Croydon (*Letters*, i. 136 n. 3).

⁴ See *ibid.* 297 n. 2.

It was meant to be for the 'jeunes filles', but already it has fallen from grace. I can only write what I feel pretty strongly about: and that, at present, is the relations between men and women. After all, it is *the* problem of today, the establishment of a new relation, or the re-adjustment of the old one, between men and women.

(i. 546)

At this point Lawrence estimated a month to completion. He was at page 256 by 17 May 'but still can't see the end very clear' (i. 550). A fortnight later he told Garnett that he was 'nearly finished', having reached page 283, and around 4–5 June 'The Sisters' must have been complete for on 10 June he asked Garnett if he had received its second half (ii. 20).

A few pages, numbered 291–6, are the only surviving fragment of an early version which was probably chronologically (and perhaps textually) close to the first draft; they are not, however, written in the first person which Lawrence twice indicated was the format of the novel's first draft, and so probably derive from a slightly later revision.⁵ The fragment tells of Gudrun Brangwen back in England, pregnant with Gerald Crich's child. There is an altercation between Gerald and the sculptor Loerke, who both wish to marry her. Loerke departs in a rage, and although Gudrun believes Gerald only wants to marry her because of the baby, she accepts his offer. As the fragment ends, she admits that she would not have cared for any other man's child. The two sit quietly: 'There was a good deal that hurt still, between them.' Since Lawrence had estimated that the first draft would be 300 pages long, this early fragment is most likely the ending itself.

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

After spending the first part of the summer in England, Lawrence and Frieda returned to Germany in August 1913, when Lawrence again began work on the novel. By 24 August, he had 'made two false starts already' (ii. 66); a week later, complaining that he was writing things 'about which I know nothing – like a somnambulist', he seems to have begun yet again: '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

⁵ Roberts E441a, UT. For a description of the manuscript, see David Farmer, 'A Descriptive and Analytical Catalogue of the D. H. Lawrence Collection at The University of Texas at Austin' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, UT, 1970), A57. The fragment will be printed in the Cambridge edition of *The Rainbow*, ed. Mark Kinkead-Weekes. If Birkin or Ella (the name of the Ursula figure in 'The Sisters') had been the first person narrator, it is possible that no 'I' narration would appear in the surviving pages.

lad, are you there!" I say to myself, when I see the sentences stalking by.⁶ This second sustained writing of the novel he would eventually (provisionally) retitile 'The Wedding Ring'; he wrote on 4 September that 'The Sisters has quite a new beginning – a new basis altogether. I hope I can get on with it. It is much more interesting in its new form – not so damned flippant' (ii. 67–8). By 15 September Lawrence was planning a walking trip across Switzerland, having finished the first hundred pages; he hoped to complete the draft in another month (ii. 74–5). The walk, however, followed by a move to Italy, prevented much consecutive writing; although he remarked that he was working on the novel at the beginning and at the end of October (ii. 82, 93), it was probably not until early in December that he was able to concentrate on it. This time it went 'slowly' (ii. 118). At the end of the year we find him telling Edward Garnett that, in a few days, he would send

the first half of the Sisters – which I should rather call The Wedding Ring – to Duckworths. It is *very* different from *Sons and Lovers*: written in another language almost. I shall be sorry if you don't like it, but am prepared. – 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. You must see what you think of the new style. (ii. 132)

He sent Garnett the first half of 'The Sisters II' on 6 January 1914 (ii. 134). Garnett must have read it and sent his observations to Lawrence immediately, for on 29 January Lawrence wrote to him that 'I am not very much surprised, nor even very much hurt by your letter – and I agree with you': but he stood his ground on one point: 'I *must* have Ella [later to be called Ursula] get some experience before she meets her Mr Birkin . . . tell me whether you think Ella would be possible, as she now stands, unless she had some experience of love and of men . . . I feel that this second half of the Sisters is very beautiful, but it may not be sufficiently incorporated to please you' (ii. 142–3).

In this letter Lawrence gave some indication of how 'The Sisters II' was moving closer to *The Rainbow*, which in its later sections would deal with Ursula's (Ella's) 'experience of love and of men'. But he also voiced satisfaction with the second half of the novel, that portion which apparently began to deal at length with Ella and Birkin, and would finally be transformed into *Women in Love*: 'I prefer the permeating beauty. It is my transition stage – but I must write to live, and it must produce its flowers,

⁶ Letter to John Middleton Murry, 30 August 1913; quoted in Sotheby's Sale Catalogue, 'English Literature and History', 22–23 July 1985, item 269. Murry (1889–1957), journalist and critic, and his companion Katherine Mansfield (1888–1923), New Zealand short-story writer, had met the Lawrences in July 1913 (*Letters*, i. 507 n. 3, ii. 31 and n. 3).

and if they be frail or shadowy, they will be all right if they are true to their hour.' He again explained that 'I have no longer the joy in creating vivid scenes, that I had in *Sons and Lovers*', and described his new method as 'exhaustive': he was no longer writing 'pure object and story' (ii. 142-3). He had reached p. 340 by 19 January (ii. 137). And he was going to send on 150 pages of this second half on 30 January (ii. 142).

Only one fragment, probably from the last part to be written of 'The Sisters II', has survived in a brief set of pages numbered 373-80. It reveals that the relationship between Ella and Birkin has begun, but also describes the continuing power over Ella of an earlier relationship with Ben Templeman, apparently a new development (ii. 142), and strong evidence that this draft succeeded the fragment numbered 291-6:

Ella felt the blood rush from her heart. For a second she seemed to lose consciousness. A wave of terror, deep, annihilating went over her. She knew him without looking; his peculiar, straying walk, the odd, separate look about him which filled her with dread. He had still power over her: he was still Man to her . . .⁷

However, shortly after responding to Garnett's criticism Lawrence left off writing 'The Sisters II', and embarked upon the next sustained composition.

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

By 7 February 1914, Lawrence had 'begun it again'; two days later he wrote to McLeod that it was for 'about the seventh time', and a month later claimed to be starting for 'about the eleventh time' (ii. 144, 146, 153). But after the initial difficulties he seems to have grown in confidence as this third sustained version developed. In the same March letter, the novel was 'on its legs and . . . going strong' (ii. 153); as proof of what he saw as its publishable quality, he began to have a ribbon and a carbon copy typescript made of it as he wrote.⁸ On 22 April, with only 80 pages remaining to be written, he sent the available typescript to Garnett: 'I am sure of this now, this novel. It is a big and beautiful work. 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' (ii. 164). Early in May, Frieda suggested the new title *The Rainbow* (not adopted at this stage); by the 16th Lawrence had finished the novel and checked the typescript (ii. 173, 174). Sixty-two pages of carbon

⁷ Roberts E441a, UT, p. 380. See Farmer, 'A Descriptive and Analytical Catalogue', A57. The fragment will be included in the Cambridge edition of *The Rainbow*.

⁸ His typist was Thomas Dunlop, British Consul in Spezia; see *Letters*, ii. 152 n. 1.

copy incorporated in the final manuscript of *The Rainbow* survive from this third major version,⁹ and it is possible to learn still more about it from a contemporary reader's report. Submitted on 10 November 1914 in the form of a letter from Alfred Kuttner to Mitchell Kennerley, who had published four of Lawrence's first five books in the USA, the report reads in part:

The real story is concentrated in the lives of Ella and Gudrun and the novel does not strike its best pace until we deal with them. But that does not become clear until we are almost half way through the novel so that the first part of the plot has a rambling quality which greatly contributes to the feeling of over-lengthiness. Mr. Lawrence takes us through practically three generations but our real interest lies only in the third.¹⁰

Kuttner clearly responded most readily to the stories of Ella and Gudrun, who had been the central characters – the sisters of the title – since the very first version. He generally liked what he read, but argued strongly for it to be 'condensed and foreshortened', as well as 'expurgated, not for moral reasons but for artistic effect. Mr. Lawrence sees sex too obsessively.' Kuttner also reported that this version of the novel contained a scene of 'Gerald Crich raping Gudrun in a boathouse'; he criticised Lawrence's lack of restraint in phrases like 'With what an agony of relief he poured himself into her'. It seems probable that the 'rape' was Kuttner's way of describing a preliminary version of the encounter which takes place in Gudrun's bedroom in chapter XXIV of *Women in Love*.

From Kuttner's report we can also gain a sense of the structure of 'The Wedding Ring': '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.' After a year of writing and many drafts, the novel had come to contain a great deal of what became *The Rainbow* as well as much that would become *Women in Love*.

'The Wedding Ring' also provoked from Lawrence the famous defence of his fictional method in a letter to Edward Garnett of 5 June 1914. Garnett had been critical both of the second version of the novel and of the third, but Lawrence was now prepared to resist his criticism.

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,

⁹ In Roberts E331a, UT. The surviving typed pages were originally numbered 219–75, 279–84, are re-numbered 548–604 and 608–13. See Farmer, 'A Descriptive and Analytical Catalogue', A40.

¹⁰ Located at LC; the report will be printed in the Cambridge edition of *The Rainbow*.

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. (ii. 182–3)

Garnett's criticism also mattered less because the novel was not now going to Duckworth;¹¹ by the middle of May 1914, the firm of Methuen had offered an advance of £300 (in two payments) for the new novel. The news had come to Lawrence through the literary agent J. B. Pinker, whom Lawrence would take as his own agent in July,¹² and the money (as Lawrence told Garnett) was 'a pretty figure that my heart aches after' (ii. 174). He signed Methuen's contract and received £150 in late June, but his happiness was short-lived; early in August, while on a walking tour in the Lake District, he learned of the outbreak of the First World War, and by 10 August Methuen had returned his typescript.¹³

***The Rainbow* and 'The Sisters III' (fourth version, two novels, November 1914–March 1915 and April–June 1916)**

Lawrence must have begun his next sustained version of the novel late in November 1914; on 3 December he wrote that he was 'working *frightfully* hard – rewriting my novel' (ii. 239). On 5 December he sent the first 100 pages to Pinker, followed by another instalment on the 18th (ii. 240, 245). By 5 January 1915 he had done 300 pages, and on the 7th sent Pinker a further 100 pages (ii. 255, 256).

But the single most important development in the writing of *The*

¹¹ Duckworth accepted a book of short stories in lieu of the novel; see *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories*, ed. John Worthen (Cambridge, 1983), p. xxvii.

¹² See *Letters*, ii. 31 n. 1.

¹³ *Ibid.* 206–7, 240–1. Methuen would claim at the *Rainbow* prosecution in November 1915 that they had asked for the novel to be rewritten, but a great many literary manuscripts were returned to their authors simply because of uncertainty following the outbreak of war. Methuen probably did no more than return the novel in a routine way, with a suggestion that some changes would be in order.

Rainbow and *Women in Love* now occurred. In that letter of 7 January to Pinker, Lawrence announced that he had decided 'to split the book into two volumes: it was so unwieldy. It needs to be in two volumes' (ii. 256). It may have been Kuttner's suggestion that the Brangwen saga was really separate from the story of Ella and Gudrun that prompted Lawrence to consider dividing and expanding his work rather than shortening it; there is evidence that he read Kuttner's report.¹⁴

From January to March work on what was now simply *The Rainbow* progressed rapidly, while the *Women in Love* material was put aside. The manuscript of *The Rainbow* was finished on 2 March 1915, and the novel itself was published on 30 September 1915, only to be suppressed in November;¹⁵ Lawrence turned to revision of his travel essays for their collection in *Twilight in Italy*, to philosophical work and to some short stories and poems.

However, in March 1916, when he and Frieda had been living for two and a half months in Cornwall, he began to consider writing another novel: novels had always been his major source of income. His first plan was to resume work on the unfinished 'Insurrection of Miss Houghton', which he had given up in 1913, but the manuscript was in Bavaria and he could not get it back (ii. 580, 595). After a month's wait – and just after Middleton Murry and Katherine Mansfield had come to live in the next cottage at Higher Tregerthen (ii. 596–7) – he went back instead to the *Women in Love* material. His income was tiny, his health had been bad in the winter, his attitude to the war and to British society in general had grown wholly antagonistic. As he told Barbara Low in May 1916:

I would write to you oftener, but this life of today so disgusts one, it leaves nothing to say. The war, the approaching conscription, the sense of complete paltriness and chaotic nastiness in life, really robs one of speech . . . I have begun the second half of the *Rainbow*. But already it is beyond all hope of ever being published, because of the things it says. And more than that, it is beyond all possibility even to offer it to a world, a putrescent mankind like ours. I feel I cannot *touch* humanity, even in thought, it is abhorrent to me.¹⁶

Nevertheless, by 26 April he had begun writing, with that combination of optimism and bewilderment which so often attended the start of a major piece of work. That day, he told the artist Mark Gertler and Lady Cynthia

¹⁴ Letter from Kuttner to Kennerley, n.d.: 'Of course I should not have written my criticism in just that way if I had intended it for Mr. Lawrence's ears but . . . I don't mind your sending it on to him' (LC).

¹⁵ See Explanatory note on 485:11.

¹⁶ *Letters*, ii. 602. Barbara Low was a pioneer in psychoanalysis, and an aunt of Catherine Carswell (see below); see *ibid.* 279 n. 6.

Asquith how 'this last week' he had begun a novel 'that really occupies me'.¹⁷ Ten days later, Lady Ottoline Morrell was told about 'a new novel: a thing that is a stranger to me even as I write it. I don't know what the end will be.'¹⁸ He was not, then, going to end the novel where 'The Sisters' had ended, with Gerald and Gudrun together; nor, presumably, where 'The Wedding Ring' had ended. April was most likely the time when Lawrence wrote the opening two chapters (later abandoned) entitled 'Prologue' and 'The Wedding'.¹⁹ While the former explores the deteriorating relationship between Rupert Birkin and Hermione Roddice, it concentrates upon Birkin's feelings for men and his attraction to Gerald Crich. Such writing would perhaps be one reason why Lawrence felt that his new novel was already 'beyond all hope of ever being published'.

On 19 May Lawrence wrote to Pinker that he was 'half way through a novel, which is a sequel to the *Rainbow*, though quite unlike it' (ii. 606). On the 24th he told Lady Ottoline: 'I have got a long way with my novel. It comes rapidly, and is very good. When one is shaken to the very depths, one finds reality in the unreal world. At present my real world is the world of my inner soul, which reflects on to the novel I write' (ii. 610). Six days later his sense of accomplishment was still strong as he wrote to Barbara Low that Ursula was now married, and the novel 'two thirds' written: 'It goes on pretty fast, and very easy. I have not travailed over it. It is the book of my free soul'.²⁰ By 19 June he was 'nearly done'; he probably finished before 28 June, when he had to go to Bodmin for medical examination: on 30 June he told Pinker that 'in effect' the novel was finished (ii. 617, 619). What he meant is clarified in a letter to S. S. Kotliansky ('Kot') of 4 July: 'I have finished my novel – except for a bit that can be done any time' – and his friend the Scottish writer and critic Catherine Carswell was told about 'a last chapter to write, some time, when one's heart is not so contracted'.²¹ The novel as it now stood consisted of an autograph manuscript (no longer

¹⁷ Ibid. 599, 601. Lady Cynthia had been a friend of the Lawrences since 1913 (ibid. 41 n. 4), Gertler since 1914 (ibid. 214 n. 1).

¹⁸ Ibid. 604. The Lawrences had stayed with Lady Ottoline at Garsington Manor in 1915 (ibid. 253 n. 3).

¹⁹ Roberts E441b, UT (see Farmer, 'A Descriptive and Analytical Catalogue', A58); first edited by George Ford and published in *Texas Quarterly*, vi (Spring 1963), 98–111 and *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, vi (Summer 1964), 137–47 respectively. They are printed as Appendix II below.

²⁰ *Letters*, ii. 614. Having written half the novel in almost exactly four weeks, and two-thirds in less than six weeks, DHL seems to have taken three to four weeks over the last third.

²¹ Ibid. 621, 627. For Kotliansky, see ibid. 205 n. 4; for Catherine Carswell, see ibid. 187 n. 5. Pinker must immediately have asked Methuen if they wanted the book; they replied cautiously on 10 July that they 'should prefer to see the MS. of his new book before deciding if we would care to cancel the agreement or not' (NYPL).

extant), probably in notebooks, up to page 649, and five further notebooks paginated 650–863 which do survive; the last of them almost completely empty, leaving space for that ‘last chapter . . . some time’.²²

Women in Love (fifth version, July 1916–January 1917)

Lawrence decided to type his novel himself; he could not afford to pay anyone else, he probably foresaw that he would want to revise it (and could do so while typing) and it was a book to which he felt so close that he was reluctant, at this stage, to let anyone else see it. He had probably begun by 12 July (ii. 529, 630); when complete, in ribbon and carbon copies, this typescript would constitute the novel’s fifth version. But he typed fewer than fifteen pages in July; ‘it got on my nerves and knocked me up’ (ii. 637), and he also needed a new typewriter ribbon.²³ But having done some pencil rewriting around 21 July to what he was now confident was ‘the fourth and the final draft’, now ‘ $\frac{4}{5}$ done’,²⁴ and having also been on the point of sending the untyped manuscript to Pinker to be typed (ii. 637), he settled down in earnest in August to the typing, and probably typed for most of the month, telling Amy Lowell on the 23rd that the typewriter she had given him ‘runs so glibly, and has at last become a true confrère. I take

²² Notebooks 3 and 7–10 of the surviving ten (the other five dating wholly from October 1916), Roberts E441c, UT (see Farmer, ‘A Descriptive and Analytical Catalogue’, A59): see also footnote 28. A calculation (almost certainly by DHL) on the inside cover of notebook 7, opposite original page 650, shows 700 multiplied by 135 to calculate word length: i.e. the number of pages written and the number of words per page (between 130 and 150 in notebook 7). If the first 649 pages had contained the same number of words as pp. 650–700, they would have been pages of the same size; the whole of the April–June draft was probably, therefore, written in similar notebooks.

²³ His typewriter (an L. G. Smith & Bros. No. 2 model) had been given him by Amy Lowell (*Letters*, ii. 222–3), and he had typed the first seven pages of *The Rainbow* on it (in Roberts E331a, UT). Between 4 July and ?1 August he had had trouble securing a new ribbon from London for it; it took five letters (and two wrong ribbons) before he got what he needed (*Letters*, ii. 621–38). The ribbon copy p. 15 (in Roberts E441d, UT) shows the impression of a much blacker typewriter ribbon, two-thirds the way down the page, and must mark the new ribbon’s arrival.

²⁴ *Letters*, ii. 637. DHL’s ‘fourth and the final draft’ can be explained in one of two ways. If he started counting from the original ‘Sisters’ of 1913, the second complete draft (not counting the false starts, and the ‘Sisters II’ incomplete draft) would have been the ‘Wedding Ring’ of February–May 1914, the third complete draft (again, not counting the *Rainbow* version of November 1914–March 1915) would have been ‘The Sisters III’ of April–June 1916, and the ‘fourth and the final draft’ the typescript and revised notebook *Women in Love* of July–October 1916. If, however, he had started the count of drafts from the division of the novel into two volumes in January 1915, then the unused typescript left over from *The Rainbow* would have constituted the first draft, the April 1916 false start evidenced by the two abandoned opening chapters the second, the ‘Sisters III’ version the third, and the July–October 1916 *Women in Love* the fourth.

so unkindly to any sort of machinery. But now I and the type writer have sworn a Blutbruderschaft' (ii. 645). Earlier in the month he had given Catherine Carswell – who was also writing a novel – his reasons for abandoning 'The Sisters' as a title: it was too close to May Sinclair's *The Three Sisters*, published in 1914.²⁵ On 9 September, he told Pinker that the novel was 'half done' (ii. 653), meaning (presumably) half typed; on 26 September, Lady Ottoline heard that only a week or two more would be needed. But the ease of his writing between April and June had been replaced by the old sense of struggle: 'I only want to finish this novel, which is like a malady or a madness while it lasts' (ii. 656). He was not a skilled typist,²⁶ remarking in 1921 that 'I hate doing it' (iii. 677), and he was actually revising as he went: 'I recomposed all the first part on the typewriter'.²⁷ He was also ill from early September onwards, and was depressed by the continuously wet weather of the late summer. Although he told Amy Lowell on 12 October that he was still typing (ii. 665), that remark was probably designed to please the typewriter's provider; the very next day he asked the mother of Douglas Clayton (who had typed for him 1913–15) if she would type the remaining third of the novel (ii. 666), as he could take no more of the strain. Altogether, he typed 368 pp., but had only managed to type about a sixth of it between 9 September and 12 October. Katherine Clayton agreed to finish the typing, but instead Lawrence took Pinker up on an offer to have the rest of the manuscript typed without charge (ii. 668) in his office; Pinker would, of course, go on making both a ribbon and a carbon copy.

From 13 October, then, Lawrence began preparing the end of the novel for Pinker's typing; he did this by writing out the penultimate part in notebooks 1–6 of the ten which still survive, and then revising notebooks 7–10 to create the very end of the novel. It is at this stage that we find him confidently naming it *Women in Love*; the title appears with no alternative

²⁵ *Letters*, ii. 639. See *ibid.* 640 for other suggestions – some facetious – about titles. DHL first mentioned the final title to Pinker on 13 July 1916 (*ibid.* 631). He later considered using 'Dies Irae' (see below); in November 1917, thinking about the book as 'more or less a sequel to *The Rainbow* . . . I think I'll call it "Noah's Ark"' (*ibid.*, iii. 183). As well as May Sinclair's novel, a novel called *Sisters* (1904) had been published by Ada Cambridge (1844–1926). *Women in Love: eight studies in sentiment* had been published by Alfred Sutro (1863–1933) in 1902, but DHL did not learn that until 1921: see Sutro, *Celebrities and Simple Souls* (1933), p. 100.

²⁶ He had to type a page twice on six occasions (pp. 57, 144, 228, 275, 305 and 338) because he failed to insert carbon paper, or inserted it reversed.

²⁷ *Letters*, iii. 79. The process is visible when he had to retype the pages described in the previous footnote; he would incorporate autograph revisions made to the first typing, and make still further changes as he typed.

in notebooks 2 and 4–6.²⁸ The inside cover of notebook 1 shows the title ‘Dies Irae’ written under *Women in Love*; on 30 October, Lawrence told Pinker that Frieda was in favour of that title (ii. 669). He used this stage of the novel’s composition to incorporate an incident based on a very recent event: he had learned early in September about Katherine Mansfield walking out of the Café Royal with a copy of his poetry collection *Amores* (1916), which she had taken out of the hands of mocking critics.²⁹ This was the source of new material incorporated in chapter xxviii. When he had completed the sixth (new) notebook, he started revising the ending of the novel as it had appeared in notebooks 7–10 in the April–June draft; as he was to tell Catherine Carswell in November, ‘there was a lot of the original draft that I *couldn’t* have bettered’ (iii. 25). The first batch of notebooks went to Pinker for typing on 25 October (ii. 669); on 31 October Lawrence sent his agent ‘the conclusion of the novel . . . all but the last chapter, which, being a sort of epilogue, I want to write later – when I get the typescript back from you. You got the preceding MS. which I sent last week, didn’t you?’ (ii. 669). Exactly what he had in mind as the ‘sort of epilogue’ is not clear. One direction he might have taken is suggested by a deleted fragment on the pages inserted at the end of the tenth notebook, which must (from its pagination number) have been written late in October:

A year afterwards, Ursula in Italy received a letter from Gudrun in Frankfurt am Main. Since the death of Gerald in the Tyrol, when Gudrun had gone away, ostensibly to England, Ursula had had no news of her sister.

“I met a German artist who knew you,” Gudrun said, “and he gave me your address. I was silent for so long because there was nothing I could say.

I have got a son—he is six months old now. His hair is like the sun shining on the sea, and he has his father’s limbs and body. I am still Frau Crich—what actually happened is so much better, to account for one’s position, than a lie would be. The boy is called Ferdinand Gerald Crich.

As for the past—I lived for some months with Loerke, as a friend. Now I am staying

[p. 427]

The incomplete sentence suggests that, at one time, the passage continued further. But whether or not Gudrun’s future was to have been the subject of the epilogue, it was never written in the form of the ‘small last chapter’

²⁸ Notebook 3, like notebooks 7–10 (see footnote 22), shows the title ‘Sisters’ deleted and ‘Women in Love’ inserted; it was at one time the last notebook of the April–June 1916 ‘Sisters III’, containing pages 861–3 (the number ‘861’ is also deleted on its cover). In October, DHL tore out the used pages, inserted them at the back of notebook 10 (where they still are), and then re-used the almost empty notebook.

²⁹ See Explanatory note on 384:34.

(iii. 29) Lawrence was still planning in November. The last scenes of the novel would, however, be completely altered (and extended) in revision between 1917 and 1919.

After Lawrence had sent the last manuscript notebooks of *Women in Love* to his agent, the history of the novel moves into a new phase marked by continuing revision, by numerous unsuccessful attempts to find a publisher, by fears of suppression after publication and by readings of the typescript by friends and potential publishers. By 13 November Lawrence had already received in two batches (the first on the 6th) the part which Pinker had had typed in his office, for he told Pinker that he would be returning the complete assembled novel in a week's time (iii. 22, 28–9); he confirmed this schedule when on 17 November he wrote to say that he would be posting it 'on Monday [the 20th], or thereabouts' (iii. 34).

Close examination of the two typescripts (hereafter TSIa and TSIb, both containing a mixture of carbon and ribbon pages) reveals much about Lawrence's procedure at this stage. He had a great desire to revise them,³⁰ and must have started doing this during his own typing in the summer and autumn (his own section of the typescript is far more heavily revised than the section typed in Pinker's office³¹). After entering almost all of the initial revision (distributed between the two copies) in his own hand, he had allowed Frieda to help by copying the new readings into one copy or the other. Usually she had followed him accurately, but sometimes she had been either careless or had deliberately inserted her own reading. As the published texts were to derive ultimately from TSIb, such alterations do not affect the transmission of the text when they appear in TSIa, or in the portions of TSIb which Lawrence later rewrote. However, some of her mistranscriptions (and failures to transcribe) in TSIb were carried over into the fresh typescript (TSII) made January–March 1917; see 'Text' below.

On 20 November Lawrence sent TSIa to Pinker (ii. 35), to be offered to

³⁰ A photograph of Gertler's painting *The Merry-Go-Round* which he had seen early in October (*Letters*, ii. 660–1) provoked revisions in chapter xxix, for example: see Explanatory note on 423:14.

³¹ It is clear in the two copies (Roberts E441d at UT, and E441e at UTor) where DHL's typing ends. Although the typefaces are similar, DHL indented only a few spaces for paragraphs, left a blank space between opening inverted commas and the first word following, and left very narrow margins on all sides. There is also, to p. 368, an average of 3.5 incidents per page of strike-overs or run-on words; from p. 369 onwards, the average drops to 0.1 per page, and the text follows notebooks 1–10. See Explanatory note on 302:2.

his contracted publisher Methuen; probably on the same day he sent TS1b (eventually intended to be sent to publishers in the USA) to the Carswells. At first he had no intention of using TS1b for anything except corrections, comments on 'discrepancy' from them (iii. 36) and advice from Catherine's husband Donald, a barrister, about possible libel: he told Carswell that 'Halliday is Heseltine, The Pussum is a model called the Puma, and they are taken from life – nobody else at all lifelike' (iii. 36). (Heseltine did indeed think the character libellous when the book was published in England in 1921; see below.) But Carswell also made some further suggestions,³² and Lawrence was already thinking of allowing someone else to read TS1b: Esther Andrews, a friend of Robert Mountsier (later Lawrence's American agent³³). However strong Lawrence's initial reservations about people reading the new novel, others would hear about it and begin asking to see it. Word quickly reached Lady Ottoline, for example, that Lawrence had used her as a model for Hermione; Lawrence told Catherine Carswell on 27 November that 'I heard from Ottoline Morrell this morning, saying she hears she is the villainess of the new book. It is very strange, how rumours go round. – So I have offered to send her the MS. – So don't send it to Pinker till I let you know' (iii. 41). As other friends sought to read the novel Lawrence generally made some attempt to prevent them, but then gave in. At first he did not want Barbara Low to see the book, but by 11 December he agreed to let her finish it since she had read the beginning on a visit to Cornwall (iii. 41). The list of those who saw it grew to include the American poet Hilda Doolittle (iii. 56), who was to send TS1b to Lady Ottoline; the latter had read it by 20 January 1917.³⁴

By 20 December Methuen & Co. had seen TS1a, and immediately cancelled their contract for the rights to Lawrence's next three novels after *The Rainbow* (iii. 58). This left Pinker free to offer the novel to other, potentially more likely publishers. But Lawrence was no longer simply relying on the prospect of publication through the usual channels. Two

³² See footnote 74 and Explanatory notes on 60:33, 63:20 and 449:1.

³³ 1920–3; see *Letters*, iii. 24 n. 4.

³⁴ Hilda Doolittle ('H.D. '; *ibid.*, ii. 203n), in her autobiographical novel *Bid Me To Live* (1960), 'hadn't the strength nor the equipment to dredge the ore out of the manuscript you sent me' (p. 183); 'it seemed very long, very confused' (p. 66). Lady Ottoline noted 'Frieda's handwriting' in TS1b, gave it to Aldous Huxley (*Garsington* 128), and probably Clive Bell and Philip Morrell (letters from Bell to Ottoline, n.d. [Jan.–Feb. 1917], UT, and to Vanessa Bell, 20 Jan. 1917, King's College, Cambridge). Dorothy Brett knew it by 14 Jan. (*Collected Letters of K. Mansfield*, ed. V. O'Sullivan & M. Scott, Oxford, i. 292); Edward Marsh (*Letters*, i. 459n) may have seen it in January (iii. 76).

days earlier, Koteliansky had suggested publication in Russia if a translation could be made;³⁵ Lawrence was also turning to Lady Cynthia Asquith and to Catherine Carswell (iii. 55, 58) with questions about the protection he might gain by dedicating his work to a patron or patroness.

By mid-January 1917, Lawrence's old publisher Duckworth had also refused the novel (iii. 80). During January, too, Martin Secker (who would publish the novel's first English edition in 1921) turned the book down, explaining to Pinker a few days later that 'the difficulties with which we are contending just now . . . compel us to adopt the policy of not increasing our present commitments until there is an end to the War and a return to normal working conditions'.³⁶ Then, on 23 January, Constable & Co. wrote to Pinker that they were rejecting the novel upon the recommendation of two readers:

One of our readers wondered whether Mr Lawrence really meant the first part of the book to be published as it stands, because it has been very much altered, and in some cases the alterations do not fit into what follows. Also we feel that the present would be a most unfavourable time for the publication of the book in its present form. In the first place, there are the writer's expressions of antipathy to England and the forms of English civilisation. At the present time, when people are sacrificing all that is dearest to them for their country, such expressions are we think bound to rouse the resentment both of the reviewers and the public. In the second place, the destructive philosophy as it is expressed in this book would we think be particularly unwelcome at the present time, and the same might perhaps be said of the author's 'detached' attitudes toward the events of the present day.³⁷

Constable then said that they would reconsider the novel if Lawrence would alter, compress or modify it. The report is the only surviving pre-publication account of *Women in Love* from a publisher's point of view, and sheds considerable light on the attitudes which made publication so difficult to arrange. For Lawrence to question the 'forms of English civilisation' while the First World War raged was unforgivable. For his part, given such a reaction, Lawrence would have liked not to offer the novel to the English public at all (iii. 67, 72, 76, 78), but because he was so short of money he stopped short of asking Pinker to withdraw the book completely.

³⁵ Ibid. 54. Catherine Carswell believed that the scheme for publication in Russia was mostly 'an excuse' for Koteliansky to send DHL £10 'on account from Russia' (*The Savage Pilgrimage*, 1st edn., 1932, p. 80 n. 1).

³⁶ Letter from Secker to Pinker, 6 February 1917, U111.

³⁷ Located at NWU.