

**THE FOX  
THE CAPTAIN'S DOLL  
THE LADYBIRD**

**D. H. LAWRENCE**

EDITED BY  
**DIETER MEHL**



**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 *The Fox*, *The Captain's Doll*, *The Ladybird* now correctly established from the original sources and first published in 1992, © the Estate of Frieda Lawrence Ravagli 1992. Introduction and notes © Cambridge University Press 1992. 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 1923, 1928, 1930, 1931) in their respective territories, for the authorisation granted to Cambridge University Press through the Frieda Lawrence Ravagli Estate for use of the work as published in preparing the new scholarly text.

First published in paperback 2001

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

*Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data applied for*

ISBN 0 521 35266 5 hardback  
ISBN 0 521 00708 9 paperback

## CONTENTS

General editors' preface	<i>page</i> vii
Acknowledgements	ix
Chronology	x
Cue-titles	xv
Introduction	xvii
'The Fox': first version, 1918–20	xix
The three 'novelettes', 1921–3	xxiii
Publication	xxvii
Reception	xxxii
Texts	xxxvii
<i>THE FOX, THE CAPTAIN'S DOLL, THE LADYBIRD</i>	
The Fox	5
The Captain's Doll	73
The Ladybird	155
Appendixes	
I The Ending of the First Version of 'The Fox'	223
II 'The Fox', Hermitage and 'those farm girls'	231
Explanatory notes	235
Textual apparatus	275

## INTRODUCTION

Between October and December 1921, shortly before setting off on his long journey to Ceylon, Australia and America, D. H. Lawrence revised a number of short stories for a collected volume (*England, My England*) and wrote three long tales which he called his 'novelettes': 'The Captain's Doll', 'The Fox' and 'The Ladybird'.<sup>1</sup> Even before he had completed the last of them, he expressed a wish that they should appear in a volume by themselves (iv. 134). They were all based, to some extent, on earlier stories whose manuscripts had been returned to Lawrence by his former agent J. B. Pinker in May 1920,<sup>2</sup> but only in the case of 'The Fox' (first written in 1918) did Lawrence actually incorporate any of the text of the early version. 'The Captain's Doll' is only very loosely connected with 'The Mortal Coil' (first written in 1913); the third story, first written in 1915 and still called 'The Thimble' by Lawrence when he began rewriting it (1 December 1921), was retitled 'The Ladybird' two days later (iv. 139) and described by him as 'quite new' when he sent the manuscript to his English agent Curtis Brown on 9 January 1922 (iv. 159). Lawrence himself never suggested a title for the volume. The three novellas were published in London by Martin Secker in March 1923 under the title *The Ladybird* and in New York by Thomas Seltzer as *The Captain's Doll* the following month.<sup>3</sup>

### 'The Fox': first version, 1918–20

The first explicit reference by Lawrence to 'The Fox' is in a letter to Katherine Mansfield of 5 December 1918, where he told her: 'I've not done "The Fox" yet – but I've done "The Blind Man" – the end queer and ironical. –' (iii. 302–3). Five days later he wrote to her again, 'I wrote the

<sup>1</sup> See *Letters*, iv. 143. (Subsequent references to *Letters*, ii., iii. and iv. are given in the text with volume and page numbers.)

<sup>2</sup> See *Letters*, iii. 472 and n. 2, 529, and Tedlock, *Lawrence MSS* 89, for the list of stories DHL believed to be with Pinker; DHL had asked for his manuscripts 'named in your list' back on 8 February 1920.

<sup>3</sup> Secker's title page includes all three titles; Seltzer's has *The Captain's Doll: Three Novelettes*. On this change see Explanatory note on 157: 1.

fox story – rather odd and amusing’, and he offered to send it to her, together with his essays on education, via his wife Frieda (iii. 307). This he seems to have done, because on 20 December he enquired whether she had passed the stories on to his agent Pinker and in a letter of 9 January 1919 he assumed that Pinker had received the manuscripts of ‘The Fox’ and ‘John Thomas’ (iii. 309, 319). There is, however, an earlier reference to his having written ‘three short stories which ought to sell: two are very good’ in a letter to Pinker of 23 November 1918; it is very likely that the three stories are ‘The Fox’, ‘The Blind Man’ and ‘John Thomas’.<sup>4</sup> Perhaps it was ‘The Fox’ that was not considered ‘very good’, and when Lawrence told Katherine Mansfield on 5 December he had ‘not done’ the story he probably meant that he had not got it into its final shape ready to send off, but that he had at least drafted it by 23 November. The references, early in the story, to November (12: 34–5) and to the end of the War (17: 24) strongly suggest a date shortly after the Armistice (11 November).

It appears, then, from the correspondence that ‘The Fox’ was begun in November 1918 while the Lawrences were staying at Hermitage, Berkshire, where they had fled from London on 22 October because Frieda was ill with a bad cold and needed a change of air. They were now again using the cottage they had occupied between December 1917 and May 1918, after their expulsion from Cornwall. They returned to it more than once in 1918 and 1919 and stayed there intermittently between April 1919 and their departures from England in October (Frieda) and November (Lawrence) of that year.

Lawrence was particularly fond of Hermitage and its surroundings which reminded him of Hardy’s *Woodlanders*, though at the same time he seems to have felt a kind of panic there, fearing he might ‘go into a soft sort of Hardy-sleep’ (iii. 224). This is why he soon abandoned the idea of settling there permanently after he had looked at one or two available cottages. He liked walking in the woods and he enjoyed the view from his window, especially when he was laid up with the flu and unable to work.

By his own standards, 1918 had not been a particularly productive year. During the first part he was working mainly on the essays that eventually became *Studies in Classic American Literature* (1923), had completed the collection of poems for *Bay* and had put together the little volume of *New Poems*, published by Martin Secker in October 1918. He had also, in July

<sup>4</sup> *Letters*, iii. 299. ‘The Blind Man’ was published in *English Review* (July 1920); ‘John Thomas’ was published as ‘Tickets, Please’ in *Strand* (April 1919); both stories were included in *England, My England*. See Cambridge edition of *England, My England* xxxiv.

1918, begun *Movements in European History*, mainly because it offered a prospect of immediate financial reward, but also partly because he was inspired by his reading of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, which fitted in with his mood of thorough disillusionment during this last phase of the war. The 'biographical details' he sent to the poet Robert Nichols on his thirty-third birthday, 11 September 1918, succinctly sum up his situation and temper at the time: 'always lived with no money – always shall – very sick of the world, like to die with the nausea of it' (iii. 282).

It is clear that the first version of 'The Fox' was written almost concurrently with 'The Blind Man' and 'John Thomas', but finished at Middleton-by-Wirsworth where Lawrence returned on 28 November 1918 to the small house they occupied between May 1918 and April 1919; his letters suggest that he felt he could work better there than at Hermitage (iii. 298). On 15 January 1919, he sent another story to Pinker ('Wintery Peacock'), at the same time acknowledging the return of the manuscripts of the other stories which Pinker had had typed (iii. 320). These stories were yet another attempt to mend his desperate financial situation; Pinker succeeded in placing all of them within the next year or two and they were published in various magazines between 1919 and 1921. At the time Lawrence felt that he was only writing to keep body and soul together. On 22 December 1918 he told Lady Cynthia Asquith: 'Ah, what a happy day it will be, when I need not write any more – except a letter occasionally. I am tired of writing', and, hoping for a small legacy from Germany, he continued: 'Oh my dear sweet Jesus, if I had even £100 a year I would never write another stroke for the public' (iii. 311).

In this mood any transaction by Pinker was some relief, and on 18 June 1919 Lawrence was able to write to him, 'I'm glad you sold "The Fox"'. I suppose they won't pay the £30. until they print – worse luck.'<sup>5</sup> *Hutchinson's Story Magazine*, which eventually published the story, had only just

<sup>5</sup> *Letters*, iii. 364. On 17 June 1919 Vivian Carter, on behalf of 'The Periodical Publishing Company Ltd', wrote to Pinker: 'I have read Lawrence's story and though it is very long – about 7,000 words in length – I like it personally and think we could publish it. Please let me know what his price would be. Would he accept £30?', and on 23 June, in reply to a letter from Pinker of 18 June, he wrote: 'I note acceptance of my offer of £30. for Mr. D. H. Lawrence's story "The Fox"' (TMSS NYPL). It appears, then, that Carter bought the story for *Hutchinson's Story Magazine*.

Pinker had also sent the story to *Everybody's Magazine* in New York, whence it was returned with a letter dated 5 August 1919 with the following comment: 'I am sending back with our sincere regret D. H. Lawrence's story, "The Fox". It seemed to us rather too unpleasant in theme and conception, though of course it is a striking piece of work. I fear its appeal would have a rather limited audience' (TMS NYPL).

begun to appear. It was a rather popular publication, featuring mainly short stories, some longer tales in instalments, poems and 'humour', as well as 'Children's pages'. Among the regular contributors were Max Beerbohm, Gilbert Frankau, Cosmo Hamilton, Frank Swinnerton, Hugh Walpole and Mrs Humphry Ward. Lawrence, who had not heard of the magazine, repeatedly got its name wrong, confusing it with *Strand* magazine and with *Nash's Magazine*.<sup>6</sup>

From a letter to Pinker of 8 July 1919 it appears that the editor had asked for an abridgement: 'I have never received from you any suggestion concerning the cutting of "The Fox". If the editor wants to cut it down, however, let him send me the MS. and I will do it.'<sup>7</sup> He received the suggestions in question, together with the story, two days later and sent Pinker the shortened version by return: 'I wish I could have cut more – but I simply can't, without mutilating the story' (iii. 374). Evidently, Pinker sent the typescript (ribbon copy)<sup>8</sup> Lawrence had asked for and this was returned with the alterations and cuts. He cut only some 580 words (out of about 8,400) and made a number of other small alterations. He was back in Hermitage at the time and might have included some more vivid impressions of the place and of the people he had described, but the changes were made in such a hurry that the *Hutchinson* version can hardly be called a deliberate revision, and Lawrence ignored it completely when he expanded the story more than two years later.<sup>9</sup>

It was some time before Lawrence heard any more about 'The Fox'. On 16 September 1920 he received proofs, apparently for the second time, and his reaction shows some impatience with the delay: 'Damn *Nash's*. They have been hanging fire with this story ever so long. I thought they'd printed it – have had proofs before' (iii. 596–7). The story was published in the November 1920 issue of *Hutchinson's Story Magazine* (iii. 17, 477–90), with five black-and-white anonymous illustrations and with the initial description, characteristic of the magazine's general tone: 'A fine

<sup>6</sup> See *Letters*, iv. 134 and 143; iii. 597 and n. 1. For *Strand* see footnote 4. As far as is known there were no negotiations with *Nash's Magazine*, but see *Letters*, iii. 576, where DHL refers to it. See also Judith G. Ruderman, 'Tracking Lawrence's *Fox*: An Account of its Composition, Evolution, and Publication', *Studies in Bibliography*, xxxiii (1980), 206–21, for details of *Hutchinson's Story Magazine*.

<sup>7</sup> *Letters*, iii. 371 and n. 2. The deletion in the letter ('let him do it') suggests that DHL's first thought was to let the editor abridge the story; then decided to do it himself. It was presumably Carter who asked for the abridgement. See *Letters*, iii. 373.

<sup>8</sup> See 'Texts', below.

<sup>9</sup> See Ruderman, 'Tracking Lawrence's *Fox*', 207–9. Her account of the *Hutchinson* version attaches more significance to DHL's hasty changes than seems warranted by the circumstances.

story of a post-war partnership between two modern young women – and the intervention of the inevitable man.’ Lawrence is introduced as ‘Author of “Sons and Lovers,” “The White Peacock,” etc.’ The illustrations were accompanied by captions taken from the story, e.g. “I shall shoot!” cried March. “What do you want?”” and ‘She was in his power. He stepped forward and put his arm round her.’ There were also, interposed between the pages of ‘The Fox’, glossy photographs of leading stage beauties of the day, a regular feature of *Hutchinson’s Story Magazine*.

On 10 November 1920, writing from Taormina, Sicily, Lawrence – now without an agent, having parted company with Pinker in January 1920 – asked Secker for a copy of the magazine of which he said he knew nothing; it was dispatched by Secker on 31 December and acknowledged on 14 January 1921 (iii. 621, 647–8). At the same time Lawrence was in correspondence with his new American agent Robert Mountsier about the American rights in ‘The Fox’. It seems that neither of the two was quite satisfied with the ending of the story and Lawrence was evidently contemplating a revision before including the story in a collected volume. On 30 November 1920 he wrote to Mountsier: ‘The end – yes, have all the opinions you can – is clipped as short as possible because editors complain so bitterly that the stories are too *long* for magazine work. I’d alter it for a book’ (iii. 627). Seven weeks later, shortly after returning from his brief trip to Sardinia, he repeated this intention in a letter to Mountsier: ‘I’ll do the end soon. – When I’ve finished *Mr. Noon* . . . I’ll remember about long short stories’ (iii. 651). He was as good as his word, and when he had settled down in Taormina again after his summer in Germany and Austria, he wrote the three ‘novelettes’ between October and December 1921. The short version of ‘The Fox’ was completely transformed by the addition of ‘a long new tail’ (iv. 127), more than twice as long as the original story. The first version, with the exception of the shortened form printed in *Hutchinson’s Story Magazine*, was never published in Lawrence’s lifetime.<sup>10</sup>

### The three ‘novelettes’, 1921–3

On 18 October 1920 the Lawrences had settled at the Fontana Vecchia in Taormina, Sicily, for the winter. During the last months of 1920 and the first half of 1921 Lawrence resumed writing *Aaron’s Rod*, which he completed in June while staying near Baden-Baden, wrote *Mr Noon* and

<sup>10</sup> A facsimile of the manuscript, together with a transcription, was included in Harry T. Moore, *A. D. H. Lawrence Miscellany* (Carbondale, 1959), pp. 26–46. See Appendix I for the original ending.



wrote his 'Diary of a Trip to Sardinia' (later to become *Sea and Sardinia*). He then began *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. From mid-July 1921 the Lawrences toured for a couple of months, visiting Thumersbach near Zell am See, Austria, where they stayed with Frieda's sister Johanna von Schreibershofen and her family for five weeks, then Florence, Siena, Rome and Capri, before returning to the Fontana Vecchia on 28 September. There Lawrence seems to have felt like completing several of his literary projects rather than beginning something entirely new, mainly because he was pondering his departure from Europe. He wrote to Seltzer on 8 October: 'I will collect my short stories, for a volume, to have my MSS in order – if such a thing be possible. I am tired of Europe – it is somehow finished for me – finished with *Aaron's Rod*' (iv. 93). This was repeated in a letter to Mountsier ten days later (iv. 103), and on 24 October he told his old friend Catherine Carswell: 'I am not very busy: just pottering with short stories. Think I may as well get the MSS together as far as possible. Feel like making my will also. Not that I'm going to die. But to give myself a nice sense of finality' (iv. 105). At the same time, however, he must have been already working on 'The Captain's Doll' because in the next sentence he asked for information about the 'tight tartan trews' worn by some Scots regiments.

Lawrence had by then obviously laid aside a 'story novel' about Venice which he had been working on during September and early October, as well as his plan for a series of 'six or seven Italian Stories that would make a book by itself' (iv. 80, 81, 83, 93). He had more than once during the summer complained about his inability to work; on 9 October he wrote to the American poet Amy Lowell, 'When I gather myself together I want to set to work. I only did two poems all the summer' (iv. 97). When he had at last settled down to work he revised the short stories that were published as *England, My England* by Seltzer in October 1922 and wrote the three novelettes based on earlier short stories which he had apparently first intended to revise for the same volume as the other stories.

'The Captain's Doll' was the first of the three long tales written at Taormina. It is based, though very loosely, on 'The Mortal Coil', which was therefore omitted from the *England, My England* volume.<sup>11</sup> The second half of the tale evidently grew out of Lawrence's experiences at Thumersbach and in Germany. On 30 July, ten days after arriving at Thumersbach, he had written to Thomas Seltzer: 'Perhaps when I am cajoled into a good mood, I will write you a Tyrol story – short novel – like

<sup>11</sup> See *England, My England* xx. DHL may also have felt that the story did not fit the English setting of the other stories.

“Wintry Peacock” (iv. 58). Frieda remembered the story as being written in Thumersbach, but this is probably a mistake induced by the story’s setting.<sup>12</sup> After the first reference to the story in his letter to Catherine Carswell, Lawrence told Mountsier on 31 October: ‘Also am just at the end of quite a different story – “The Captains Doll” – about 16 or 20,000 words I should think – long. Will send you that also when it’s typed’ (iv. 107), and on 2 November, informing his artist friend Earl Brewster about his literary activities, he said: ‘I . . . suddenly wrote a very funny long story called “The Captains Doll” – which I haven’t finished yet. But I have just got it high up in the mountains of the Tyrol, and don’t quite know how to get it down without breaking its neck’ (iv. 109). Four days later, however, the ending was written and Lawrence told Mountsier: ‘I have finished “The Captain’s Doll”: good, but I don’t know if it will sell’ (iv. 112). A day later the manuscript was posted to Mrs Carmichael in Florence for typing.<sup>13</sup>

Then Lawrence began revising ‘The Fox’. The carbon typescript (hereafter TCC) of the early version had been returned by Pinker in May 1920 (iii. 529). Lawrence started by revising the story very lightly until he came to p. 24 of TCC, where he began rewriting the text between the lines. Of the next five pages only two were lightly revised, the other three (pp. 26, 28–9) were practically replaced by an interlinear version. After p. 29, Lawrence abandoned the typescript altogether and added 38 closely written pages in place of the last two typed pages (to judge by the amount of text remaining). This new section transformed the short story into a long tale of about the same length as ‘The Captain’s Doll’. On 13 November Lawrence noted in his diary: ‘write Fox ending’, and on the 16th: ‘Finish Fox’.<sup>14</sup> The day before he had written to his mother-in-law, the Baroness Anna von Richthofen:

Then I have written two novelettes. ‘The Captain’s Doll’, which takes place in Germany and Zell: the other, ‘The Fox’, in England. I want to get all my manuscripts settled up. That way I shall collect a book of novelettes and short stories. But I’ve got rather too many for one book. (iv. 121–2)

On 16 November he told Earl Brewster that he ‘put a long tail to “The Fox”, which was a bobbed short story. Now he careers with a strange and fiery brush’ (iv. 126), and on 18 November he wrote to Mountsier: ‘I put a

<sup>12</sup> See Frieda Lawrence, *“Not I, But The Wind . . .”* (Santa Fe, 1934), p. 114.

<sup>13</sup> See diary entry in Tedlock, *Lawrence MSS* 94. Little is known about Mrs Carmichael, but see ‘Texts’, below.

<sup>14</sup> Tedlock, *Lawrence MSS* 94. For a description of the combined typescript and autograph manuscript see David Farmer, ‘A Descriptive and Analytical Catalogue of the D. H.

long new tail on the "Fox". It will be a good book of stories' (iv. 127). This suggests that Lawrence still thought he might put all his stories in one volume. He was particularly pleased with his 'two long stories', as he told Seltzer on 26 November:

I have got two long stories: 'The Captain's Doll', 34,000 words and 'The Fox' about the same. I will send them to Mountsier the minute I get the typescript from Florence. I think they are very interesting . . .

'The Fox' and 'The Captain's Doll' are so modern, so new: a new manner. (iv. 131-2)

On 1 December, he had the typescript (two copies) of 'The Fox' from Mrs Carmichael and dispatched a copy, probably together with 'The Captain's Doll' and six other stories, to Mountsier on the same day.

The letter in which the typescripts are listed also contains the first statement that the three long stories should go in a volume by themselves: 'I am doing a third long story - "The Thimble" - to go with "Fox" and "Captain's Doll" in one volume'.<sup>15</sup> After that, Lawrence always referred to the three stories as 'novelettes' and insisted on having them published in a separate volume. He sent duplicates of the typescripts of 'The Fox' and 'The Captain's Doll' to his new English agent Curtis Brown on 12 December (with a covering letter dated 7 December), suggesting that Martin Secker should publish the short-story volume first, not the three novelettes.<sup>16</sup> A similar statement occurs in a letter to Mountsier, also dated 7 December, where Lawrence again insists that the three novelettes should not appear in the same volume as the other short stories he was revising at the time (iv. 144-5).

'The Ladybird' was, then, begun more or less immediately after Lawrence had finished revising 'The Fox'. Again, he began by rewriting an earlier story, as appears from the letter to Mountsier of 1 December, where the new story is referred to as 'The Thimble', written in 1915. Only two days later, however, the new title had been found (iv. 139). It is possible that Lawrence began to revise the early manuscript, which he had had back from Pinker early in 1920, but soon gave it up and only made use of the central situation in 'The Thimble' and of a few

Lawrence Collection at The University of Texas at Austin' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1970), A13.

<sup>15</sup> *Letters*, iv. 134; see also pp. 139 and 143.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, iv. 143-4. Listing the manuscripts sent to Curtis Brown, he repeated: 'These three I want to go in one volume by themselves . . . These I call the three novelettes' (iv. 143). And to Secker he wrote on the same day: 'I want these to be a book by themselves, later' (iv. 145).

phrases.<sup>17</sup> Beyond that, ‘The Ladybird’ is an entirely new creation, combining some of Lawrence’s war experiences with a great variety of mythological, anthropological and psychological references, testifying to his wide and unorthodox reading.<sup>18</sup>

Neither Lawrence’s diary nor the letters tell us exactly when the story was finished. The letter to the South African painter Jan Juta of 3 December 1921 talks of the three novelettes as if they were completed: ‘I have done three long stories’ (iv. 139). This must refer to an earlier manuscript,<sup>19</sup> because in his letter dated 7 December, he told Curtis Brown: ‘I am writing a third: “The LadyBird” – about the same length – 30,000 words or so . . . I will send “The LadyBird” as soon as it is done’, and added in a postscript that it was ‘nearly ready’ (iv. 143–4). Five days later Lawrence wrote to Secker that ‘Of the three novelettes, all are finished, but one is at the typist still’ (iv. 148), and on 21 December he told Mountsier, ‘I have finished the third of the *novelettes* – “Ladybird” – and will send it you when it comes from the typewriter. With “The Fox”, “The Ladybird”, and the “Captains Doll”, I think you have a rather nice volume’ (iv. 150). It usually took Mrs Carmichael about a fortnight to type manuscripts of this size, and the typescripts of ‘The Ladybird’ were received by Lawrence on 3 January 1922, as he noted in his diary.<sup>20</sup> Copies were sent to Mountsier and Curtis Brown simultaneously on 9 January, together with ‘England, My England’ which had arrived that day (iv. 155–7, 159). In the parcel to Mountsier Lawrence also enclosed the ‘handwritten MSS of “Fox” and of “Captains Doll”, so that I needn’t cart them about’ (iv. 156); to Seltzer he wrote on the same day that the three stories would ‘make a really interesting book – perhaps even a real seller’ (iv. 157).

## Publication

From early on, then, the three ‘novelettes’ were treated by Lawrence as a single volume, except that he wanted Mountsier to sell them to magazines

<sup>17</sup> There was an earlier manuscript of the revised story, part of which DHL inserted in his final MS. See ‘Texts’, below. These re-used leaves cover the same episode as occurs in ‘The Thimble’, which suggests that the first draft of the revision was closer to the early story than the final version of ‘The Ladybird’. There is no doubt, however, that the earlier manuscript dates from the time of revision, i.e. November–December 1921, and was not another version of ‘The Thimble’. See *England, My England* xviii–ix, for the textual history of ‘The Thimble’.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. the source studies referred to in the Explanatory notes.

<sup>19</sup> See footnote 17, and ‘Texts’, below, for evidence of an earlier manuscript.

<sup>20</sup> See Tedlock, *Lawrence MSS* 95.

first. 'The Fox' was the first story to be placed, and it appeared in the *Dial* in four instalments between May and August 1922. Few details of the transaction have survived,<sup>21</sup> but it is clear from the correspondence between Mountsier and Seltzer that the latter also took an active part in the efforts to sell the stories to American magazines. In a letter to Mountsier of 25 May he discusses the possibilities and the problems for these long tales:

Hapgood has accepted THE CAPTAIN'S DOLL. But he wants to run it in one issue, and therefore must cut it down to about 2/5. He thinks, and I think he is right, that a story of this character cannot run for three months for readers of his class. We may be able to get \$1500 for it, or at least \$1000. I shall try for \$1500. He means to run it in October but says he will make an effort to do it sooner, if that will help me. If it were possible to communicate with Lawrence, I am of the opinion that we ought not to permit it to be cut so much without Lawrence's consent. But as it is, I believe we shall have to make up our minds ourselves. Apart from the money, it will do Lawrence a lot of good to appear with so excellent a story in a magazine with so large a circulation. I am strongly in favor of selling it to them. Let me know at once what you think.

THE LADYBIRD.

I don't think any magazine will take this, except perhaps The Dial. It seems as though we will be able to publish all three stories in the fall, of which I am very glad.

Perhaps you had better telegraph me about THE CAPTAIN'S DOLL.<sup>22</sup>

On 17 June Seltzer wrote again, 'I shall try to wind up the sale next week', and on 22 June he reported, 'I have sold *The Captain's Doll* for \$1000 and a check is coming in a week or so.'<sup>23</sup> His efforts on behalf of 'The Ladybird' were less successful. In the letter of 22 June he told Mountsier:

<sup>21</sup> In a letter of 11 April 1922 to Mountsier (TMS UT), Gilbert Seldes, the managing director, announced he would be sending a cheque for 'The Fox', and on 23 June he informed Mountsier that the story would have to appear in four instalments. See also Ruderman, 'Tracking Lawrence's Fox', 216-19, and Nicholas Joost and Alvin Sullivan, *D. H. Lawrence and 'The Dial'* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1970). 'The Fox' appeared in much more distinguished company in the *Dial* than it did in *Hutchinson's Story Magazine*. Among contributors at the time were Arthur Schnitzler, Hugo von Hofmannsthal, W. B. Yeats, T. S. Eliot, John Dos Passos and such artists as Henri Matisse and Marc Chagall. DHL himself had earlier suggested to Mountsier that 'The Captain's Doll' should be offered to the *Dial* (iv. 130).

<sup>22</sup> TMS UT. See also *D. H. Lawrence: Letters to Thomas and Adele Seltzer*, ed. Gerald M. Lacy (Santa Barbara, 1976), p. 223.

<sup>23</sup> TMS UT. See also *Letters to Thomas and Adele Seltzer*, pp. 226, 228. On 12 June, Seltzer had written to Mountsier: 'I am bargaining with Hearst's International. One thousand dollars sure. I am holding out for more, but I doubt if we can get any more' (TMS UT).

Had a talk with John Peale Bishop about *THE LADY BIRD*. They would be only too glad to take a story by Lawrence if they could get one about 3,000 words long. But I gave him the MS of *LADY BIRD*. He may reduce it to 10,000 words and run it in three issues, September to November. If *Vanity Fair* doesn't take it, I don't believe any other magazine will, except *The Dial*. It is superb, but not popular enough for a magazine like the *Red Book*.

A week later, however, he had to inform him that 'Bishop of *Vanity Fair* returned *Ladybird*. He can't reduce it enough to run in one issue and he does not see how the story can be broken into parts.'<sup>24</sup> 'The *Ladybird*' was then offered to the *Dial*, which was 'still flirting' with it in late November 1922, as Mountsier told Lawrence (iv. 341 n. 1).

The extreme financial importance of these negotiations becomes clear from Lawrence's letter written on 19 September 1922 to Secker who wanted to bring the book out sooner than was compatible with magazine publication:

Mountsier says *he* is trying to publish *Ladybird* here, and that the book must by no means appear in England before it is settled. I got \$1000 from *Hearsts* for "Captains Doll" – for the *International*. And it is this kind of money I have to live on. England makes me about £120 a year; if I got no more than that I should have to whistle my way across the globe. Therefore America must have the first consideration. On the English crust I could but starve, now as ever. (iv. 298–9)

Secker was apparently convinced that it would be better to publish the three novelettes before the collection of short stories (iv. 262 n. 1). As early as 21 March 1922 he had told Curtis Brown that he planned to bring out *The Ladybird* that November.<sup>25</sup> Lawrence repeatedly insisted that priority was to be given to the American publication, in periodicals especially, but Secker evidently went ahead with his plans to publish *The Ladybird* in 1922 and even got as far as setting the manuscript up in type: a surviving proof copy of the book bears the date 1922.<sup>26</sup> Lawrence

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 230. Before that, the story had been submitted to at least two other magazines: the *Metropolitan* (New York) returned the MS to Mountsier on 3 April (TMS UT). The editor, Carl Hovey, thought it was 'a beautiful specimen of Lawrence at his best', but too long, and he doubted if 'the large public which we are obliged to interest would get the right reaction from so uncommon a sex study'. On 7 June, Harry P. Burton, editor of *McCall's Magazine*, returned the story to Seltzer (it had been submitted by Mountsier) as 'rather recondite for our audience' (TMS UT). Burton's letter is wrongly dated 1933, but the correct date is confirmed by a reference to it in a letter from Seltzer to Mountsier of 12 June (TMS UT).

<sup>25</sup> *Letters*, iv. 258 n. 1. On 27 March, Curtis Brown's secretary asked Mountsier for his approval of the November date (TMS UT), but as early as 16 January DHL had told Curtis Brown: 'Mountsier writes in a frenzy, saying that Secker must not forestall Seltzer in publishing any of the books – Short Stories or otherwise' (iv. 168).

<sup>26</sup> In the collection of Mr George Lazarus; the proof copy agrees in all details, including misprints, with Secker's first edition of March 1923 (but see footnote 67). In August,

succeeded, however, in delaying the publication of the book till March 1923, mainly by insisting on the American rights and on his obligations to his American publishers. 'Secker *ought not* to publish the three novelettes before they are through here [in USA] . . . To let Secker publish just as he pleases would simply take the bread out of my mouth', he wrote angrily on 20 September 1922 to Curtis Brown, telling him of Seltzer's success in selling 'The Captain's Doll' and Mountsier's negotiations for 'The Ladybird' (iv. 302). He was evidently so annoyed with Secker that, when Mountsier and Seltzer visited him at Del Monte Ranch, near Taos, New Mexico, in January 1923, he considered arranging with another publisher for the publication of his next books, including the three novelettes (which Secker had already set up); he was persuaded by Curtis Brown to think better of it, however, and it was only a month before he severed his business connection with Mountsier.<sup>27</sup>

In the end, neither 'The Captain's Doll' nor 'The Ladybird' was published in a magazine. The *Dial* evidently declined 'The Ladybird', to Lawrence's great annoyance,<sup>28</sup> and after some frantic correspondence Hearst's eventually released 'The Captain's Doll' without publishing it, in February 1923.<sup>29</sup> In January Lawrence had suddenly realised that the story had not yet been published by Hearst's *International Magazine* and

Secker had asked Curtis Brown for the typescripts of the three novelettes, 'so that I may get ahead with the work of manufacture. I will not of course publish until February next, but it is of enormous advantage to my traveller to have the complete book in good time' (quoted in a letter from Curtis Brown's secretary to Mountsier of 21 August 1922, TMS UT). However, in a letter to Curtis Brown of 6 October 1922, Secker expressed his willingness to defer publication 'for a reasonable period, not exceeding June next, to suit American publication' (*Letters*, iv. 324 n. 2).

<sup>27</sup> Cf. *Letters*, iv. 15, and Mountsier's letter to Curtis Brown of 3 January 1923 (TMS UT). On 2 January, Curtis Brown had written to DHL about a business meeting with Secker, concluding: 'Secker is more keen and confident about your work than anyone else here so far as I can discover. He has had a good deal of trouble over the previous books, a fact well-known to the other publishers here, and if we were to propose a change now, the suspicion would prevail that Secker had got discouraged and given it up' (TMS UT).

<sup>28</sup> *Letters*, iv. 358. DHL evidently felt let down by the *Dial*'s editor Seldes. The delay had, of course, prevented publication elsewhere.

Apparently Mountsier made one more effort to place 'The Ladybird', because the story was returned by the *Century* (which had in the previous April (10th) declined 'The Captain's Doll', TMS UT) on 4 December by one of the editors, Carl van Doren, with the following comment: 'I suppose it is really a criticism of Lawrence's story, "The Ladybird," when I say that I am not enough excited by it to be willing either to run so long a story in one issue or to think that it would warrant publication in two parts in *The Century*. It has some very striking material, however' (TMS UT).

<sup>29</sup> A typescript of the story must, at this time, already have been in the hands of Seltzer. See *Letters*, iv. 341 n. 1, and 'Texts', below.

that therefore – since periodicals wanted *first* publication and would not publish what was already in book form – it could not come out yet (iv. 371). Since Secker was still anxious to publish the three novelettes immediately and Lawrence was already going through the proofs of Seltzer's edition, he was in a very awkward position and tried to postpone the publication of both books. On 10 February 1923 he wrote to Curtis Brown: 'I was annoyed to hear from Seltzer that those Hearst people are holding back "The Captain's Doll" at least till June. I will let you know immediately they definitely fix their date.' In a postscript he added: "Those Hearst people promised to publish the "Capt's Doll" in January – They are a nuisance' (iv. 379–80). Ten days later Lawrence received a cable from Seltzer with the information that Hearst's had released the story and he immediately wrote to Curtis Brown and Secker asking them to fix a date for simultaneous publication with Seltzer.<sup>30</sup> He had a suspicion – not unjustified as events proved – that Secker wanted to publish without waiting for Seltzer: as he wrote to Seltzer on 19 January 1923:

... I don't trust Secker. And Curtis Brown says Secker is making a fine book of *Ladybird*, and will bring it out in March. I knew that was what they were up to. Hurry up your printers . . . be sure and be ready with the book *early* in March. That Secker shall not steal a march on us, and leave us stranded in April. (iv. 369)

In spite of all these efforts, however, Secker did 'steal a march' on them: *The Ladybird* was published in London by 22 March 1923, and *The Captain's Doll* in the USA less than a month later. The date of the American edition has been a matter of disagreement. Warren Roberts' bibliography gives 14 November 1923 and this has been accepted by most writers after him. It is certainly an error, however: the Library of Congress Register of Copyrights gives the publication date as 11 April 1923.<sup>31</sup> The book was announced in *Publisher's Weekly* of 21 April, under 'The Weekly Record of New Publications' (p. 1282). The first review of *The Captain's Doll* appeared in the *New York Times Book Review* of 22 April 1923 and commented on the different titles of the English and American editions. Since Seltzer usually published on Wednesdays (or Thursdays), 11 April is the actual publication date.

<sup>30</sup> *Letters*, iv. 389–91. See also Tedlock, *Lawrence MSS* 96–7.

<sup>31</sup> YU. See G. Thomas Tanselle, 'The Thomas Seltzer Imprint', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, lviii (1964), 429, which gives 11 April as publication date; E. D. McDonald, *A Bibliography of the Writings of D. H. Lawrence* (Philadelphia, 1925), p. 71, gives April 1923 as publication date.



## Reception

The reception of *The Ladybird* in England was from the first very favourable. On 27 March 1923, immediately after publication, Secker wrote to Curtis Brown, 'I am pretty sure "The Ladybird" is going to do well, and I have already gone to press with another edition' (iv. 427 n. 1); on 27 April Frieda reported to friends she and Lawrence had made in 1922, the young Danish painters Kai Göttsche and Knud Merrild, that 'Lawrence's *Captain's Doll* is a great success in England' (iv. 434). The first review to appear, in *The Times Literary Supplement* of 22 March 1923 (p. 195), was indeed highly complimentary.<sup>32</sup> Arthur McDowall thought that the form of the 'little novels' suited Lawrence particularly well, 'giving him something of the range and depth he wants, and a limit too'. They showed Lawrence at his best. McDowall's opening sentences throw an interesting light on Lawrence's reputation in England at the time:

Among our novelists there is no one who seems to be the voice of some compelling power in quite the way that Mr. D. H. Lawrence does. It is a power astonishingly rich in beauty, deep-flowing, very near the sources of life, but it can also be so darkly physical and overwhelming as to spread the oppression which he appears to feel. How good, then, to find him in a mood where he is at ease with his inspiration and not submerged by it: the stream running clear, and his own interest not flagging. Delightful, too, to see him refuting the critics by telling a story with the ease and mastery he shows here.

While praising the realism of the tales, McDowall thought that the Count in 'The Ladybird' represented an idea brought to life by the author rather than a living person and that 'the story floats like a romance which is straining at its moorings in the real', whereas in the other two tales the author was in full control of the fantasy. He responded perceptively and sympathetically both to the theme and to the poetry of the three stories: Lawrence, 'with all his keen sense of the present, treats the war as art must treat it in the future', and concluded:

The whole book, indeed, is steeped in imagination. The very things which give titles to the stories make, each of them, an image. And the tension in the stories, through which beat the mystery and pulse of life, is relieved and made beautiful by this imaginativeness.

Charles Marriott in the *Manchester Guardian*, 6 April 1923, was hardly less enthusiastic: 'It is doubtful if anything in recent fiction combines so true an impression of life with so vivid an account of the accidents of

<sup>32</sup> Collected in R. P. Draper, ed., *D. H. Lawrence: The Critical Heritage* (1970), pp. 191-2.