

**THE FIRST
'WOMEN IN LOVE'**

D. H. LAWRENCE

EDITED BY
JOHN WORTHEN
AND
LINDETH VASEY



**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 First 'Women in Love'* is established from the original sources and first published in 1998, © the Estate of Frieda Lawrence Ravagli 1998. Introduction and notes © Cambridge University Press 1998. 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.

First published in paperback 2001

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

Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data

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

The First 'Women in Love' / D. H. Lawrence; edited by
John Worthen and Lindeth Vasey.

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

ISBN 0 521 37326 3

I. Worthen, John. II. Vasey, Lindeth. III. Title.

IV. Series: Lawrence, D. H. (David Herbert), 1885-1930. Works. 1979.

PR6023.A93F57 1998

823'.912 - dc20 97-18195 CIP

ISBN 0 521 37326 3 hardback

ISBN 0 521 00709 7 paperback

CONTENTS

General editors' preface	<i>page</i> vii
Acknowledgements	ix
Chronology	x
Cue-titles	xv
Introduction	xvii
'The Sisters' (first version, March–June 1913)	xix
'The Sisters II' (second version, August 1913–January 1914)	xxi
'The Wedding Ring' (third version, February–May 1914)	xxii
<i>The Rainbow</i> and 'The Sisters III' (fourth version, two novels, November 1914–March 1915 and April–June 1916)	xxv
<i>The First 'Women in Love'</i> written (fifth version, July–November 1916)	xxix
<i>The First 'Women in Love'</i> prepared for publication (fifth version revised, November 1916)	xxxiii
Responses from publishers	xxxiv
Responses from other readers	xl
Text and status	xlviii
<i>THE FIRST 'WOMEN IN LOVE'</i>	I
Appendix	445
Explanatory notes	453
Textual apparatus	513
Line-end hyphenation	530
A note on pounds, shillings and pence	532

INTRODUCTION

On 20 November 1916, D. H. Lawrence sent to his agent, J. B. Pinker, a complete and corrected typescript (totalling almost 175,000 words) of his newest novel, here called *The First 'Women in Love'*: the first version of the novel published in 1920 as *Women in Love*. He had been working on this book since the end of April 1916, though it was also the culmination of the fictional enterprise based on the lives of the Brangwen sisters which had occupied him since early in 1913; but, even by the standards of his own most intense periods of work, what he had accomplished during the seven months between April and November 1916 had been quite extraordinary. He had written the novel while living in isolation in Cornwall, unsure about what he was capable of earning, subject to constant uncertainty about the war and its progress, and about his own status as unscripted civilian. And he had actually written it twice within that seven-month period, producing in *The First 'Women in Love'* what is arguably his most important piece of fiction of the second decade of the twentieth century – a novel which, until now, has been read by very few people, and whose very existence as an independent text has been ignored.¹ This Introduction will trace the composition history of *The First 'Women in Love'* up to November 1916; and will then examine its very first readers' response to it.

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

In the middle of March 1913, while Lawrence and Frieda Weekley were living at Gargnano on the Lago di Garda in Italy, he began to write a novel which he entitled 'The Sisters'² which, on 5 April, he would cheerfully

¹ The two surviving early drafts of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, of 1926 and 1927, have been published, as *The First Lady Chatterley* (New York, 1944) and *John Thomas and Lady Jane* (1972); the first draft of *The Plumed Serpent* has also been published, as *Quetzalcoatl*, ed. Louis L. Martz (Redding, 1995), but this was a state of the text which DHL had no intention of publishing, as he always knew that he was going to rewrite the book. The first surviving long draft of *Sons and Lovers* will also be published, as *Paul Morel*: it will appear in the Cambridge Edition of the Works of D. H. Lawrence, although it was never finished, nor submitted to a publisher.

² 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 by volume and page number.)

refer to as a 'pot-boiler' (i. 536), then 110 pages long. He badly needed to write a new novel; he and Frieda were unmarried and totally dependent upon his writing; and while *Sons and Lovers*, finished five months earlier, had been accepted, it was not yet published, and he had few other prospects of income. He had also spent a good deal of time that spring writing another novel ('The Insurrection of Miss Houghton') which had turned out to be unpublishable.³ By 23 April they had moved to Germany and he had reached page 145 of 'The Sisters', but complained to his friend Arthur McLeod⁴ that it was a book '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 his friend Edward Garnett,⁵ reader for Duckworth (about to publish *Sons and Lovers*), that he had completed 180 pages of 'The Sisters', now projected as a work of around 300 pages: '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, and must have sent Garnett the book's first part. By 17 May, Garnett had read and commented on it, and Lawrence was at page 256, 'but still can't see the end very clear' (i. 550). A fortnight later he was 'nearly finished', having reached page 283, and early in June he sent Garnett the 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 this first draft; they are not however written in the first person which Lawrence twice remarked was the format of the first draft (i. 550, ii. 20), and so they probably derive from a slightly later revision: he thought the first-person method was part of what 'ailed the book' (i. 550). Since Lawrence had estimated that the first draft would be 300 pages long, this early fragment may well represent the way the book ended.⁶

³ It was completely rewritten in 1920 as *The Lost Girl*; see the Cambridge Edition, ed. John Worthen (Cambridge, 1981), pp. xix–xxiv.

⁴ McLeod had been one of DHL's fellow-teachers in Croydon from 1908 (see *Letters*, i. 136 n. 3).

⁵ See *Letters*, i. 297 n. 2.

⁶ The fragment is printed as Appendix I ('Fragment of "The Sisters"') in *R* 463–70, and also in *Women in Love*, ed. David Farmer, Lindeth Vasey and John Worthen with an Introduction and Notes by Mark Kinkead-Weekes (Penguin, 1995), pp. 489–96. For full details of the writing, revision and publication of the novels *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*, see *R* xix–lxxvi and *WL* xx–lxi respectively.

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

After spending the first part of the summer of 1913 in England, Lawrence and Frieda returned to Germany in August, where Lawrence started work on a second draft of 'The Sisters'. By 24 August he had 'made two false starts already' (ii. 66); a week later, complaining that he had 'written one or two things about which I know nothing – like a somnambulist', he complained that the book seemed equally hard to grasp:

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.

That's *my* Klagen. I look to Italy to wake me up. Think of me as the Sleeping Beauty.⁷

This second writing, so uncertain at the beginning, quickly became something he was sure of, even before he and Frieda left for Italy; 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 the 15th he had finished its first hundred pages, and was thinking that he could even complete the draft in another month (ii. 74–5); but he was interrupted first by a walking trip across Switzerland to meet Frieda and her brother-in-law in Lerici, on the Italian coast; and then by the business of finding and settling into a house in nearby Fiascherino. He was working on the novel at the start and the end of October (ii. 82, 93), but he does not seem to have been able to concentrate on it before December. This time, too, it went 'slowly' (ii. 118); and at the end of the year he told Edward Garnett that, in a few days, he would be sending:

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 posted the first half of what we can call 'The Sisters II' – perhaps 200 pages – on 6 January 1914 (ii. 134). Garnett must have read them and sent his observations to Lawrence almost immediately, for on 29 January Lawrence replied that 'I am not very much surprised, nor even very much

⁷ Letter to John Middleton Murry, 30 August 1913 (unpublished): 'Klagen' means 'complaint' (German). Murry (1889–1957), journalist and critic, and his partner 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).

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 at least 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 he was still writing and 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, 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 page 340 by 19 January (ii. 137) and planned to send another 150 pages to Garnett on 30 January (ii. 142). Only one fragment, probably from the last part of 'The Sisters II' to be written, has survived in a set of pages numbered 373–80.⁸ Shortly after responding to Garnett's criticism on 29 January 1914, Lawrence abandoned 'The Sisters II' and embarked upon the next sustained version of the novel: one which took it to the verge of publication.

'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 he claimed to be starting for 'about the eleventh time' (ii. 144, 146, 153). But after these 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 carbon typescript made of it while he wrote.⁹ By 3 April he had 'done two-thirds' (ii. 163); and less than three weeks later, on 22 April, with only eighty pages remaining to be written, it had the new title he had been considering at the end of

⁸ Roberts E441a (UT); printed in *R* 473–9 and in *The Rainbow*, ed. Mark Kinkead-Weekes with an Introduction and Notes by Anne Fernihough (Penguin, 1995), pp. 463–9.

⁹ His typist was Thomas Dunlop, British Consul in La Spezia; see *Letters*, ii. 152 n. 1.

December – ‘The Wedding Ring’ – and he was sending to Garnett what had so far been completed: ‘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 Rainbow’ as its title, but Lawrence did not yet adopt it; by the 16th he had however finished the novel and checked the typescript, sending it to Garnett the following day (ii. 173, 174). Sixty-two pages of carbon copy incorporated in the final manuscript of *The Rainbow* survive from this third main version,¹⁰ 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 out 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.¹¹

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 beginning in 1913. 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’.¹² It seems probable that this was Kuttner’s way of describing a preliminary version of the encounter which takes place in Gudrun’s bedroom in *Women in Love*.

From the report we can also gain an idea 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, the novel had come to contain a great deal of what became *The Rainbow* as well as much that would become *Women in Love*.

This version also provoked Lawrence’s famous defence of his fictional method in a letter to Edward Garnett of 5 June 1914. Garnett had been

¹⁰ In Roberts E331a (UT). The surviving typed pages were originally numbered 219–75 and 279–84, and are renumbered 548–604 and 608–13.

¹¹ Located in LC; printed in full in R 483–4.

¹² R 484.

critical both of 'The Sisters II' and of 'The Wedding Ring', and Lawrence had to some extent accepted his criticisms; but he was now prepared to take a stand against what Garnett was saying.

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 . . .

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 Lawrence was on the verge of deciding to give the novel to another publisher.¹³ *Sons and Lovers*, published in May 1913, had caused a real outburst of interest in his work, and he had received offers and suggestions from a number of publishers as well as from two literary agents. By the middle of May 1914, the long-established firm of Methuen had offered him an advance of £300 (in two instalments) for the new novel, along with a contract for the next two; the news had come to Lawrence via the literary agent J. B. Pinker, who regularly acted for the authors who were offered Methuen's three-novel contracts.¹⁴ So although Lawrence had sent the completed 'Wedding Ring' to Garnett in May 1914, he went to see both Pinker and Duckworth when he returned to England in June,¹⁵ and decided to throw in his lot with Pinker and Methuen; the money the latter was offering (as Lawrence explained to Garnett) was 'a pretty figure that my heart aches after' (ii. 174), and the fact that he and Frieda were getting married in July probably confirmed him in the belief that he must take the best financial offer available. He signed Methuen's contract and received £150 late in 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 (ii. 206–7, 240–1). They would claim at the *Rainbow* prosecution in November 1915 that they had asked in August 1914 for the novel to be rewritten, but a great many literary manuscripts (especially of fiction) were returned to their authors simply because of uncertainty about what was going to happen to the publishing business following the outbreak of war.¹⁶ Methuen probably did

¹³ Duckworth accepted a volume of short stories in lieu of the novel; see *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories*, ed. John Worthen (Cambridge, 1983), p. xxvii. For details of the split with Duckworth, see below.

¹⁴ E.g. see *The Collected Letters of Joseph Conrad: Volume 4 1908–1911*, ed. Frederick R. Karl and Laurence Davies (Cambridge, 1990), p. 502.

¹⁵ See *Letters*, ii. 31 n. 1.

¹⁶ The *Publisher's Circular* showed that the total of books published during the year 1914

no more than return the novel in a routine way, with a recommendation that some changes would be in order, and that Lawrence should resubmit it in six months' time.

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

Lawrence must have begun the book's next sustained version late in November 1914; on 3 December he wrote that he was 'working *frightfully* hard – rewriting my novel' (ii. 239). He had begun by trying to type it himself, on the typewriter which Amy Lowell¹⁷ had sent him; but stopped after 7 single-spaced pages which bear every sign of an inexperienced typist at work. He continued by hand; 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 completed 300 pages in all, and on the 7th sent Pinker another batch of 100 pages (ii. 255, 256).

But the single most important development in the writing of *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* now occurred. When Lawrence sent Pinker the third batch of pages on 7 January, he also 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). Kuttner's suggestion that the Brangwen saga was really separate from the story of the marriages of Ella and Gudrun may have confirmed Lawrence in his decision to divide and expand his work rather than to abbreviate it; there is evidence that Kennerley sent him Kuttner's November 1914 report (presumably in late November or December 1914).¹⁸

From January to March, Lawrence made rapid progress on what was now simply *The Rainbow* (the *Women in Love* material was put aside). The novel was finished on 2 March 1915, typed and revised, and published by Methuen on 30 September 1915, only to be suppressed in November.¹⁹ Lawrence – unable to earn his living from fiction in an England increasingly dedicated to a war he hated – turned to revision of his travel essays for

(11,537) was considerably reduced compared with 1913 (12,379), in spite of a great many ephemeral publications about the war in the second half of the year, and after a first half-year which suggested that the 1913 total would be exceeded; it also revealed that fiction showed the largest single decrease (392) of any individual category: science (108) and religion (80) both increased (*Athenaeum*, 2 January 1915, p. 11).

¹⁷ American poet (1874–1925); see *Letters*, ii. 203 n. 2.

¹⁸ 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' (*R* 485).

¹⁹ See *R* xlv–li.

collection in *Twilight in Italy*, to philosophical work and to some short stories and poems; at the end of the year he and Frieda went to live in Cornwall.

The idea of the novel whose second half he had abandoned never, however, completely left him. He had written 'End of Volume One' on the last leaf of the manuscript of *The Rainbow* in March 1915, for example,²⁰ and on 16 February 1916, the composer Philip Heseltine – then staying with the Lawrences – mentioned in a letter to a friend that he hoped to publish 'a sequel to *The Rainbow*' in his plan for *The Rainbow Books and Music* (an idea which unfortunately came to nothing).²¹ Novels, so far in his professional career, had provided Lawrence with most of his income; however, good sense would also have suggested to him that – rather than provoke the suspicion and outrage which such a sequel would inevitably invite – he might do better to publish a less controversial text. In March 1916, he planned to resume work on the unfinished manuscript of 'The Insurrection of Miss Houghton', given up in 1913; the manuscript however was in Bavaria and he could not recover it (ii. 580, 595). After waiting for a month – during which time John Middleton Murry and Katherine Mansfield²² had come to live in the next cottage at Higher Tregerthen (ii. 596–7) – he went back instead to the material left over from *The Rainbow*. 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 almost completely antagonistic. Yet he was going to write a novel; and that book, in its turn, came to reflect his new attitude towards his society. 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.²³

Nevertheless, sometime between 18 and 26 April he had begun writing. What he had returned to presumably consisted of the second half of the typescript he had submitted to Methuen in 1914 and which they had

²⁰ Roberts E331a, p. 811 (UT).

²¹ Letter to Viva Smith, 16 February 1916 (BL); see Nehls, i. 348–51. For Heseltine, see Explanatory note to 50:1.

²² See footnote 7.

²³ *Letters*, ii. 602. Barbara Low (1877–1955) was a pioneer in psychoanalysis, and an aunt of Catherine Carswell (see below); see *ibid.* 279 n. 6.

returned to him, and which he had not used when writing *The Rainbow*. There is no trace however of any of that typescript in the drafts of what is here called 'The Sisters III'.²⁴ He started completely anew, with that combination of fascination and bewilderment which so often attended the start of his major pieces of work. On 26 April, he told the artist Mark Gertler and Lady Cynthia Asquith how this 'last week' he had begun a book 'that really occupies me'.²⁵ 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.'²⁶ He was not, then, going to end 'The Sisters III' where 'The Sisters I' had finished, with Gudrun and Gerald together; nor, presumably, where 'The Wedding Ring' had ended. April was the most likely time for Lawrence's composition of the opening two chapters (later abandoned and revised, respectively) entitled 'Prologue' and 'The Wedding'.²⁷ 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' (ii. 602).

Another reason, perhaps, was the fact that the novel was not only conceived in the period of the war, but – as Lawrence put it in 1919 – though 'it does not concern the war itself . . . the bitterness of the war may be taken for granted in the characters' (*WL* 485:5–7). He insisted on its difference from *The Rainbow* by saying that, while the latter was 'all written before the war . . . I don't think the war altered it, from its pre-war statement' (iii. 142), his 1916 novel 'actually does contain the results in one's soul of the war' (iii. 143). In the very week when he started it, he told Cynthia Asquith that 'The world crackles and busts' (ii. 601); and Mark Kinkead-Weekes has argued that 'From the beginning, then, the new fiction was apocalyptic – conceived as it was in the exploding world of Verdun, the Somme and the Easter Rising.'²⁸

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); by now he was writing in notebooks, something he would subsequently do

²⁴ He had, for example, re-used two sections of the old typescript while writing *The Rainbow* in the spring of 1915: see footnote 10 and *R* lii.

²⁵ *Letters*, ii. 599, 601. Cynthia Asquith had been a friend of the Lawrences since 1913 (*ibid.* 41 n. 4), Gertler since 1914 (*ibid.* 214 n. 1).

²⁶ *Letters*, ii. 604. The Lawrences had stayed with Ottoline Morrell (1873–1938) at Garsington Manor in 1915 (*ibid.* 253 n. 3); see Explanatory note on 11:14.

²⁷ Roberts E441b (UT); they are printed in *WL* 489:1–518:12.

²⁸ *D. H. Lawrence: Triumph to Exile 1912–1922* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 328.

regularly.²⁹ On 24 May he told Ottoline Morrell that '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 book 'Two thirds' written: 'It goes on pretty fast, and very easy. I have not travelled over it. It is the book of my free soul.'³⁰ By 19 June he was 'nearly done'; he probably finished it before 28 June, when he had to go to Bodmin for medical examination: on 30 June he told Pinker that 'in effect' the book was finished (ii. 617, 619). What he meant is clarified in a letter of 4 July to his friend S. S. Koteliansky ('Kot'): 'I have finished my novel – except for a bit that can be done any time' – and 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'.³¹ 'The Sisters III', as it now stood, consisted of an autograph manuscript, now lost, almost certainly in 10 or 11 (now lost) notebooks, up to page 649, and then 5 surviving notebooks paginated 650–863, the last of them almost completely empty, leaving space for that 'last chapter'.³²

The First 'Women in Love' written (fifth version, July–November 1916)

In almost exactly two months between the end of April and the end of June 1916 Lawrence had thus written a complete draft of what was, even then, a

²⁹ The manuscripts of *Mr Noon*, *Kangaroo*, *Quetzalcoatit*, *The Boy in the Bush*, *The Plumed Serpent* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* are all in notebooks. The complete draft of 'The Sisters III' appears to have been about 120,000 words (see note 32), so he had written something like 60,000 words in almost exactly 4 weeks, suggesting that he was averaging around 2,000 words a day; by his standards, fairly leisurely progress. See e.g. *The Boy in the Bush*, ed. Paul Eggert (Cambridge, 1990), p. xxx.

³⁰ *Letters*, ii. 614. Having written half the novel in 4 weeks and two-thirds in less than 6 weeks, DHL seems to have taken 3 to 4 weeks over the last third; but it is likely that he was also going over and revising the first part.

³¹ *Letters*, ii. 621, 627. For Koteliansky, 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).

³² Notebooks 3 and 7–10 of the surviving total of 10 (the other 5 dating wholly from October 1916), Roberts E441c (UT). A calculation (almost certainly by DHL) on the inside cover of notebook 7, opposite original page 650, shows 700 (the number of pages then written) multiplied by 135 (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, therefore, very probably written in notebooks, and he would have used 10 or 11.

fairly long novel: something around 120,000 words. Recognising that he would have to submit two typescripts (for English and American publication), and being very short of money, he decided to do what he had not done with *The Rainbow* back in November 1914, and commit himself to typing out the whole book; he felt so close to it that he was reluctant to let anyone else see it, and he must also have anticipated making some revisions while typing. Accordingly, he spent the months between July and mid-October not so much typing out its first half as completely 're-composing' it while typing and heavily revising it. It became half as long again as it had been, growing to 175,000 words.

He had probably begun by 12 July (ii. 529, 630), in ribbon and carbon copies,³³ but he apparently completed fewer than fifteen pages in July. He had typed relatively little since November 1914, in spite of owning a typewriter;³⁴ he had actually left the typewriter behind in Buckinghamshire when he and Frieda moved to Sussex in January 1915 (ii. 293) but probably got it back in March (ii. 310). He had started to type out his philosophy in May 1915 (ii. 341, 343), 're-composing as I go' (ii. 352), but had abandoned that; however, he had apparently composed his story 'England, My England' directly on to the typewriter at the start of June (ii. 354 n. 4). He had also continued to have others type for him (Viola Meynell and Kot in the spring of 1915, Douglas Clayton in August–September).³⁵ While staying with the Lawrences in Cornwall in January 1916, however, Philip Heseltine had used Lawrence's machine to type out a ribbon and a carbon copy of Lawrence's poetry volume *Amores* (ii. 514–15, 529); watching Heseltine at work may have persuaded Lawrence that he could take on the next large job himself. Koteliansky had gone on supplying him with typing and carbon paper from London (ii. 514–15); but now, in July 1916, he badly needed a new typewriter ribbon, something quite impossible to find in west Cornwall: 'We are as usual miles from every shop' he had written back in January (ii. 514–15). It took, however, five letters to the faithful Kot in London (and two ribbons of the wrong size) before he got what he

³³ He made no attempt to keep the two copies (TS1a, Roberts E441d, UT: TS1b, Roberts E441e, UTor) distinct; the two typescripts show a mixture of ribbon and carbon pages.

³⁴ *Letters*, ii. Amy Lowell (see *Letters*, ii. 222 and n. 3, 223, 227, 229) had wanted to help him at a time when he was desperately hard up but was (rightly) careful about how she might be able to help him; many of his references to the machine are in letters to her (e.g. *Letters*, ii. 234–5, 243, 394, 645, 665), to show his gratitude. In 1919, when leaving England, he sold the typewriter for £5 to Catherine Carswell's brother Gordon MacFarlane (1884–1949): 'Does the hateful old thing go all right now?' (iii. 393–4).

³⁵ See *Letters*, ii. 299, 313, 317, 333, 338, 370, 381.

needed.³⁶ Around the start of August, he appears to have settled down in earnest, and probably typed for the whole of the month, telling Amy Lowell on the 23rd that her typewriter 'runs so glibly, and has at last become a true confrère. I take so unkindly to any sort of machinery. But now I and the type writer have sworn a Blutbruderschaft' (ii. 645).

The typing, however, turned out to be exhausting and utterly laborious. By 1 September he described himself as only typing 'fitfully' (ii. 649); and on the 9th, he told Pinker that the novel was 'half done' (ii. 653), presumably meaning that it was only half typed. On 26 September, Ottoline Morrell heard its author's optimism that 'only a week or two' more work would be needed; but the ease of composition he had experienced between April and June had been replaced by a terrible struggle: 'I only want to finish this novel, which is like a malady or a madness while it lasts' (ii. 656). He had been ill from early September onwards, and was further depressed by the constantly wet weather of the late summer; and the laborious typing was getting badly on his nerves.³⁷ To make matters worse, he was actually rewriting the novel while typing it: 'I recomposed all the first part on the typewriter'.³⁸ Over the next fourteen years, he typed relatively little of his own work: in 1921 he would say 'I *hate* doing it' (iii. 677), and in 1926 remarked 'It's a slow business, I'm no typist' (v. 464). Although he told Amy Lowell on 12 October that he was 'still typing' (ii. 665), the remark was probably designed to please the provider of the typewriter: the very next day he asked the mother of Douglas Clayton (who had typed for him in 1913–15) if she would take on the rest of the novel (ii. 666): 'I have done about two-thirds. But I can't do any more – this typing is bad for me. Shall I send you the rest, as I write it out? – I might not be able to pay you immediately – but before very long. I felt I ought to do it myself – but it upsets me and hurts my nerves, so I give it up' (ii. 666). Altogether, he had typed 368 pages, around 110,000 words. Katherine Clayton agreed to finish

³⁶ The ribbon copy p. 15 (in Roberts E441d) shows the impression of a much blacker typewriter ribbon, two-thirds of the way down the page, and presumably marks the new ribbon's arrival.

³⁷ He not only made numerous errors, but on six occasions (pp. 57, 144, 228, 275, 305 and 338) he had to type a page twice because he had failed to insert carbon paper, or had inserted it reversed; while the first twenty pages show him having constant trouble with the positioning of the last line on the page (twice the paper slipped so badly in the machine that he had to write the line in again by hand). This may have been caused by a missing 'flap from the back of the type-writer . . . The paper catches without it' (*Letters*, ii. 632).

³⁸ *Letters*, iii. 79. The process is visible when he had to retype the pages described in the previous footnote; he would incorporate autograph revisions already made to the first typing, add new ones to the original page, and then make still further changes as he typed for the second time.

the work, but – as he was able to tell her on 21 October – ‘in the meantime comes a letter from my agent, saying he will have the thing done in his office – and as that will cost nothing, I would much rather he were out of pocket, than that you were’ (ii. 668). Pinker would, of course, ensure that both a ribbon and a carbon copy were made, to add to what Lawrence had already done.

From around 13 October, then, Lawrence began preparing the last third of the novel for typing. He clearly did not want simply to send to a typist the notebooks containing the last third of the April–June draft. He wanted once more to ‘write it out’ (ii. 666), exactly as he had himself been recomposing while typing. Accordingly, he worked astonishingly fast to write, in less than a fortnight and perhaps no more than ten days, a completely new draft of a good deal more than half of what remained; and he then undertook a very heavy revision of the last part of the novel in the old notebooks dating from June. He wrote around 39,000 words between 13 and 25 October, when he sent his first batch of work (in six brand new notebooks) to Pinker; and then spent five days revising the final 26,000 words, in the last four old notebooks, before despatching them to Pinker on 31 October (ii. 669).

It is at this stage that we find him changing for certain the novel’s title. Early in August, he had given Catherine Carswell – who was also writing a novel, finally published in 1920 as *Open the Door!* – his reason for abandoning ‘The Sisters’ as a title: ‘May Sinclair having had “three Sisters” it won’t do’. But although thinking he might call the book *Women in Love* – a title he had first mentioned to Pinker on 13 July (ii. 631) – he was still by no means decided: ‘I don’t feel at all sure of it’.³⁹ The title appears with no alternative in notebooks 2 and 4–6.⁴⁰ The inside cover of notebook 1, however, shows ‘Dies Irae’ written under *Women in Love*; on 30 October, Lawrence told Pinker that Frieda preferred that title (ii. 669). He made no attempt, however, to change again the title of the book here called *The First*

³⁹ *Letters*, ii. 639: i.e. *The Three Sisters* (1914) by May Sinclair (1863–1942). See *ibid.* 640 for other suggestions for the title, some of them facetious. 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). A novel called *Sisters* by Ada Cambridge (1844–1926) had been published in 1904. *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.

⁴⁰ Notebook 3, like notebooks 7–10 (see footnote 32), shows the title ‘Sisters’ deleted and ‘Women in Love’ inserted; but 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 1916, DHL crossed out the 3 used pages, tore them out and inserted them at the back of the notebook (where they still are) and then re-used the now empty notebook.

'*Women in Love*'; he himself had deleted the typed title 'THE SISTERS.' and inscribed 'Women in Love.' on the first page of both copies of the typescript (see p. lvi).

He also used this part of the book'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 on the 1st with a copy of his poetry collection *Amores* (1916), which she had taken out of the hands of a group of acquaintances who were mockingly reading it aloud. This was the source of new material he incorporated in chapter x.

When he had completed the sixth (new) notebook, and sent the batch off to Pinker on 25 October (ii. 669), he started revising the ending of the novel; as he explained to Catherine Carswell in November, 'there was a lot of the original draft that I *couldn't* have bettered' (iii. 25). On 31 October, he sent to Pinker '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). He did not however write this 'epilogue' when he got the typescript back, but – as in July – remained determined that the novel should have one. By 7 November, when he was working on the first batch of typescript Pinker had returned, he stated that 'The novel will have an epilogue – a small last chapter. But that, I don't want to write until the whole is sent in to the printer; and heaven knows when that will be' (iii. 29). By 20 November he had finished his revision of the typescript and had in fact changed the ending extensively;⁴¹ but even these changes are unlikely to represent what he thought his 'small last chapter' might do. Another direction which 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 page number – have been written late in October. Lawrence may well have started to draft this as the epilogue before sending the notebooks to Pinker for typing, and have decided that he didn't want to write it just then. The fragment reads:

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

⁴¹ See Explanatory note on 443:28.

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 staying⁴²

This shows that Gudrun's future would have been one of the subjects of the epilogue, which he planned to keep quite short (iii. 29); this fragment suggests that it might actually have taken the form of a letter by Gudrun.⁴³ We need have no doubt, however, that the novel as it was typed and which he then heavily revised in November 1916 – with the ending rewritten in the typescript – represented *The First 'Women in Love'* as Lawrence wanted it to go to publishers in the winter of 1916. Whether or not he would only have written his epilogue just before the novel went to the printer (no publisher would have been very happy with such an arrangement, it should be said, especially in the case of a novel by Lawrence), he did not do so; and the last scenes of the novel would, of course, be completely altered and extended in revision between 1917 and 1919, before the book was finally published as *Women in Love* in 1920.

The First 'Women in Love' prepared for publication (fifth version revised, November 1916)

After less than a week's break, Lawrence began to receive batches of Pinker's typescript; the first arrived on 6 November, and the second on 13 November. Lawrence was obviously extremely eager to get the book finished; he told Pinker on the 13th that 'The novel I will send on in a week's time: not longer' (iii. 28–9).

By this stage, the Cornwall cottage must have been almost entirely devoted to the novel. In no other of his books was Frieda so involved. For months, now, she had been helping to transcribe to the second typescript copy the revisions Lawrence had been making in the first copy he had been producing: this process of revision had probably started in August. As the second half of the novel came back in its new, typed form from Pinker's office in November, Lawrence again set to work revising it. This stage of revision, of course, may well have included still further work on the first half of the book. But it lasted exactly a fortnight: on Monday 20 November, the complete novel, in its two corrected typescripts, was done. One copy (hereafter TSIa) was sent to Pinker, and its history will be discussed next;

⁴² Roberts E441c, p. 427.

⁴³ DHL would end the final version of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* with a letter from Oliver Mellors.