

# J·D·H·L·S

Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies

## Citation details

Review essay: **“OPPOSING TRUTHS”: D. H. LAWRENCE  
AND THE LITERARY COSMOS OF THE FIRST WORLD  
WAR’**

Author: Susan Reid

Source: *Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies*, vol. 4.1 (2015)

Pages: 141–154

Copyright: individual author and the D. H. Lawrence Society.  
Quotations from Lawrence’s works © The Estate of Frieda  
Lawrence Ravagli. Extracts and poems from various publications  
by D. H. Lawrence reprinted by permission of Pollinger Limited  
([www.pollingerltd.com](http://www.pollingerltd.com)) on behalf of the Estate of Frieda Lawrence  
Ravagli.

**A Publication of the  
D. H. Lawrence Society of Great Britain**

REVIEW ESSAY

**“OPPOSING TRUTHS”:  
D. H. LAWRENCE AND THE LITERARY COSMOS  
OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR**

SUSAN REID

**Santanu Das, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Poetry of the First World War*.**

**Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2014.**

**Pp. 346. £18.99 (paperback). ISBN 978 1 1076 9295 4**

**Andrew Frayn. *Writing Disenchantment: British First World War Prose, 1914–30*.**

**Manchester: Manchester UP, 2014.**

**Pp. 256. £70.00 (hardcover). ISBN 978 0 7190 8922 0**

**Carl Krockel. *War Trauma and English Modernism: T. S. Eliot and D. H. Lawrence*.**

**Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.**

**Pp. 232. £60.00 (hardcover). ISBN 978 0 2302 9157 7**

Rupert Brooke's death was one of many First World War centenaries marked this year. In May 1915, only a few weeks after his sonnet 'Soldier' was read from the pulpit of St. Paul's Cathedral on Easter Sunday, Brooke succumbed to an infected mosquito bite en route to Gallipoli and was buried in a foreign field on the island of Skyros. Although his poetry remained popular for the duration of the war, Brooke is mostly remembered now as one of the perpetrators of what Wilfred Owen denounced as "The old Lie: Dulce et decorum est / Pro patria mori".<sup>1</sup> And yet for Lawrence, writing on 15 November 1916:

Rupert Brooke's sonnet, which I repudiate for myself, I know now is true for him, for them. But for me it is not true, and nothing will ever make it so: least of all death, for death is a great reality and seal of truth: my truth, his truth. It is terrible to think there are opposing truths – but so it is. (3L 33)

Lawrence's acceptance of "opposing truths", though "terrible", is remarkable given that almost exactly one year earlier *The Rainbow* (1915) – his novel which culminates in Ursula Brangwen's vision of "the world built up in a living fabric of Truth" (R 459) – had been banned and subsequently burned by authorities who repudiated his "Truth" and left him feeling "so sick, in body and soul, that if I don't go away I shall die" (2L 429). Officially *The Rainbow* was prosecuted under the Obscene Publications Act rather than the Defence of the Realm Act (later invoked to evict the Lawrences from Cornwall), but hostile reviewers had been unequivocal in asserting that "A thing like *The Rainbow* has no right to exist in the wind of war".<sup>2</sup> Although the First World War would prove to be a very literary war, as Samuel Hynes has pointed out, only certain types of literature were welcome.<sup>3</sup>

By 1916 – a turning point both in the war and for Lawrence – he had come to realise that: "never again will I say, generally, 'the war': only 'the war to me'. For to every man, the war is himself, and I cannot dictate what the war is or should be to any other being than myself" (3L 33). Lawrence's recognition of a multiplicity of war experiences was prophetic of the ongoing difficulties of interpreting the cultural meanings of the First World War, which have regularly been presented as "opposing truths", contested between the soldier-poets of the early years of the conflict (like Brooke) and their successors (like Owen), but also between combatants and non-combatants, poets and prose writers, Georgians and literary modernists, men and women. Cumulatively, such contestation has resulted in the admission of a greater diversity of voices to the canon of war literature, but at the same time a critical consensus has formed around two main ways of understanding the

cultural history of the First World War: as influentially stated by Jay Pinker these comprise one that focuses on the flowering of “Modernism” during and after the conflict as a rupture with tradition and a second mode, favoured by Pinker himself and other recent critics, which perceives a more nuanced continuity in the “traditional values” of western culture.<sup>4</sup>

Lawrence’s critics have tended to place him on the side of modernist rupture, due in large part to the “nightmare” that the war represented for him personally (2L 211) and that continued to irrupt into post-war texts such as *Kangaroo* (1923). Indeed, Paul Delany’s *D. H. Lawrence’s Nightmare* (1979) long ago defined the writer’s recognition of the war “as a fundamental shift in man’s social relations, and in the mass will that underlay them”.<sup>5</sup> Since then there has been a paucity of book-length studies about Lawrence’s war writing to supplement or challenge this view, although now, among the books reviewed here, Carl Krockel’s study makes a compelling case for the war’s traumatic effects on the writings of both Lawrence and T. S. Eliot, while Andrew Frayn’s analysis of “disenchantment” argues for the contiguity of war and modernity in almost two decades of British war prose (including Lawrence’s writing from the 1920s). In many ways, then, these two books occupy the opposing sides of what Pinker identifies as “the so-called modernist/traditionalist divide”, opening up fertile new ground for debate about how the war impacted Lawrence’s writing – at least as far as his prose is concerned.

Lawrence’s status as a “war poet” remains moot. Santanu Das regrets Lawrence’s exclusion from *The Cambridge Companion to the Poetry of the First World War* “because of pressures of space”, while noting “the utter strangeness” of his poem ‘Resurrection’ that “is unlike anything else in First World War poetry” (22). Das’s comments chime neatly with Lawrence’s avowal that he could not write “generally, [about] ‘the war’: only ‘the war to me’” (3L 33). And yet, Das’s recognition of “utter strangeness” also resonates suggestively with his preceding discussion of Owen’s use of language (and indeed with Owen’s poem ‘Strange Meeting’) and

with the “strange joy” (a quote from Isaac Rosenberg) that he finds in some trench poetry (18). If Lawrence’s credentials as a war poet have yet to be established – though the new prominence given to *All of Us* in the recent Cambridge Edition of *The Poems* provides renewed stimulus, as Kate McLoughlin demonstrates in this number of *JDHLS* (45–66) – his position in the broader canon of war literature seems only slightly more secure.<sup>6</sup> For Paul Fussell, a leading proponent of the school of “modernist rupture”, the divide between the modernists and the soldier-writers was not only a matter of experience:

The roster of major innovative talents who were not involved with the war is long and impressive. It includes Yeats, Woolf, Pound, Eliot, Lawrence, and Joyce – that is, the masters of the modern movement. It was left to lesser talents ... to recall in literary form a war they had actually experienced. Sassoon, Graves, and Blunden are clearly writers of the second rank.<sup>7</sup>

*The Cambridge Companion to the Poetry of the First World War* is more circumspect about questions of “rank”, although the volume’s inclusive approach to “a wider and more varied range” of war poems confines the ‘Soldier-Poets’ to one of four parts. And the admirable intention to address war poetry not as “history by proxy” but “to read the poetry as *poetry*”, with particular “attention to questions of form” (xx), has the effect of exposing the quality and formal innovation of the soldier-poets in comparison with the modernists and their successors. Indeed, Fran Brearton reminds us, in a thoughtful chapter on ‘Poetic Legacies of the First World War’, that some of the best British poets of the twentieth century, such as the war-haunted Ted Hughes (whose father was a veteran), have reworked the material of the soldier-poets, though she resists making the crass assertion that they have done better in this regard.

Vincent Sherry’s opening chapter begins with a poet who was not even born until after the First World War, using the example of Philip Larkin’s poem ‘MCMXIV’ (‘1914’) to tease out the dangers

of “reading history backward” (41). Instead, Sherry reads forward from a Georgianism that set itself against decadence before and during the war and, before that, from the “dream of freedom” unrealised by European revolutions (42). He traces a crisis of liberalism that found its “motive idea of liberation” chillingly inverted in “the experience of imprisonment in the trench system” (42). Peter Howarth follows by questioning the received notion of “The story of the First World War poets ... as a move from idealism to realism” (51) in a wide-ranging discussion of how form was mediated by experience. He astutely concludes that the psychological and aesthetic double bind for war poets, such as Ivor Gurney and John Rodker, was in “finding a form which could recognise what happened without extending the war’s own remorseless grip in the process of writing” (64).

As one would expect, these opening chapters set the context for the case studies that follow. In the second and longest section of the volume, on ‘Soldier-Poets’, Elizabeth Vandiver and Mark Rawlinson further challenge the “myth about the progression of war poetry” from idealism to realism (70): Vandiver examining how early poets Brooke and Julian Grenfell may have “fetichise[d]” (73) rather than ennobled the death and violence of war, while Rawlinson examines how war veterans (Robert Graves, Robert Nichols, Edmund Blunden and Herbert Read) were able to gain time and distance from their experiences, noting that: “The archetypal pattern of much canonical war poesis is revision” (83). Chapters on Isaac Rosenberg (by Neil Corcoran) and David Jones (by David Poole) focus on how they re-worked an amalgamation of sources from, respectively, the metaphysical and Romantic poets, and an array of warrior epics, not least *Y Gododdin*. Chapters on Siegfried Sassoon (by Sarah Cole) and the inter-relationship of Ivor Gurney and Edward Thomas (by Edna Longley) focus, in turn, on the psychological aspects of war experience and memory. Cole skilfully unpicks the binary between the perceived impersonality of so-called “protest” poetry and “an attention to the more soluble,

private self, ravelling and unravelling, as boundaries separating world from person dissolve" (102).

Sandra M. Gilbert has perhaps the most loaded subject in Wilfred Owen, who haunts many chapters in this volume, but her contribution is one of the most accomplished. She deals deftly with Owen's "metamorphosis" from Keatsian to anti-Keatsian as he bears witness to the death of pastoralism at the Western Front, while also refocusing the longstanding question of whether Owen carried photographs of the dead and mutilated towards the notion of photographic realism in his poems: "His poetic eye became a sort of camera eye as, with increasing intensity, he sought to re-present the horrifying sights he had seen, even in semi-darkness" (121).

A lot of ground has been covered before we reach Part III and here the pace intensifies in a series of chapters that attempt to deal with all the war poets who were *not* British soldier-poets. Having said that, David Goldie opens proceedings by dealing with 'Archipelagic Poetry' by Irish, Welsh and Scots writers, who for the most part, perhaps surprisingly, curbed their impulses towards strong cultural nationalism for the duration of the war. Similarly, Simon Featherstone relates how 'Colonial Poetry' from Canada, Australia and India also tended to support "imperial commitment to Allied war aims" (174), with the notable exception of Rabindranath Tagore.<sup>8</sup> Margaret R. Higonnet reprises her important work in gaining recognition for a range of 'Women's Poetry of the First World War', while Tim Kendall focuses on Thomas Hardy and Rudyard Kipling as the senior civilian war poets, who had already gained their credentials in writing about the earlier Boer War. Christine Froula uses the prominent examples of Eliot and Ezra Pound to conclude that: "The Great War did not make modernist poetics, but it did make modernist poems whose voices echo down history's corridors. It also left deep scars on their creators" (223).

Of Eliot's war trauma Krockel has more to say as we will see below. But to conclude on *The Cambridge Companion to the Poetry of the First World War*, its framing parts I and IV are, for me, more engaging and provocative than the (necessarily) limited,

catch-all chapters, excellent though these are. In closing, the volume deals with ‘Afterlives of First World Poetry’, in twentieth-century poetry (Fran Brearton’s contribution, mentioned above) and through the lens of contemporary poets in ‘A Conversation’ with Michael Longley, Andrew Motion and Jon Stallworthy. The last words, however, must go to Jay Pinker’s discussion of “glory” – illustrated by charts graphing usage of the word over the twentieth century – that probes how and why we commemorate war now. Pinker concludes (in a fitting endorsement of this volume) that: “It is to war poetry that we must turn to understand why commemorating the Great War in 2014, a century after the outbreak of the conflict, still has a taste of ashes to it” (254).

Carl Krockel’s study of *War Trauma and English Modernism: T. S. Eliot and D. H. Lawrence* begins by confronting Pinker’s earlier notion of a critical divide between “the ‘Georgian’ war writers on one side and the Modernists on the other” (1). In his ‘Introduction’, Krockel revisits the notion of civilians and militaries as “Two Nations” (2), to quote Vivian de Sola Pinto, Sassoon’s second-in-command (and later co-editor of Lawrence’s *Complete Poems*). “For Sassoon ‘the essential quality’ of his poetry lay in it being ‘true to what I experienced’”, writes Krockel, before deploying the counter example of Lawrence’s revisions to the “battlefield action” of his 1915 short story ‘England, My England’ (4). The diminished emphasis on violence in the 1922 version reflects that what was more important was the “action at home” that determined the causes and outcomes of the war. In some ways, then, civilian writers like Lawrence “were more faithful to the actual conditions of war than Sassoon and Owen” (4), the two key soldier-poets referenced throughout this study. Threatened not “by shellfire, but by a society fixated by war”, the injuries civilian writers sustained were not physical but psychical, a condition that “mirrors that of the traumatised soldier” (9). Moreover, both “sides” of the literary divide shared a decadent “cultural tradition reaching back to Romanticism, both English and French”; a “shared culture of shock” that prepared writers for what Krockel describes

as “traumatic imitation”, exemplified in texts from Lawrence’s *The Rainbow*, the subject of the opening chapter, to Eliot’s *Little Gidding* which closes the study. Above all, then, Krockel’s book concerns the ways in which the trauma of war extended to civilian writers and uses case studies of Lawrence and Eliot “to explore the magnitude of the impact of world war not only upon its immediate participants, but upon British culture in the twentieth century” (23).

Three chapters on each of Lawrence and Eliot proceed chronologically from the early years of the First World War through the 1920s and, in Eliot’s case, to the Second World War. Although the chapters alternate between the two writers in order to point up similarities and differences, for reasons of space, I will deal with Lawrence first and more fully. Chapter 1 illustrates how *The Rainbow* uses the backdrop of the South African War of 1899–1902 to draw astute parallels between the two conflicts, before going on to describe scenes of “traumatic imitation” that mimic the violence of the First World War. “Ursula’s development reflects the darkening of Lawrence’s analysis of the war in 1915”, Krockel argues: “War hysteria resembles an epidemic which infects her sexuality. Likewise, her destructive relationship with Skrebensky is as much subject to the contagion of war, as it represents a locus of health” (36).

Chapter 3 shifts to 1916 and the writing of *The First ‘Women in Love’* in order to address unresolved questions about the relation of the final novel to history, and to do so Krockel makes several interesting critical moves. He sets the circumstances of intensified warfare against Lawrence’s deteriorating health, as others like Delany have done before, but then he suggests that “Lawrence’s breakdown uncannily resembles the illnesses experienced by combatants at the front” (65). Borrowing from Shoshana Felman’s trauma theory, Krockel then reads *The First ‘Women in Love’* as a form of “testimony”: “a therapeutic process of ‘working through’ material from disparate and local fragments towards experience objectified into a larger narrative” (68). This process may also reflect Lawrence’s “access to the pioneering research on war

trauma in 1916”, for example through his close friendship with David Eder (72). Working through a number of textual examples, Krockel constructs a cogent case for the place of *The First ‘Women in Love’* “alongside the poetry of Sassoon and Graves in 1916” and also as one of the first modernist responses to the war.

Chapter 5 extends Krockel’s argument for writing as a “working through” of trauma to the novels of the 1920s: *Aaron’s Rod*, *The Lost Girl*, *Mr Noon*, *Kangaroo* and *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*. Like Sassoon, Krockel argues, Lawrence “suffered from ‘an anti-war complex’, as [W. H.] Rivers defined it, which paradoxically, caused in them moments of extreme militaristic rage” (130). Both thereby suffered from a “splitting of the self” with one side suffering from war trauma and the other side denying that trauma by identifying with the aggressor; a split that becomes manifest in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. Krockel thus provides a compelling way of understanding the “problem” novels of the 1920s that may finally displace their standard reading as “leadership novels”. His reading of *The Plumed Serpent* as a type of “holy war” is particularly satisfying in explaining how the novel “replicates the ‘vicious circle’ of *Fantasia of the Unconscious*: attempting to conceive a future clear of the legacy of the war, it ‘ends in poison-gas’” (150).

Through the chapters on Eliot, Krockel first traces a trauma “anxiously anticipated” through a fascination with Baudelaire and the city (manifested in Eliot’s “nervous sexual attacks ... when alone in a city” [qtd. 50]) and “the Decadent excesses of morbidity, sensationalism and abnormality” exhibited in his ‘The Death of Saint Narcissus’ (56). Following marriage to Vivienne in 1915, often he was unable to write as a result of “the most awful nightmare of anxiety that the mind of man could conceive” (qtd. 93), exemplified in his prose poem ‘Hysteria’. In 1918 tensions mounted further as a result, scholars suspect, of Vivienne’s infidelity. Krockel thus places Eliot in a similar situation to combatants for whom “the fidelity of the wife at home was one factor among many in establishing the aetiology of trauma in the war zone” (104). Poems like ‘Ode on Independence Day’ and

'Sweeney among the Nightingales', Krockel argues, "record both illness and healing in the midst of the traumatic event" (105), while the drafting of *The Waste Land* is also a tale of "opposing personal anguish and impersonal perspective" (112). Through the 1920s, however, while Lawrence obsessively worked through his war trauma, "Eliot's aim in his poetry was to transcend personal history, not objectify it" (156). This involved an element of "false witnessing" which denied rather than mastered trauma and by 1930 he was intent on dismissing the war: "Perhaps the most significant thing about the War is its *insignificance*; and it is this insignificance which makes it so acutely tragic" (qtd. 164). With *Ash Wednesday* comes a forgetfulness achieved through religious rather than therapeutic means and ultimately, in *East Coker* and *Little Gidding*, the focus shifts to "war (regardless of its outcome) as a means of fulfilling a religious vision" (190). Nonetheless, Krockel concludes, throughout "his poetry and prose the traces of Eliot's terror of war are preserved for us as his readers, and his witnesses" (196).

Finally, Krockel turns to the question of "why Lawrence's and Eliot's fortunes differed so greatly in British culture between the two wars, and continue to in the present" (197). A crucial difference is self-presentation: "while Lawrence repeatedly exposed his wounds in the hope of finding a cure", Eliot held out "Tradition" as a means of navigating from past to future (198). And, as regards their war writing, even F. R. Leavis preferred "Eliot's oblique recording of the war" to Lawrence's articulations of agony, and so while "Lawrence's oeuvre was progressively dissociated from war, Eliot's became retrospectively associated with it" (208). But what Krockel does not address directly is Eliot's long-time standing as a canonical high modernist versus Lawrence's more ambivalent status within modernist studies. This may seem to lie beyond the remit of a study of war trauma in these two writers, but "War Trauma" is coupled with "English Modernism" in the book's title. My one criticism of Krockel's excellent study is that the author does not define precisely what he means by "English Modernism", nor does his bibliography include

any general studies of modernism that might provide further clues. By implication, his commitment to comparative study of writers who are not often studied together suggests the pluralistic approach recently espoused by the new modernist studies, but on the other hand, while broadening the canon of modernist literature, such studies tend to de-emphasise the war.<sup>9</sup> This is troubled terrain.

Andrew Frayn's *Writing Disenchantment: British First World War Prose, 1914–30* is very clear about its terms of engagement. Frayn cites Vincent Sherry in introducing his concern with modernism as “a counter-culture of modernity” (5) rather than something separate from war experience. His study is underpinned by continuity between war and modern life and the major traditions of intellectual liberalism. Accordingly, the title term of “disenchantment” is identified as a “product of conditions which were already ingrained” before the war and therefore “not solely attributable to the war years or the 1920s” (7). The roots of disenchanted prose lie instead in “a literature of decline, decay and degeneration”, exemplified by Max Nordau's *Degeneration* and Oswald Spengler's *The Decline of the West*. For Spengler (a frequent point of reference in this book), “the decline of the West was not a specific problem but an eternal imponderable, with civilisation as the tipping-point of any culture towards destruction” (20). Just as there was continuity in its underlying conditions so Frayn perceives continuity in the writing of disenchantment in British prose throughout the war and its aftermath until 1930. This ambitious time span, covered in five packed chapters, is valuable for the perspective it brings, though it necessarily dictates some condensation of material, with the war itself confined to a single chapter. Nonetheless this is a well-paced book with an extensive bibliography that suggests an impressive command of the relevant literature and provides a great resource for further reading.

Chapter 1 opens with the assertion of a “truth” borne out by the prosecution of *The Rainbow* discussed at the beginning of this essay: “The expression of disenchantment in wartime was difficult” (40). War propaganda supported official orthodoxies, as illustrated

by well-known war posters, but also by writers like Ford Madox Ford, who despite his affiliations with Germany, maintained that "the attitude of Great Britain was absolutely correct" (47). Although war novels, such as *Mr Britling Sees it Through* by H. G. Wells and *The Return of the Soldier* by Rebecca West, tended to "seek a return to peace by continuing to fight, a small number of dissenting voices question that apparent necessity"; the case studies here are Rose Macaulay's *Non-Combatants and Others* and Rose Laure Allatini's *Despised and Rejected* (59). The end of the war brought hope, briefly, but this quickly turned to disenchantment under the strain of demobilisation and reintegration, and an array of economic problems, as Frayn describes in Chapter 2. Nonetheless, escapist texts like Gilbert Frankau's *Peter Jackson, Cigar Merchant* and Ernest Raymond's *Tell England* were bestsellers, while C. E. Montagu's journalistic *Disenchantment*, though read by "opinion-formers", "was far from the dominant way of understanding the war" in 1922 (104).

Chapter 3 turns to modernist novels of the 1920s "which are haunted by the spectre of war" (119). A case study of Lawrence asserts his disenchantment with the war "as an extreme symptom of modernity", which conflated men with machines and war with industrialisation (120). 'England, my England' is therefore a promising starting point, but, unlike Krockel, Frayn reads the greater violence in the 1915 version in terms of a "violence [that] mitigate[d] wartime disenchantment" and so, by implication, is no longer needed in the peacetime of the 1920s when Lawrence made his revisions (123, emphasis added). This interpretation is difficult to reconcile with the violent turmoil depicted in *Aaron's Rod* (1922), written around the same time as the story was revised, or with the later *The Plumed Serpent* (1925), neither of which are referenced here. Instead, Frayn traces a deepening despair in *The Ladybird* – citing Dionys's desire for death as a suggestion that "death is better than life in the post-war world" (126) – that becomes a language of spiritual disease in the *Memoir of Maurice Magnus* (129) and culminates in Clifford's embodiment of

disenchantment in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (133). Of course, Frayn's reading of Lawrence in the 1920s is not incompatible with Krockel's: it is entirely possible that disenchantment co-existed or indeed was in some way linked with war trauma. However, Frayn dismisses this possibility without fully exploring its implications and misses an opportunity, perhaps, to put his concept of "disenchantment" under some strain. In a brief discussion of *Kangaroo*, he writes: "Carl Krockel suggests that 'Lawrence-as-Somers', itself a problematic formulation, experiences 'a repressed sense of helplessness and guilt from not being able to contribute to the war effort'. This is not the case. He actively rejects this war and its eradication of individualism" (130). Further discussion of Krockel's book-length study would have been instructive as it seems there is much still to be said about Lawrence in the 1920s.

In the rest of Chapter 3, readings of Virginia Woolf's "war trilogy" (140) – *Jacob's Room* (1922), *Mrs Dalloway* (1925) and *To the Lighthouse* (1927) – complement Lawrence's concerns about Western society. Though, similarly, "Woolf's desire to see the war as rupture" places Frayn's central thesis of continuity under a strain that, for me, is not readily dismissed as a desire "to change the social order" (151). Chapter 4 deals with 'Sagas and series, 1924–1928', contrasting R. H. Mottram's *The Spanish Farm Trilogy* with Ford Madox Ford's better-known *Parade's End* tetralogy to argue that: "The adapted saga form allows an extended, nuanced engagement with the conflict" (163). Chapter 5 turns to 'the War Books Boom, 1928–1930', which as Ford pointed out started to resemble a form of 'Stocktaking' (201). The standard here was set not by British fiction but by a German book, Erich Maria Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front* (1929), and R. C. Sherriff's stage play *Journey's End* (1928). By contrast, Richard Aldington's angry novel *Death of a Hero* (1929) has had a shorter shelf-life, "serving as a drainage channel for the suppressed indignations" of late 1920s England (220). Such novels marked a tailing off of war fiction, as disenchantment came under "attack ... from socially and politically conservative commentators" (240).

In war prose as in poetry, as we have seen in the case of Eliot, it was time to move on, even if the underlying issues had not been “worked through” and even though onwards led, as we know now, to a second global conflict. Frayn’s impressive survey ends with the closing image from the 1930 film *All Quiet on the Western Front*, in which, as the dying Paul Bäumer reaches out of his trench towards an elusive butterfly, we grasp that “nature, beauty and rural life” have been overtaken by “the machine, modernity and modern warfare” (245).

---

<sup>1</sup> Wilfred Owen, ‘Dulce Et Decorum Est’, in *The Poems of Wilfred Owen*, ed. Jon Stallworthy (London: Chatto & Windus, 1990), 117.

<sup>2</sup> James Douglas in *Star*, 22 October 1915, 4, quoted in *D. H. Lawrence: The Critical Heritage*, ed. R. P. Draper (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), 94.

<sup>3</sup> For a well-argued account of the Home Front war on literary “decadence”, including suppression of *The Rainbow*, see Chapter 2, ‘The Arts Enlist’, in Samuel Hynes, *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture* (London: Bodley Head, 1990).

<sup>4</sup> Jay Pinker, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995), 1–11.

<sup>5</sup> Paul Delany, *D. H. Lawrence’s Nightmare: The Writer and His Circle in the Years of the Great War* (Hassocks: Harvester Press, 1979), 211.

<sup>6</sup> For instance, there are only 11 scattered page references to Lawrence in the index of Vincent Sherry, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Literature of the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005).

<sup>7</sup> Paul Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (London: Oxford UP, 1975), 313–4.

<sup>8</sup> Colonial war poetry is an important area where existing work is lagging, but see also Santanu Das, ed., *Empire, Race and First World War Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011) and Santanu Das, *Indian Troops in Europe, 1914–18* (Ahmedabad: Mapin Publishing, 2015).

<sup>9</sup> For example, Peter Brooker, Andrzej Gąsior, Deborah Longworth and Andrew Thacker, eds, *The Oxford Handbook of Modernisms* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010). Of a total of 55 chapters, only one, by Marina McKay deals with ‘Violence, Art, and War’, and there are no index entries for the First World War.