

J·D·H·L·S

Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies

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

Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies

EDITOR

Andrew Harrison

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Paul Redmond

EDITORIAL BOARD

Helen Baron

Fiona Becket

Michael Bell

Howard J. Booth

James T. Boulton

David Ellis

Bethan Jones

Sean Matthews

Paul Poplawski

N. H. Reeve

Neil Roberts

Stephen Rowley

Keith Sagar

John Turner

Jeff Wallace

John Worthen

The *JDHLS* is published annually by the D. H. Lawrence Society of Great Britain. Queries and submissions should be sent to the Editor via e-mail, DrAndrewHarrison@aol.com

The D. H. Lawrence Society was formed in 1974 to further knowledge and appreciation of the life and works of D. H. Lawrence. Current membership subscriptions are: Ordinary, £18; Concessions, £16; European, £20; Overseas, £20. The subscription includes the price of the *JDHLS* and members also receive a regular Newsletter. Cheque subscriptions payable to "The D. H. Lawrence Society" should be sent to Ms Sheila Bamford, 39 Church St., Heage, Belper, Derbyshire DE56 2BG.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| EDITORIAL NOTES AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | |
| ANDREW HARRISON | 5 |
| FURTHER LETTERS OF D. H. LAWRENCE | |
| JOHN WORTHEN and ANDREW HARRISON | 7 |
| <i>A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF D. H. LAWRENCE,</i> | |
| THIRD EDITION (2001), BY WARREN ROBERTS AND PAUL | |
| POPLAWSKI: CORRECTIONS, ADDITIONS AND UPDATES TO | |
| SECTIONS B, C, D AND E. | |
| PAUL POPLAWSKI | 11 |
| “THE INSIDIOUS MASTERY OF SONG”: | |
| D. H. LAWRENCE, MUSIC AND MODERNISM | |
| SUSAN REID | 109 |
| “THE DAY OF MY LETTERS IS OVER”: | |
| D. H. LAWRENCE’S PICTURE POSTCARDS FROM THE | |
| AMERICAS | |
| OLIVER TAYLOR | 131 |
| OUT OF PLACE: | |
| COLONIAL AUSTRALIANS IN <i>ST. MAWR</i> | |
| DAVID GAME | 161 |
| “UNHEARD-OF BECOMINGS” IN D. H. LAWRENCE’S | |
| <i>ST. MAWR</i>: A DELEUZEAN READING | |
| GERALD DOHERTY | 185 |
| “A MILLION THANKS FOR THE BOOKS”: | |
| A RECENTLY DISCOVERED POSTCARD FROM | |
| D. H. LAWRENCE TO HENRY SAVAGE | |
| JONATHAN LONG | 215 |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| REVIEWS | 219 |
| NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS | 231 |
| ABBREVIATIONS | 233 |

EDITORIAL NOTES AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ANDREW HARRISON

It is with great sadness that the Lawrence community mourned the deaths of Mark Kinkead-Weekes and Peter Preston during 2011. This number of the *JDHLS* is dedicated to their memory, to commemorate their significant contributions to Lawrence scholarship, and the study of Lawrence's life and work, over many years.

I would like to thank the contributors for their hard work, patience and co-operation; Paul Redmond for his assistance; Jonathan Long for his generous work on behalf of the journal and the Society; John Worthen for his advice and editorial contributions; the D. H. Lawrence Society for its continuing support of the *JDHLS*; and my colleagues at the University of Nottingham for their support and encouragement.

Victoria Manthorpe has provided two corrigenda notes relating to her article, 'Ernest Weekley and D. H. Lawrence: Education and Language', *JDHLS*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (2010):

1. Page 90 line 1: Ernest Weekly (1865-1945) should read Ernest Weekley (1865-1954)
2. Page 111, Note 2: Muriel Lough (née Barker 1913-1988) should read Muriel Lough (née Barker 1913-1998)

In addition, James T. Boulton has kindly provided the following note:

With reference to the photograph on p. 102 of the article on Ernest Weekley, I believe that the young woman sitting on the ground near Weekley's left leg was Monica Alice McMain, later

Partridge following her marriage in 1937 to William (Bill) Partridge. She graduated at Nottingham in 1936 having read French with Latin; Janko Lavrin appointed her as his tutorial assistant. She became a lecturer and eventually (in 1967) Professor in the Department of Slavonic Languages; she retired in 1980 and died in 2008.

Bill Partridge was distinguished in his own right: he became Professor of Pharmaceutical Chemistry; he was also a fine painter, a member of the St Ives Group. He and Monica collected paintings in watercolour, a collection which was bequeathed to Pembroke College, Cambridge.

Holders of unpublished manuscript letters by or to D. H. Lawrence, and researchers who have located unpublished letters in archives, are encouraged to make these available for publication by contacting either the Editor (DrAndrewHarrison@aol.com) or John Worthen (DrJohnWorthen@btinternet.com).

Individuals wishing to submit work with a view to publishing it in the *JDHLS* are invited to contact the Editor via e-mail in the first instance (DrAndrewHarrison@aol.com). Submissions are refereed by two members of the Editorial Board. Once an essay has been accepted for publication a style sheet will be forwarded to the author.

The Editor and Society are grateful to Laurence Pollinger Ltd, the Trustees of the Estate of Frieda Lawrence Ravagli, for permission to quote from copyright material.

The cover photograph shows the Pacific Ocean at the back of 'Wyewurk', the house in Thirroul, south of Sydney, where the Lawrences stayed between 29 May and 10 August 1922: "We have only our little grassy garden – then the low cliff – and then the great white rollers breaking, and the surf seeming to rush in right under our feet as we sit at table" (*4L* 249).



Lettice Anna Brown (née Berry)
(1881-1952).

(Photograph courtesy of Terry Flynn)

***A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF D. H. LAWRENCE,
THIRD EDITION (2001),
BY WARREN ROBERTS AND PAUL POPLAWSKI:
CORRECTIONS, ADDITIONS AND UPDATES TO
SECTIONS B, C, D AND E.***

PAUL POPLAWSKI

Introduction

The material presented here completes the task, begun in the last issue of the *JDHLS*, of providing a ten-year supplement to the third edition of *A Bibliography of D. H. Lawrence*. In that issue, I dealt with sections A (primary works by Lawrence) and F (secondary or critical works). Here, I provide corrections, additions and updates to the remaining sections, B, C, D and E. Section B gives bibliographical details of the first editions of books (including some pamphlets and catalogues) which contain previously unpublished material by Lawrence. For evident reasons, it is now rare for major new items of this kind to appear, and the relevant section below mostly contains corrections or revisions to existing entries in the third edition and adds only three new entries. Section C lists the first periodical printings of previously unpublished works by Lawrence – and although, again, one would not expect to see many new entries appearing here, my supplement makes a number of important revisions and corrections to the section, and does in fact add several newly-discovered items from the past (mainly deriving from Christopher Pollnitz's researches for the forthcoming *Cambridge Poems*), along with a few more recent items. Section E provides locations and brief descriptive details of Lawrence's known manuscripts, and for this section, too, my supplement mostly makes corrections and revisions and adds only a small number of new items. By contrast, my update to Section D – which gives details of translations of Lawrence's works – adds a huge

number of new items, including both recent translations and newly-discovered ones from the past.¹ The nature of this section, unlike the others dealt with here, means that it can, in principle, continue to grow *ad infinitum*, but the fact that it has expanded quite so enormously since the previous edition of the *Bibliography* bears striking witness to Lawrence's continuing and widespread relevance to readers around the world.²

Corrections, additions and updates

References are to the third edition of the *Bibliography*, indicating existing item numbers and, often, page and line numbers – e.g., **(C22) 457:8**. For Section D, only item numbers are generally given.

¹ Some 484 translations have been added here, along with several new language sub-sections. With the translations already listed in the third edition of the *Bibliography*, this means that, since the first (German) translation of 1922 (of *The Rainbow*) there have been at least 1041 separate book-length translations of Lawrence's works in 43 different languages (and it almost certain that there are further existing translations still to be identified and recorded).

² For their invaluable help with this supplement, I am extremely grateful to the following: Bingbin Bi (Hei Ma), Keith Cushman, Nick Ceramella, Simonetta de Filippis, Jay Gertzman, Andrew Harrison, Virginia Hyde, Christa Jansohn, Jeff Jones, Gigi Joseph, Petr Krul, Jonathan Long, John Martin, Dieter Mehl, Stefania Michelucci, Masami Nakabayashi, Christopher Pollnitz, Neil Reeve, Natalya Reinhold, Betsy Sargent, Maria Smirnova, Roy Spencer, Sara Timby (Stanford University Libraries), Lin Vasey, John and Connii Worthen. Peter Preston's many fields of expertise within Lawrence studies included bibliography and I am deeply indebted to him for freely sharing his knowledge, books and enthusiasm with me. His presiding inspiration helped me to complete this work and I dedicate it to his memory.

SECTION B

(B5) 390:10 *Add at end of entry:* See also (B12).

(B12) 394:22 *Add at end of entry:* See also (B5)

(B14) 396:3 *Replace sentence beginning* See also ... *with:* Lawrence's "Introduction" was printed separately for the first time in 1937 as "The Portrait of M. M." in *Woollcott's Second Reader* (Viking Press, New York); the text was taken from Knopf's edition and was reprinted, with the same title, in 1960 in *the noble savage* (C243.3). A short extract from the "Introduction" appeared in Richard Aldington's 1935 *The Spirit of Place* (A72) (and see also (A112) for a further appearance in extract form). The whole essay was reprinted in *Phoenix II* (A108) (and see also (A115.5)). The manuscript (E233.7) is entitled "Memoir of Maurice Magnus" and has been published as such in (A137) and (A167).

(B25.5) 404:5 *Add page references after German title:* pp. 135–43

(B26) 404:20 *In the second line of the notes, for 1928 read 1929; then add the following sentence to the end of this paragraph:* In fact, we now know that Lawrence received proofs of the novel in February 1929 and had completed the "Introduction" by the 24th of that month.

(B35) 411:11 *Extend sentence of contents, to read:* ...1921–1930; and early fragments related to "Indians and an Englishman" and "Certain Americans and an Englishman", pp. 52–58 (reprinted as Appendix II and note 121:8 of the Cambridge edition of *Mornings in Mexico* (A37b)).

(B40.5) 417:35 *The pagination given for "Giovanni Verga" is incorrect and should be:* pp. 115–17

(B46) 421:24 *For* by Jessie Chambers for submission to Ford Madox Hueffer *read* by Louie Burrows for submission to Austin Harrison (*This is an error surviving from the first edition of the Bibliography. Tedlock was correctly advised that this manuscript was not in Lawrence's hand, but he was mistaken in attributing it to Jessie Chambers; and Hueffer had resigned from the English Review by the time in question. The manuscript E284b was,*

however, correctly attributed to Louie Burrows in the third edition. For relevant details, see Lawrence's letters in A121a, pp. 245–6, 248, 249, and the composition and publication history for "Odour of Chrysanthemums" contained in A6b (especially pp. l-li) and A174, pp. xxiii–xxvii.)

(B56) / (B57) 428 Insert new entry, as follows:

| | | |
|--------------|--|-------------|
| B56.5 | COLLECTION OF FIRST AND FINE EDITIONS OF D. H. LAWRENCE | 1953 |
|--------------|--|-------------|

first edition

Catalogue No. 28 | A | COLLECTION | OF | FIRST & FINE EDITIONS | OF | D. H. LAWRENCE | Including Critical | and | Biographical Material [*the whole enclosed within a box frame made up of lines repeating Lawrence's initials: DHL DHL DHL ...*] | NOTE: The order of the Titles listed follows that of Edward D. | McDonald's Bibliographies of D. H. Lawrence. To save | space we have refrained from repeating the more detailed | Bibliographical descriptions, since the items listed corres- | pond to those of McDonald's entries. | CAMBRIDGE BOOK SHOP | 845 North La Cienega Boulevard | Los Angeles 46, California

White paper upper cover serving as title page and printed in black as above. All edges trimmed. Leaves measure 11" x 8 ½". No printed pagination but the catalogue has 14 pages including the cover. It is stapled in the top left corner. No date is given, but John Martin reports that the letter was bought by Stanford University very shortly after the catalogue's publication and Stanford's records show they ordered the letter on 21 December 1953.

CONTAINS: "Letter" of 5 December 1927 to Charles Wilson, p. [15]. This letter is reprinted in Volume VI of the Cambridge *Letters* (A121f), pp. 229–30. At the time of that volume's publication (prior to this catalogue's coming to light), the letter was thought to

have been previously unpublished. The letter is item 100 in the catalogue and is offered for sale at \$25.00. (The first item is Duckworth's *Love Poems* (A3), offered for \$17.50).

(B60) 431:22–4 *The source article referred to (C220) is by Emile Delavenay, but he is not explicitly mentioned, despite a cross-reference in the index; moreover, it could be made slightly clearer that Lawrence's "Marginal Notes" are contained here within a reprinting of Delavenay's article. Therefore, amend this paragraph to read as follows:*

“Marginal Notes”, pp. 66–70; contained within a reprinting of Emile Delavenay's “Sur un exemplaire de Schopenhauer annoté par D. H. Lawrence”, which first appeared in the *Revue Anglo-Américaine*, February 1936 (C220).

(B63) 434:10 *Add to end of entry:* NOTES: First published in the United Kingdom by Heinemann in 1961 at 35s. Published in 1969 in Canada, without illustrations, as *D. H. Lawrence: A Critical Survey* by Forum House, Toronto.

(B70) 437 *Move whole entry to Section A as A103.7; leave main heading, with item number and date and add below:* Item now listed as (A103.7).

(B87) 447:27–28 *Amend paragraph of contents to read:*

First publication of the following three items:

Autobiographical fragment, “Mushrooms”, p. [vii]. See (E260a) and (A165, Appendix III).

“Chapter Plan” for *Paul Morel*, pp. 278–9. See (A4i, Appendix II).

Fragmentary poem-sequence, “A Life History in Harmonies and Discords”, Appendix III, pp. 495–499. See (E320.1).

Add new post-1994 entries, to follow (B88):

B89

GERARD A. J. STODOLSKI, INC.
CATALOGUE SEVEN

1996

first edition

GERARD A. J. STODOLSKI, INC. | AUTOGRAPH LETTERS
[ornament] MANUSCRIPTS [ornament] DOCUMENTS |
CATALOGUE SEVEN | THE SOUL LIES BURIED IN THE INK
*[the whole printed in dark mauve against a background collage of
facsimile fragments, apparently taken from catalogue items, printed
in light mauve]*

White card covers, upper cover serving as title page and printed as above; background collage extends to lower cover which also incorporates a pre-printed address panel; no real spine, but printed in mauve along stapled side, from top to bottom: GERALD A. J. STODOLSKI, INC CATALOGUE SEVEN All edges trimmed. Leaves measure 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{7}{8}$ ". No printed pagination but the catalogue has 52 pages including covers and is stapled between pp. [24] and [25]. The inside upper cover gives the dealer's address in Manchester, New Hampshire, a guarantee of the authenticity of all items and a note on 'Want Lists'. Distributed in 1996 and probably not sold.

CONTAINS: "Letter" of 28 January 1921 to the American poet, Sara Teasdale, in facsimile, with (slightly faulty) printed transcription, p. [38]. This letter is reprinted in an accurate transcription in Volume VIII of the Cambridge *Letters* (A121i) (letter 2160a, pp. 39–40); at the time of that volume's publication (prior to this catalogue's coming to light), the letter was thought to have been previously unpublished. The letter is item 88 in the catalogue and is offered for sale at \$3500.

**B90 D. H. LAWRENCE, PHILIP HESELTINE AND 2001
THREE UNPUBLISHED LETTERS**

first edition

[University of Birmingham / publisher's device] | THE UNIVERSITY | OF BIRMINGHAM | INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED RESEARCH | IN ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES [preceding two lines in green] | James T Boulton | D. H. Lawrence, Philip Heseltine | and Three Unpublished Letters | OCCASIONAL PAPERS: SECOND SERIES N^o5

Stapled booklet with cream card covers, upper cover serving as title page and printed in black and green as above; lower cover has a list, continuing into the inside lower cover, of the Institute's first and second series of occasional papers. All edges trimmed. Leaves measure 8⁵/₈" x 5³/₄". [i]–[iv] + 1–[36] (including covers). Published in 2001 at £3.

CONTAINS: Three letters to Philip Heseltine, two dating from November 1915 and one from June 1917. The letters are printed within an essay by Professor Boulton which seeks "to chronicle the relationship between Lawrence and Heseltine from its beginning to its acrimonious end" ("Preface", p. 1). Part of the third letter is also reproduced in facsimile on p. 24. These letters have since been reprinted in (C278).

SECTION C

(C8) 454:14 *Add to note on "Violets":* Also printed in *Smart Set*, September 1913, along with "Kisses in the Train".

(C22) 457:8, 13 *Amend sentence to read:* First collected in *Young Lorenzo* (B34); also collected in the *New Statesman's* fiftieth anniversary anthology, *New Statesmanship* (Longmans, 1963), pp. 3–8, and see also (A107) and (A136). *Then, at end of notes, delete "See (A107)."*

(C24) 457:24 *Add to sentence, after final page reference:* (reprinted in a twenty-fifth anniversary selection, *Armchair Esquire*, edited by Arnold Gingrich and L. Rust Hills (Heinemann,

1958), pp. 22–28; pp.349–383 of the book includes a checklist of literary contributions to *Esquire*, 1933–1958).

(C29) 459:5–6 *Revise last sentence of notes to read:* “On the Balcony”, “River Roses” and “Gloire de Dijon” appeared in *Lyric*, August and October 1917 and January 1918 respectively.

(C31) 459:26 *Add further publication details, to read:* *Smart Set* (42: 71–77) March 1914. *Also, amend next line to read:* Collected in revised form in *The Prussian Officer* (A6) and in this precise version, as well as in its manuscript version, in *The Vicar’s Garden* (A174).

(C33) 460:9 *Extend first sentence, to read:* See also (B38.7), (A171) and (A174).

(C34.5) 460:31 *Amend line to read:* Collected in revised form in *The Prussian Officer* (A6) and in this precise version, as well as in its manuscript version, in *The Vicar’s Garden* (A174).

(C57) 465:8 *Add missing “DE” to essay title:* HENRY ST. JOHN DE CRÈVECOEUR *Also, amend note, to read:* “Henry” was changed to “Hector” (Crèvecoeur’s correct name) for book publication in (A25a); the Cambridge edition (A25c) retains Lawrence’s idiosyncratic forms “Henry” and “Crèvecoeur”.

(C68) / (C69) 467 *In preparing the Cambridge edition of Lawrence’s Poems, Christopher Pollnitz has established that the publication of “Verse Free and Unfree” in Voices preceded that of “Poetry of the Present” in Playboy. Therefore, add new entry, as follows:*

C68.5 VERSE FREE AND UNFREE

Voices, October 1919

Printed as the introduction to the American edition of *New Poems* (A11b) and collected in *Phoenix* (A76). Also published as “Poetry of the Present” in *Playboy* in late 1919 (see C69 and C70) and reprinted with that title from (A11b) in the *Evening Post Book Review* for 19 June 1920.

(C69) 467:26–30 *Replace whole paragraph with:* See C68.5. (NB. In the existing paragraph (A116) was a misprint for (A11b).)

(C73) 469:7 *Amend final sentence to read:* The story also appeared in a German translation by Franz Franzius in 1923 in *Insel-Almanach auf das Jahr 1924* (118–132).

(C74) 469:22 *Add note to end of entry:* Lawrence sent his essay to Mountsier on 7 September 1920; it was originally intended as a foreword to *Studies in Classic American Literature* (A25) but bears little relation to the foreword actually published there; it is not known who gave the essay its title.

(C100) 474:12 *Add note:* First collected in *Phoenix II* (A107).

(C101) 474:14, 18 *Add month to first publication details, to read:* ...December 1922. *Also, amend first sentence of second paragraph of notes, to read:* The “letter” in question, written on 12 October 1922, is ...

(C110) 476:28 *Add page references after periodical title:* (86–87)

(C110.5) 476:34 *Add to entry:* HUMMING-BIRD (C80) also reprinted here.

(C116) 478:10 *Add:* A German translation by Philip Lehrs, “Religiös Sein”, appeared in 1924 in *Insel-Almanach auf das Jahr 1925* (15–25).

(C122) 479:10–11, 14 *Amend the entry for the drawing, to read:* THE CORN DANCE (A drawing)

This original drawing by Lawrence is reproduced in the Cambridge edition of *Mornings in Mexico* (A37b) on p. [69]. A simplified copy, traced by Dorothy Brett, appeared in the *Laughing Horse* in April 1926 (C139) and was reprinted as a broadside in 1927 (A37.5); it was also used for the dust-jacket of *Mornings in Mexico* (A37a).

Then, amend final sentence of note and extend paragraph, to read: ...The essay also appeared, unillustrated, in the *Adelphi* (2: 208–15), August 1924, and, in a German translation by Else Jaffe, “Der Tanz vom Spriessenden Korn”, in *Der Neue Merkur* (8: 104–10), October 1924. The essay was included by the editor of *Theatre Arts Monthly*, Edith Isaacs, in her collection, *Theatre: Essays on the Arts of the Theatre* (Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1927), pp. 246–54 (reprinted, 1968); Isaacs’ book was published some time after 5

August 1927 as it acknowledges the prior appearance of the essay in the first American edition of *Mornings in Mexico* (A37).

(C126) 480:2, 6–7 *Add further page reference: ... (4: 3, 11) ... At end of entry, add volume and page references: ... Adelphi (2: 494–507), ...*

(C127) 480:19–20 *At end of entry, add volume and page references for both periodical publications, to read: ... January and February (2: 685–92, 764–78) 1925 ... Living Age (325: 47–56), 4 April 1925.*

(C132) / (C133) 481 *Insert new item, as follows:*

C132.5 ROSALINO

Insel-Almanach auf das Jahr 1926 (103–19), Insel-Verlag, Leipzig, 1925.

A translation by Franz Franzius of “The Mozo”, first collected in June 1927 in *Mornings in Mexico* (A37a). See Virginia Hyde’s introduction to (A37b), pp. lv–lvi, for details of how this translation came about. See also *Letters* v (A121e), pp. 252–3, 331. For the essay’s first appearance in English, see (C151).

(C133.5) 481:17 *Italicise periodical title and add page reference after it: (p. 12)*

(C136) 481:30, 34 *Add volume and page references, to read: Southwest Review (11: 102–15), ... Also, amend last line of note, to read: ... and a second probably between 12 May and some time in June (although the final paragraph may have been added later: see the introduction to *Mornings in Mexico* (A37b), pp. xlvi–xlix).*

(C137) 482:6 *Italicise title and add page reference: (p. 7).*

(C139) 482:23, 32–3 *Amend first line of entry to give page references for each item, to read:*

Laughing Horse (13: 1–3, 4–5, 6–9, 10, 11–14, 15), April 1926
Then, for the details of the drawing, “Pueblo Indian Dancers”, replace the existing two lines with: This is a copy of Lawrence’s original drawing (C122), traced by Dorothy Brett for this publication, and also used for the dust-jacket of Secker’s *Mornings in Mexico* (A37a) as well as for the separate broadside (A37.5).

(C140) 483:8 *Add volume and page references, to read: ... New Criterion* (5: 467–75), ...

(C142) 483:16 *Add:* A German translation by Karl Lerbs appeared in 1933 in *Insel-Almanach auf das Jahr 1934* (57–76).

(C147) 484:16 *Add volume and page references, to read: ... Adelphi* (3: 538–54), ...

(C151) 484:31, 33 *Insert new note after publication data:* First publication in English; for first appearance, in German, see (C132.5). *Also, amend last sentence and add journal volume and page numbers, to read:* This essay appeared, in abridged form, in the *Living Age* (332: 608–15), 1 April 1927, as ...

(C157) 486:20 *Add to end of paragraph:* It was published in a German translation by Hans Bülow as “Der Mann, Der Inseln Liebte. Eine Geschichte” in the *Frankfurter Zeitung und Handelsblatt* (Ixxii), 29 April, 1 and 3–6 May, 1928.

(C162) 487:19, 21 *For IN LOVE read IN LOVE? Also, add further note:* Published in German in 1928, as “Verliebt?”, in a translation by Else Jaffe-Richtofen, in *Insel-Almanach auf das Jahr 1929* (57–76).

(C165.5) 488:6, 8 *For Collected in read Collected, and first published in English, in ... Then, for See (C217). read See (E143.6) and also (C217) and (A60b).*

(C167) 488:14–17 *Make heading read: THE ESCAPED COCK [Part I] Then, make second line of entry read:* Published together with the later Part II as *The Escaped Cock* (A50a). *Also, amend start of next line, to read:* Written 13–28 April 1927, this is the earliest ...

(C172) 489:30 *Correct date and add page references, to read: Vogue* (London) (35, 58), 8 August 1928

(C173) 490:2–4 *Replace sentence beginning “It was probably ...” with:* It was written in May 1927, probably after 19 May and before the end of the month. *Also, add page and date references to second periodical publication, to read:* *Fortnightly Review* (562–569), 1 October 1928.

(C178) 490:30 *For See (B25.5). read* The essay appears to have been published first in a German translation by Frieda Lawrence – see (B25.5).

(C180.5) 491:16 *Add:* Also appeared in the American *The Household Magazine* (30: 3, 62), February 1930.

(C182) 491:27 *Add:* Also published in German in 1930, as “D. H. Lawrence über sich selbst”, in a translation by Kurt Fiedler, in *Insel-Almanach auf das Jahr 1931* (82–90).

(C184) 492:8–9 *Amend first sentence to read:* ...was probably written in May 1928; it was received for typing by Nancy Pearn by 4 June 1928.

(C189) / (C190) 493 *Insert three new items, as follows:*

C189.3 WHEN THE RIPE FRUIT FALLS

Time and Tide (10: 808), 5 July 1929

Collected in *Pansies* (A47)

C189.5 BEAUTIFUL OLD AGE

Time and Tide (10: 907), 26 July 1929

Collected in *Pansies* (A47)

C189.7 BE STILL

Time and Tide (10: 982), 16 August 1929

Collected in *Pansies* (A47)

(C192) / (C193) 493–94 *Insert two new items, as follows:*

C192.1 TRUST

Time and Tide (10: 1174), 4 October 1929

Collected in *Pansies* (A47)

C192.5 STOP IT

Time and Tide (10: 1371), 15 November 1929

Collected in *Pansies* (A47)

(C194) 494:9 *Add page references, to read:* *Echanges* (54–62), December 1929.

(C196) 494:25 *Add page references, to read:* *Everyman* (733–734), 23 January 1930.

(C197) / (C198) 495 *Insert new item, as follows:*

C197.5 FATHER NEPTUNE'S LITTLE AFFAIR WITH
FREEDOM

Time and Tide (11: 472), 11 April 1930

Collected in *Nettles* (A52), from a different manuscript source, as “Neptune’s Little Affair with Freedom”.

(C212) 499:12 *For December read November*

(C217) 500:16, 19–28 *For INGLESE read INGLESI Then revise and shorten the paragraph of notes from its second line, to read: ... from Insel-Verlag for “a more or less personal article” from Lawrence. The essay was in fact written in May 1927 and it was first published in the same year, in a German translation, in Insel-Verlag’s *Das Inselschiff* (see (C165.5)). This German translation was in turn translated into Italian, by Emma Sole, for its appearance in Turin’s *La Cultura*.*

(C241) 505:10 *Add note: First collected in (A114); also printed in (A168).*

(C243.3) 505:25, 26–29 *Correct title of journal to: the noble savage Then replace first sentence of note, to read: This is the essay’s first periodical appearance but its second printing separately from the Magnus *Memoirs*; it first appeared on its own in the 1937 anthology, *Woolcott’s Second Reader* (see notes to B14).*

(C274) / (C275) 512 *Insert new item as follows:*

C274.5 DANDELIONS (A watercolour painting) in “Six Paintings by D. H. Lawrence” by Keith Sagar

Words International (East Sussex) (1: 30), November 1987. This painting is also reproduced in Keith Sagar’s *D. H. Lawrence’s Paintings* (A164), where Sagar explains how he came to acquire it in 1985. When he first came across it in 1980, he writes, the painting “had never been heard of since Lawrence gave instructions for it to be sent to Orioli in 1929” (p. 80).

Add new post-1990 entries, to follow (C276):

C277 LETTERS in “Further Letters of D. H. Lawrence” by James T. Boulton
Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies (1, 1: 7–32), 2006.

The twenty-seven letters published here are all printed from original manuscripts. Eighteen of the letters were previously unpublished; the other nine have previously appeared in the Cambridge *Letters* (A121), but in versions taken from secondary, and sometimes incomplete, sources. This and subsequent related essays in this journal are intended to update the volumes of Cambridge *Letters*; the letters are presented in a similar format, with identifying numbers that position them appropriately in the established Cambridge sequence.

C278 LETTERS in “Further Letters of D. H. Lawrence” by James T. Boulton

Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies (1, 2: 7–21), 2007.

This essay contains three previously unpublished letters and two letters previously published in the Cambridge *Letters* but printed here for the first time from original sources. It also reprints the three letters to Philip Heseltine in (B90) and has a section of “Supplementary Documents” (pp. 18–21) containing three previously unpublished documents relating to Lawrence’s last illness and death (two letters to Dr Andrew Morland and a short account by Morland’s wife, Dorothy, of her contact with Lawrence in his final months).

C279 LETTERS in “Further Letters of D. H. Lawrence” by James T. Boulton

Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies (1, 3: 7–13), 2008.

Along with contextualising notes and documents, two short letters from Lawrence are published here for the first time (one from 1927 to George and Anne Conway, sent with a gift copy of *Glad Ghosts* (A36), and one from 1929 to the editor of *Vanity Fair*, sent with an “open letter” response to Lawrence’s essay, “Woman in Man’s Image” (C187)). A section of “Supplementary Documents” (pp. 10–13) contains two previously unpublished letters to Lawrence, from S. S. Koteliansky and Charles Lahr respectively.

C280 LETTERS in “Further Letters of D. H. Lawrence” by James T. Boulton

Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies (2, 1: 7–59), 2009.

This essay contains eight previously unpublished letters by Lawrence and one letter previously published in the Cambridge *Letters* but printed here for the first time from the original manuscript. A section of “Supplementary Documents” (pp. 15–59) contains previously unpublished letters to Lawrence (including several from Thomas Seltzer) and two previously unpublished letters from Frieda Lawrence (to Harwood Brewster).

C281 LETTERS in “Further Letters of D. H. Lawrence” by John Worthen and Andrew Harrison.

Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies (2, 2: 7–16), 2010.

Five previously unpublished letters appear here, along with three previously published in the Cambridge *Letters* but printed here for the first time from the original manuscripts. One further letter from Lawrence to T. S. Eliot is included, taken from *The Letters of T. S. Eliot*, Volume 2 (Faber & Faber, 2009). Two letters to Lawrence from T. S. Eliot, also taken from the latter volume, appear in a section of “Supplementary Documents” (pp. 15–16) along with a previously unpublished letter from Robert Bridges to Martin Secker relating to Lawrence’s *Collected Poems*.

SECTION D

It should be remembered that only translations published as books (in their first editions) are systematically recorded in Section D. Translations appearing in periodicals or as part of general anthologies or compilations are not given separate entries here, though they may sometimes be noted within a main entry or in the headnote to a linguistic sub-section (and see also Section C for some early translations published in periodicals).

515:5 Amend third sentence of headnote, to read: Notes of these and other relevant bibliographical articles ... Also, immediately after this sentence, add: For a wealth of related information, see also *The Reception of D. H. Lawrence Around the World* edited by Takeo Iida (F690) and *The Reception of D. H. Lawrence in Europe* edited by Christa Jansohn and Dieter Mehl (F759). Each of these books contains essays by individual scholars on the translation and reception of Lawrence's works in different countries and regions, often accompanied by extensive and detailed bibliographical information: I have drawn on this information in updating this section since 2001 and I am happy to acknowledge my debt to the relevant scholars in the appropriate sub-sections below.

ARABIC

Add new entries after (D0.31), as follows:

D0.32 . . . AL-THALAB . . . Baghdad, Dār al-Ma'mūn lil-Tarjamah wal-Nashr, 1987. pp. 128. A translation by Namīr Abbās Muzaaffar of *The Fox*.

D0.33 . . . AL-THA LAB . . . Al-Lādhaqiyah (Syria), Dār al-Hiwār, 1989. pp. 115. A translation by Zaki Oust of *The Fox*.

D0.34 . . . FANTĀZYĀ AL-GHARĪZAH . . . Al-Qāhirah (Egypt), Dār al-Hilāl, 1992. pp. 293. A translation by Abd al-Maqṣūd Abd al-Karīm of *Fantasia of the Unconscious*.

D0.35 . . . AL-KHUNFUĀ' AL-MANQUTAH . . . Al-Lādhaqiyah, Dār al-Hiwār, 1995. pp. 147. A translation by Zakī Al-Uṣṭāh of "The Ladybird".

D0.36 . . . QAWS QUZAH . . . Damascus, Dār al-Madā lil-Thaqāfah, 1998. A translation by Fādil Al-Sadūnī of *The Rainbow*.

D0.37 . . . ARD AL-MASĀ WA-QASĀID UKHRĀ . . . Al-Qāhirah, Al-Majlis al-Alā lil-Thaqāfah, 2000. pp. 179. A translation by Tāhir Al-Barbarī of selected poems.

D0.38 . . . NISĀ ASHIQĀT . . . Damascus, Ward, 2003. pp. 624. A translation by Ḥanā Abūd of *Women in Love*.

D0.39 . . . NISĀ FĪ AL-HUBB : RIWĀYA . . . Ȅumş (Syria), Maktabat Waḍāḥ, 2007. pp. 347. A translation by Khalīl Ibrāhīm al-Shāwī of *Women in Love*.

515 Add new language sub-section for Basque after (D0.5):

BASQUE

D0.75 . . . AZERIA . . . Donostia-San Sebastián, Txertoa, 1991. pp. 133. A translation by Xabier Galarreta of *The Fox*. Republished in 1999 by X. Galarreta, Astigarraga, and in 2004 by Hiria, Donostia-San Sebastián.

D0.77 . . . BIRJINA ETA IJTOA . . . Euba, Ibaizabal, 1993. pp. 117. A translation by Irene Aldasoro of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

BENGALI

Add new entries after (D1), as follows:

D1.03 . . . JIPSI O KUMARI . . . Calcutta, Anuradha Prakasani, 1980. pp. 108. A translation by Utpal Bhattacharya of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D1.04 . . . SANS EYAND LABHARS . . . Calcutta, Tulikalam, 1981. pp. iv + 336. A translation by Sudhamsuranjan Ghosh of *Sons and Lovers*.

D1.06 . . . THE BEST STORIES OF D. H. LAWRENCE . . . Delhi, Rupa, 1987. A translation by Bani Basu of a selection of stories which also appears to have been republished in 1996 by Bishwa Shahitya Kendro, Dhaka.

D1.08 . . . SĀNAS AYĀNDA LĀBHĀRAS . . . Calcutta: Madela Publishing House, 1998. pp. 448. A translation by Asit Sarkār of *Sons and Lovers*.

BULGARIAN

516 Add headnote: See also Stefana Roussenova's essay (and related bibliography), "The Reception of D. H. Lawrence in Bulgaria", in Jansohn and Mehl (F759), pp. 213–21, 332–34.

(D1.2) *Amend first word of title to LYUBOVNIKÄT. Insert before final sentence of note: Reprinted in 1939 and 1943. Then add to final sentence: (see (D1.24) below).*

(D1.22) *Add: Reprinted in the same year.*

(D1.24) *Make title as in (D1.2) and amend note to read:* This is in fact the new edition of (D1.2) mentioned in that entry; it includes a preface by Frieda Lawrence, taken from (A42g), and an afterword.

Add new entry after (D1.24):

D1.25 . . . VLJUBENI ŽENI . . . Sofia, Ciela, 2005. pp. 586. A translation by Boris Damjanov of *Women in Love*.

516 Add new language sub-section for Catalan after (D1.3):

CATALAN

D1.350 . . . L'AMANT DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Barcelona, Proa, 1980. pp. 466. A translation by Jordi Arbonès of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, apparently reprinted many times, including in 2008. Also published as follows (all Barcelona): Enciclopedia Catalana, 1992 (2 vols); Columna, 1995; Suma de Lletres Catalana, 2002.

D1.354 . . . FILLS I AMANTS . . . Barcelona, edicions 62, 1987. pp. 412. A translation by Laura Santamaría i Guinot of *Sons and Lovers*. A reissue of 2002 appears to be much longer and may be a revised translation.

D1.356 . . . DONES ENAMORADES . . . Barcelona, Edhasa, 1990. pp. 704. A translation by Jordi Arbonès of *Women in Love*.

D1.357 . . . LA GUINEU I ALTRES RELATS . . . Barcelona, Edhasa, 1990. pp. 152. A translation by Marta Bes i Oliva and Josep Julià of *The Fox* and other tales.

D1.359 . . . LA VERGE I EL GITANO . . . Valencia, Amós Belinchón, 1992. pp. 156. A translation by Inés Costa i Granell of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

CHINESE

516:19 *Add to headnote:* While the publication of translations in periodicals is not normally recorded in Section D, it is worth noting here that the earliest Chinese translation of Lawrence appears to have been of the essay, “On Being a Man”, which was translated by the poet, Xu Zhimo, and printed in the *Shanghai Morning News* on 5 June 1925, just one year after the essay’s first English appearance in June 1924 (C121). This sub-section has been updated with kind assistance from Bi Bingbin (Hei Ma).

(D1.4) *In the title, for QUIN read QING*

(D1.46) *In the first line, for Beo read Bei and, in the next line, add name of translator and source of text, to read:* A translation by Rao Shuyi from the French (D44). *Also, add to the end of the entry:* In the third edition of the *Bibliography*, another printing of this translation – by l-yüan Publishing, Hong Kong, 1988 – was mistakenly given a separate entry as (D1.745): now that the details are recorded here with the parent entry, that separate entry can be deleted.

(D1.53) *For Kuangzhou read Guangzhou*

(D1.55) *Add to entry:* A new edition of this translation was published by Penguin-People’s Literature Press, Beijing, in 2011, with a preface by the writer and translator, Hei Ma (pen-name of Bi Bingbin).

(D1.56) *For CHAI read CAI*

(D1.61) *For Changohun read Changchun and for Time read Times*

(D1.71) *For Zhaoling read Zhaolin*

(D1.745) *The name of the translator here was incorrectly recorded for the third edition: it should be Rao Shuyi not Jao Shu-I – but, as this reveals the work to be a new edition of Rao Shuyi’s existing translation of 1936 (D1.46), the item does not need to be listed as a separate entry. Therefore, delete the contents of the entry and replace with:* See (D1.46).

(D1.76) *For Peoples read People’s and correct, as appropriate, mistaken capitalised setting of the second line.*

(D1.79) *Add to end of entry:* This translation was reprinted in 1989 and, as *Lian Ai Zhong de Nv Ren*, by Shangding Culture Press, Taiwan, in 1992. It was further reprinted, with that title and under Bi Bingbin's pen-name of Hei Ma, in 1994 and 1996. A revised edition by Hei Ma, with the same title, was published in 1999 by Yilin Press, Nanjing, reprinted in 2001 by Owl Press, Taiwan, and again in 2010 by China Central Translation Press, Beijing.

(D1.80) *For CHAI read CAI*

Add new post-1990 entries after (D1.80), as follows:

D1.802 . . . LING YU ROU DE POU BAI . . . Lijiang Press, 1991. A translation by Bi Bingbin of a range of Lawrence's critical essays; republished in 1992 by Shangding Culture Press, Taiwan, and in 1995 and 2004 as *Lao Lun Si Wen Yi Sui Bi* under Bi Bingbin's pen-name of Hei Ma. A bilingual edition, with revised translations, was published in 2006 by Tuanjie Press, Beijing.

D1.804 . . . HONG LUO HUN . . . Lijiang Press, 1992. A translation by Bi Bingbin and Shi Lei of *The Rainbow*. Reprinted in 1995 as *Hong* (using Bi Bingbin's pen-name of Hei Ma) with further editions published in 1996 and 2000 by Beiyue Wenyi Press, Taiyuan. A revised edition (*Hong*) was also published in 2000 by the Yilin Press, Nanjing, and reprinted in 2010. (Pirated editions of this translation were issued in 2001 and 2002 by Yanbian Press, Jilin, and China Theatre Press, Beijing, respectively.)

D1.806 . . . LAO LUN SI SUI BI JI . . . Shenzhen, Haitian Press, 1993. A translation by Hei Ma (pen-name of Bi Bingbin) of selected essays by Lawrence; reprinted in 1994 as *Xing Yu Mei* by Youth Publisher, Taiwan.

D1.809 . . . SELECTED ESSAYS OF D. H. LAWRENCE . . . Beijing, People's Daily Press, 1996. A translation by Hei Ma.

D1.810 . . . SELECTED ESSAYS OF D. H. LAWRENCE . . . Taiyuan, Beiyue Wenyi Press, 1996. A translation by Hei Ma (a different selection from (D1.809), but with some repeated material).

D1.813 . . . SELECTED SHORT STORIES OF D. H. LAWRENCE . . . Yinchuan, Ningxia People's Press, 1998. A translation by Hei Ma *et al.*

D1.815 . . . SUN AND OTHER STORIES BY D. H. LAWRENCE . . . Sichuan People's Press, 1999. A translation by Hei Ma.

D1.817 . . . FLOWERY TUSCANY AND OTHER ESSAYS BY D. H. LAWRENCE . . . China Guangbodianshi Press, 2000. A translation by Hei Ma.

D1.818 . . . DREAM OF LIFE AND OTHER STORIES BY D. H. LAWRENCE . . . Sichuan People's Press, 2000. A translation by Hei Ma.

D1.819 . . . DAI SHU . . . Nanjing, Yilin Press, 2000. A translation of *Kangaroo* by Hei Ma.

D1.821 . . . ESSAYS OF LAWRENCE . . . Hangzhou, Zhejiang Literature and Art Publishing House, 2001. A translation by Bi Bingbin and Yao Jirong.

D1.823 . . . THE RAINBOW . . . Wuhan, Changjiang Literature and Art Publishing House, 2002. A translation by Cai Chunlu et al.

D1.826 . . . XING YU MEI . . . Changsha, Hunnan Wenyi Press, 2004. A translation by Hei Ma of "Sex Versus Loveliness" and other essays, illustrated with some of Lawrence's paintings.

D1.827 . . . LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER . . . Beijing, People's Literature Press, 2004. A translation by Zhao Susu.

D1.830 . . . SHU • HUA • REN . . . Beijing Shiyue Wenyi Press, 2006. A translation by Bi Bingbin of Lawrence's essays on "Books, Paintings, and Writers".

D1.831 . . . LAO LUN SI LUN MEI GUO MING ZHU . . . Shanghai, Shanghai-Sanlian Press, 2006. A translation by Hei Ma of *Studies in Classic American Literature*. (Selections from *Studies* by the same translator, under his given name, Bi Bingbin, were previously published in 1988 in the *American Literature Quarterly*, Shandong University, Jinan.)

D1.833 . . . LAO LUN SI SAN WEN / SELECTED ESSAYS OF LAWRENCE . . . China Book Press, 2007. A bilingual edition with Chinese translations by Hei Ma.

D1.834 . . . LAO LUN SI XIAO SHUO / SELECTED STORIES OF LAWRENCE . . . China Book Press, 2007. A bilingual edition with Chinese translations by Hei Ma. This includes a revised version of Hei Ma's previously published translation of "The Daughters of the Vicar", which appeared in 1997 as the title piece of an anthology of international stories, *Mu Shi De Nv Er Men*, published by Guizhou People's Press.

D1.836 . . . LAO LUN SI JING XUAN JI . . . Beijing Yanshan Press, 2008. A compilation of the "Best Works of Lawrence", selected by Feng Jiqing, including *Women in Love*, translated by Feng Jiqing; *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, translated by Yang Hengda *et al.*; forty essays and stories translated by Hei Ma, and other short stories translated by Wen Meihui, Feng Jiqing, Qiu Yihong.

D1.837 . . . LAO LUN SI SAN WEN . . . Beijing, People's Literature Presss, 2008. A translation of selected essays of Lawrence by Hei Ma, illustrated with Lawrence's paintings and photographs of Lawrence. (This is a different selection from similarly titled previous items, though with some repeated material).

D1.838 . . . LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER . . . Beijing Yanshan Press, 2008. A translation by Yang Hengda *et al.*

D1.840 . . . CHUN JING JI [BE PURE IN SPIRIT] . . . China Guoji Guangbo Press, 2009. A new compilation of previously published translations by Hei Ma of selected essays of Lawrence.

D1.841 . . . YE YING . . . China Guoji Guangbo Press, 2009. A bilingual edition, with Chinese translations by Hei Ma, of "The Nightingale" and other essays by Lawrence (again, this is a new compilation of previously published translations by Hei Ma).

D1.843 . . . LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER . . . Nanjing, Yilin Press, 2010. A bilingual edition with Chinese translation by Hei Ma. A single-language Chinese edition of this translation, *Cha*

Tai Lai Fu Ren de Qing Ren, was also published in 2010, by China Central Translation Press, Beijing.

D1.845 . . . YING GE LAN, WO DE YING GE LAN / ENGLAND, MY ENGLAND AND OTHER STORIES. . . Shanghai, Shanghai-Sanlian Press, 2011. A bilingual edition with Chinese translations by Hei Ma. Translations by Hei Ma – under his given name, Bi Bingbin – of the individual stories, “England, My England” and “The Princess” (“Gong Zhu”), were previously published in the periodical, *Masterpiece Reading*, Taiyuan, in 1986 and 1987 respectively.

D1.846 . . . SHI SU DE ROU SHEN: LAO LUN SI DE HUI HUA SHI JIE . . . Beijing, Jincheng Press, 2011. The title translates as *The Flesh of the World: The World of D. H. Lawrence's Paintings*, and the book is based on the 2003 Chaucer Press edition, *D. H. Lawrence's Paintings* (A164), although the reproductions are in a smaller format. The whole of the text of (A164) has been translated by Hei Ma – that is, Keith Sagar's introduction and Lawrence's three essays, “Introduction to These Paintings”, “Making Pictures” and “Pictures on the Wall” – along with an extra essay not included in (A164), “Art and Morality”.

D1.847 . . . SHU ZHI NIE [THE BAD SIDE OF BOOKS]. . . Beijing, Jincheng Press, 2011. A translation, with a preface, by Hei Ma of sixty-two of Lawrence's essays and book reviews, including the whole of *Studies in Classic American Literature* (see (D1.831) above), and pieces from *Introductions and Reviews* (A167), *Late Essays and Articles* (A165) and other collections.

CROATIAN, SERBIAN [formerly SERBO-CROATIAN] AND SLOVENE

(D2) *Add*: Republished in 1966 (D10.175) and in 1983 by Pomurska založba, Murska Sobota.

(D7) *Add*: Reprinted in 1983 by Logos, Split.

(D8) *Add*: Republished by Pomurska založba, Murska Sobota, 1986.

(D10.16) *Add:* Republished by Učila International, Tržič (Slovenia), 2005.

(D10.21) *Add:* Reprinted in 1983.

(D10.22) / (D10.5) *Insert new entries, as follows:*

(D10.4) . . . LJUBIMEC GOSPE CHATTERLEYEVE . . . Murska Sobota, Pomurska založba, 1981. pp. 441. A translation by Janko Moder of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Reprinted in 1983.

(D10.41) . . . DEVICA IN CIGAN: TRI NOVELE . . . Murska Sobota, Pomurski tisk, 1981. pp. 310. A translation by Maja Kraigher-Žaucer of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*, *The Fox* and “The Princess”.

Add new post-1982 entries after (D10.5), as follows:

D10.52 . . . ARONOVA PALICA . . . Murska Sobota, Pomurska založba, 1983. pp. 410. A translation by Zoja Skušek-Močnik of *Aaron's Rod*.

D10.55 . . . ZALJUBLJENE ŽENE . . . Sarajevo, Veselin Masleša, 1987. pp. 500. A translation by Milosav Popadić of *Women in Love*.

D10.56 . . . LJUBAVNIK LEDI ČETERLI . . . Beograd, Nolit, 1988. pp. 549. A translation by Svetozar Ignjačević of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Republished by Mediasat, Madrid, 2005, and by Novosti, Beograd, 2006.

D10.57 . . . ČOVEK KOJI JE UMRO . . . Beograd, Rad, 1989. pp. 81. A translation by Djordje Krivokapić of *The Man Who Died*.

D10.60 . . . LJUBAVNIK LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Zagreb, Mosta, 1993. pp. 274. A translation by Josip Tabak of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Republished by Globus media, Zagreb, 2004.

D10.62 . . . APOKALIPSA . . . Beograd, Rad, 1996. pp. 121. A translation by Jovica Aćin of *Apocalypse*.

D10.63 . . . ŽENSKA JE ODJEZDILA . . . Ljubljana, Karantanija, 1997. pp. 98. A translation by Miran Jarc of “The Woman Who Rode Away”.

D10.64 . . . PRUSKI OFICIR I DRUGE PRIPOVETKE . . . Beograd, Nolit, 1997. pp. 313. A translation by Nikola Radosavljević of *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories*

D10.65 . . . JUTRA V MEHIKI . . . Ljubljana, Cankarjeva založba, 1998. pp. 139. A translation by Dušanka Zabukovec of *Mornings in Mexico*.

D10.67 . . . KĆER TRGOVCA KONJIMA . . . Beograd, Rad, 2000. pp. 56. A translation by Bojana Ranković of “The Horse-Dealer’s Daughter” and “You Touched Me”.

D10.70 . . . LJUBAVNIK LEDI ČETERLI: PRVA VERZIJA . . . Beograd, Draganić, 2004. pp. 260. A translation by Branko Vučićević of *The First Lady Chatterley*.

D10.71 . . . PRVA LEDI ČETERLI . . . Beograd, Narodna knjiga and Politika, 2004. pp. 312. A translation by Marija Janić of *The First Lady Chatterley*.

D10.72 . . . DEVICA I CIGANIN . . . Beograd, Narodna knjiga and Politika, 2005. pp. 153. A translation by Ana Peković of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*. Reprinted in 2007 and also issued in the same year by Filip Višnjić, Beograd.

D10.73 . . . PREKRŠILAC . . . Beograd, Narodna knjiga and Politika, 2005. pp. 221. A translation by Ana Peković of *The Trespasser*. Reprinted in 2007.

D10.74 . . . SINOVI I LJUBAVNICI . . . Beograd, Narodna knjiga and Politika, 2005. 2 vols. pp. 234, 233. A translation by Ana Peković of *Sons and Lovers*.

D10.75 . . . BELI PAUN . . . Beograd, Narodna knjiga and Politika, 2005. 2 vols. pp. 190, 269. A translation by Milica Pavlović of *The White Peacock*.

D10.76 . . . DUGA . . . Beograd, Narodna knjiga and Politika, 2005. 2 vols. pp. 255, 328. A translation by Milica Pavlović of *The Rainbow*.

D10.77 . . . SINOVI I LJUBAVNICI . . . Beograd, Zograf, 2007. pp. 458. A translation by Branislav Stanojević of *Sons and Lovers*.

CZECH AND SLOVAK

521 *Add to headnote:* See also “The Reception of D. H. Lawrence in Czechoslovakia (1927–1992) and in the Czech Republic

(1993–2000)” in Grmelová’s 2001 book on Lawrence (F707), pp. 185–206; and her essay (and related bibliography), “*A Genius Redivivus: The Czech Reception of D. H. Lawrence*”, in Jansohn and Mehl (F759), pp. 198–212, 328–332. An important correction to this sub-section, derived from the latter essay, is that the first Czech translation of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* was published in 1930 and not in 1932 as previously recorded. It came out just after the German translation (D80) and would therefore appear to be the second earliest translation of that novel.

Add new entry before (D11):

D10.99 . . . MILENEC LADY CHATTERLEYOVÉ . . . Prague, Odeon, 1930. A translation by Staša Jílovská of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* made from the 1929 Paris edition (A42c) and including a translation of Lawrence’s introduction, “My Skirmish with Jolly Roger”. Reissued with revisions in 1931 and 1932; see also (D12).

(D12) For Staši Jílovské *read* Staša Jílovská *and add*: This translation was in fact first published in 1930 – see (D10.99) above.

(D14) *Add*: Illustrated by the avant-garde Czech artist, Toyen. Included, apparently in a revised translation, in (D15.6) below, and republished by Garamond, Prague, in 2003.

(D15) *Correct title to MUŽ, KTERÝ ZEMŘEL, correct date to 1935 and add*: With illustration by Toyen.

(D15.5) *For Novotná read Nováková.*

(D15.5) / (D15.7) *Insert new entries, as follows:*

D15.6 . . . PANNA A CIKÁN’ A JINÉ POVÍDKY . . . Prague, Odeon, 1966. A translation by Hana Skoumalová of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*, *The Fox*, “Odour of Chrysanthemums” and “A Modern Lover”. See also (D14).

D15.65 [Move existing entry (D15.71) to this position, changing the date of first publication to 1975 with additional note: Reprinted in 1982.]

D15.68 . . . POZEMSKÝ NEPOKOJ . . . Bratislava, Tatran, 1981. pp. 424. A translation by Igor Navrátil of selected tales, expanded and reissued in 1982 as (D15.74).

(D15.7) *Add:* Republished in 2004 by Alpress, Frýdek-Místek.

(D15.71) *It has emerged that this translation was first published in 1975. Therefore, move item to correct chronological position as (D15.65) and replace with note:* See (D15.65).

(D15.74) / (D15.8) *Insert new entry:*

D15.78 . . . OVDOVENIE PANI HOLROYDOVEJ . . . Bratislava, LITA, 1985. pp. 55. A translation by Ľudovít Trenčanský of *The Widowing of Mrs. Holroyd*.

(D15.8) *Add:* Reprinted in 1990; republished in 1994 by Nakladatelství Josefa Šimona, Prague, and in 2001 by Levné knihy KMa, Prague.

(D15.83) *Add:* Republished in 2002 by Slovart and in 2005 by Petit Press (both Bratislava).

(D15.90) *Add:* Reprinted in 2002.

Add new post-1999 entries after (D15.94), as follows:

D15.945 . . . APOKALYPSA . . . Prague, Garamond, 2002. pp. 133. A translation by Petr Fantys of *Apocalypse*.

D15.946 . . . VÍTĚZNÝ HOUPACÍ KŮŇ . . . Prague, Vyšehrad, 2003. pp. 65. A translation by Zuzana Mayerová of “The Rocking-Horse Winner”.

D15.948 . . . SYNOVÉ A MILENCI. . . Frýdek-Místek, Alpress, 2005. pp. 427. A translation by Kateřina Hilská of *Sons and Lovers*.

D15.952 . . . MUŽ, KTERÝ MILOVAL OSTROVY. . . Prague, Radix, 2011. pp. 32. A translation by Petr Krul of “The Man Who Loved Islands” (Penguin text (A101.6)), with illustrations by Mikoláš Axmann.

DANISH

522 *Add headnote:* See also the essay (and related bibliography) by Dorrit EinerSEN and Arnt Lykke Jakobsen, “The Reception of D.

H. Lawrence in Denmark" in Jansohn and Mehl (F759), pp. 255–64, 343–45.

(D17) *Add*: Reprinted 1984 and 1985.

(D23) *Add*: Republished in Copenhagen in 1986 and 1996 by Schønberg, and also in 1996 by Bogsamleren.

(D25.1) *Amend note to add contents, to read*: . . . short stories, including "Monkey Nuts", "The Horse-Dealer's Daughter", *Sun*, "The Border-Line", "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman", "In Love", "The Overtone", *Rawdon's Roof*, "Mother and Daughter" and "Things".

Add new entries after (D25.6), as follows:

D25.62 . . . JOMFRUEN OG SIGØJNEREN . . . Søborg, Piraco, 1988. pp. 136. A translation by Jørgen Ingemann Larsen of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D25.65 . . . ÅBENBARING . . . Copenhagen, Gyldendal, 1996. pp. 113. A translation by Henrik Palle of *Apocalypse*, with a preface by Hans Hauge.

DUTCH

(D34) *Add*: Subsequent re-publications include: Amsterdam, Pandora, 1995, 2003; Brussels, De Morgen, 2003.

(D34.35) *Add*: Republished by Reader's Digest, Amsterdam, 2006.

(D34.41) / (D34.42) *Insert new entries, as follows:*

D34.415 . . . VRUCHTEN, BOMEN EN BLOEMEN . . . Leuven, Acco, 1980. pp. 69. A translation by Machteld Stassijns of selections from *Birds, Beasts and Flowers*.

D34.416 . . . LIEFDE TUSSEN DE HOOIBERGEN . . . Antwerpen, Het Spectrum, 1982. pp. 318. A translation by J. M. Blom of "Love Among the Haystacks" and other stories.

D34.417 . . . HET LIEVEHEERSBEESTJE, DE VOS, DE POP VAN DE KAPITEIN . . . Antwerp and Utrecht, Het Spectrum, 1983. pp. 235. A translation by Max Schuchartt of *The Fox*, *The Captain's Doll*, *The Ladybird*. Reprinted 1995.

Add new post-1986 entries after (D34.42), as follows:

D34.43 . . . VIJGEN: GEDICHTEN . . . Leuven, Kritak; Amsterdam, Van Gennep, 1986. pp. 74. A translation by Paul Claes of “Figs” and other poems.

D34.44 . . . OMNIBUS . . . Utrecht, Kadmos, 1986. pp. 400. A translation by Albert Groendijk of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* and *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D34.46 . . . NAAR SARDINIË: REISDAGBOEK . . . Leuven, Kritak, 1989. pp. 221. A translation by Erik Spinoy of *Sea and Sardinia*.

D34.5 . . . ETRUSKISCH TESTAMENT . . . Utrecht, IJzer, 1994. pp. 158. A translation by Frank Mommersteeg of *Etrusan Places*.

525 Add new language sub-section for Estonian, as follows:

ESTONIAN

D34.70 . . . ST. MAWRI TÄKK . . . Tallinn, Vaba Maa. pp. 144. An apparently very early translation of *St. Mawr* from some time in the 1920s, after first English publication in May 1925, but precise date unknown. Translator also unknown.

D34.705 . . . PASTORI TÜTRED . . . Tartus, Loodus, 1930. pp. 64. A translation by Helmi Kivisepp of “Daughters of the Vicar”.

D34.715 . . . POJAD JA ARMASTAJAD . . . Tallinn, Eesti Raamat, 1985. pp. 430. A translation by Henno Rajandi of *Sons and Lovers*.

D34.72 . . . NEITSI JA MUSTLANE . . . Tallinn, Perioodika, 1987. pp. 93. A translation by Mati Soomre of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D34.725 . . . KOLM EROOTILIST ROMAANI . . . Tallinn, Ajaraamat, 1993. pp. 144. The length of this book suggests extensive abridgement or adaptation, but it purports to be a translation of “three erotic novels”, including *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, by the appropriately named Vallo Kraat. The other two novels are *The Rosy Crucifixion* by Henry Miller, and *The Love Machine* by Jacqueline Susann.

D34.726 . . . LADY CHATTERLEY ARMUKE . . . Tallinn, Tuum, 1993. pp. 351. A translation by Mati Soomre of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Republished in 2007 by Tänapäev Estonia, Tallinn.

D34.73 . . . MEES, KES SURI . . . Tallinn, Perioodika, 1998. pp. 55. A translation by Anne Lange of *The Man Who Died*.

D34.735 . . . LEPATRIINU . . . Tallinn, Perioodika, 2000. pp. 87. A translation by Aet Varik of "The Ladybird".

D34.737 . . . VIKERKAAR . . . Tallinn, Eesti Raamat, 2001. pp. 574. A translation by Asta Blumenfeld of *The Rainbow*.

D34.739 . . . ARMASTAVAD NAISED . . . Tallinn, Eesti Raamat, 2002. pp. 587. A translation by Asta Blumenfeld of *Women in Love*.

D34.741 . . . KAPTENI NUKK . . . Tartu, Fantaasia, 2003. pp. 98. A translation by Eva Luts of "The Captain's Doll".

D34.743 . . . REBANE . . . Tartu, Fantaasia, 2004. pp. 64. A translation by Eva Luts of *The Fox*.

D34.744 . . . PREISI OHVITSER . . . Tartu, Fantaasia, 2004. pp. 71. A translation by Margit Peenoja and Liisa Pint of "The Prussian Officer", *Sun* and "The Shadow in the Rose Garden".

D34.745 . . . MEES, KES ARMASTAS SAARI . . . Tallinn, Odamees, 2004. pp. 134. A translation by Aulis-Leif Erikson of "The Man Who Loved Islands" and other stories.

D34.75 . . . EMA JA TÜTAR . . . Tallinn: Eesti Raamat Estonia], 2009. pp. 250p. A translation by Sirje Keevallik, Malle Klaassen, Leelo Keevallik of "Mother and Daughter" and other stories.

FINNISH

(D35) *Add*: Apparently reissued by the same publisher as *Poikia ja rakastajia* in 1980.

(D38) *Add*: Reprinted 1957.

(D39) *Add*: Reprinted 1978 and republished in 1986, 1991 and 2001 by Gummerus, Jyväskylä, Helsinki.

(D39.32) / (D39.5) *Insert new entries, as follows*:

D39.38 . . . MIES JOKA KUOLI, ST. MAWR . . . Espoo, Weilin & Göös, 1980. pp. 298. A translation by Elina Hytönen.

D39.39 . . . RAKASTUNEITA NAISIA . . . Espoo, Weilin & Göös, 1980. pp. 631. A translation by Rauno Ekholm of *Women in Love*. Republished in 2006 by Gummerus and Loisto, Helsinki.

FRENCH

526: 15 *Add to headnote*: A further checklist, covering the period 1986–1996, was published by Jacqueline Gouirand-Roussel on in the *D. H. Lawrence Review* 29:2 (2000); and see also Ginette Katz-Roy's chapter and extensive bibliography in Jansohn and Mehl (F759), pp. 107–137, 295–309.

(D40) *Add*: Republished by La Petite Ourse, Lausanne, in 1956 and, with original lithography by Guy Bardone, by Les Médecins bibliophiles, Paris, in 1965.

(D42) *Add*: Republished by Gallimard, Paris, in 1936, 1949, 1980 and, with translations of “The Captain’s Doll” and *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, in 1992.

(D43) *Add*: Translation first reprinted by Stock in 1947 and then many times subsequently; also issued in 1951 by Le Club français du livre and in 1956 by Club des Libraires de France.

(D44) *Add*: Translation first reprinted in 1946 and then in many subsequent editions by Gallimard and other publishers throughout the twentieth century.

(D51) *Replace final full stop with a colon and add full list of stories and further note, as follows*: “The Prussian Officer”, “The Thorn in the Flesh”, “The Shades of Spring”, “The White Stocking” and “Odour of Chrysanthemums”. Republished by Stock in 1982 and, in a revised translation by Bernard Jean, within a bilingual edition, in 2001.

(D59) *Add*: Published under a new title, *L’Homme qui aimait les îles*, in 1988 by Pardès, Survivre, Puiseaux.

(D62) *Add*: Reprinted in 1961, 1966, 1983 and 1993. The translation of the title story was issued in a separate volume, with an

essay on Maya culture by Jacques Bergier, in 1958 by Editions de la Bibliothèque mondiale, Paris, .

(D63) *Add:* Reprinted in 1985 and, in a revised translation by Janine Hérisson, 2004.

(D64) *Add:* Reprinted in 1979 and, in a revised translation, in 2002 (see D72.90).

(D66) *Insert before final sentence of note:* Reissued without illustrations in 1947. *Then add to end of note:* The latter variant appears also to have been published by Deux-Rives, and there have been several further issues of this translation by other publishers, in 1957, 1966, 1969, 1979 and 1980.

(D68) *Delete acute accent in Bélamiche to read Belamiche and add to end of entry:* Republished in 1958 and 1985 by Gallimard, Paris. An apparently related item is a book of photographs illustrating extracts from *Sea and Sardinia*, as follows: *Sardaigne*, Lausanne, La Guilde du livre, 1964 (pp. xxxv + 96), with photographs by Marianne Pfaeltzer and notes by Bernard Brandel. I have not seen a copy of this book, but bibliographical searches indicate that it contains 96 pages of photographs and 29 pages of Lawrence's text in translation. I have been unable to discover the source of the translation and assume it must derive from Belamich as there is no evidence of another translation at that period.

(D72) *Delete acute accent in Bélamiche to read Belamiche and add to end of entry:* Reprinted in 1985.

(D72.2) / (D72.4) *Insert new entry as (D72.25) and transfer contents here from existing entry (D72.41) – see below.*

(D72.4) *Replace final full stop with a colon and add list of stories and further note, as follows:* *The Fox*, “Love Among the Haystacks”, “A Modern Lover”, “The Old Adam”, “Her Turn”, “Strike-Pay”, “The Witch à la Mode” and “New Eve and Old Adam”. Reprinted in 1985. Léo Dilé's translation of *The Fox* was published separately by Stock in 1983, with several subsequent reprints.

(D72.41) For 1969 read 1968 – and, therefore, move the contents of this entry to a new entry, (D72.25), and replace with a note: See (D72.25). Also, add number of pages, pp. 317, and add at the end of the existing note: The essays included are: “Cocksure Women and Hensure Men”, “Do Women Change”, “Sex Versus Loveliness”, “Enslaved by Civilisation”, “The State of Funk”, “Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine”, “Blessed Are the Powerful”, “On Being Religious”, “Love”, “Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious” and “On Being a Man”.

(D72.42) For pp. 317 read pp. 297 and add to the note: The essays included are: “Introduction to *Pansies*”, “Foreword to *Women in Love*”, “Hymns in a Man’s Life”, “Art and Morality”, “Books”, “The Good Man”, “The Novel and the Feelings”, “Surgery for the Novel, Or a Bomb”, “Pornography and Obscenity”, “Making Love to Music”, “Making Pictures”, “Introduction to These Paintings”, “The Individual Consciousness versus the Social Consciousness”, “We Need One Another”.

(D72.43) Add to the note: The essays included are: “Return to Bestwood”, “Climbing Down Pisgah”, “The Reality of Peace”, “Democracy”, “On Human Destiny”, “Aristocracy” and “Education of the People”.

(D72.5) Add number of pages, pp. 416, and add to note: Reprinted in 1993 and 1996.

(D72.52) Add to end of entry, to read: ... Deleuze, with a preface by Fanny and Gilles Deleuze. Revised translation by Fanny Deleuze printed in 2001 by Desjonquères, Paris.

(D72.58) Add number of pages, pp. 249, then replace final full stop with a colon and add list of stories, as follows: “Mother and Daughter”, “Things”, “The Lovely Lady”, “Love Among the Haystacks”, “None of That”, “The Woman Who Rode Away”, *Rawdon’s Roof*.

(D72.62) Add number of pages, pp. 307, then replace final full stop with a colon and add list of stories, as follows: “Prelude”, “The White Stocking”, “Goose Fair”, “Odour of Chrysanthemums”, “A

Fragment of Stained Glass”, “The Daughters of the Vicar”, “Second Best”, “Once”, “The Miner at Home”, “A Chapel and a Hay-Hut Among the Mountains”, “The Shades of Spring”, “Her Turn”, “Strike-Pay” and “A Sick Collier”.

(D72.64) / (D72.7) *Insert new entry, as follows:*

D72.67 . . . NOUVELLES COMPLÈTES . . . Paris, Classiques Garnier, 1986–87. 2 volumes, pp. 744, 812. A translation by Pierre Nordon of the *Complete Short Stories*.

(D72.7) / (D72.75) *Insert new entries, as follows:*

D72.71 . . . FEMMES EN EXIL . . . Paris, Minerve, 1988. A translation of *St. Mawr* by Marc Amfreville and Anne Wicke.

D72.72 . . . D. H. LAWRENCE . . . Paris, Editions de l’Herne, 1988. pp. 400. Edited by Ginette Katz-Roy and Myriam Librach. In addition to critical materials, this large anthology includes a selection of Lawrence’s letters, poems, essays, prefaces and reviews translated by Nicole Dubois, Ginette Katz-Roy, Martine Ricoux-Faure, F.-J. Temple and others.

D72.73 . . . FILS ET AMANTS . . . Paris, Librairie générale française, Livre de poche, 1988. A translation of *Sons and Lovers* by Pierre Nordon.

Add new post-1989 entries after (D72.75), as follows:

D72.76 . . . SOUS L’ÉTOILE DU CHIEN . . . Paris, La Différence, 1989. pp. 128. A bilingual edition of selected poems with translations by Lorand Gaspar and Sarah Clair, with a translation of “Poetry of the Present” used as a preface and with a postface by Claude Michel Cluny.

D72.77 . . . LA BELLE DAME ET AUTRES CONTES MORTIFERÈS . . . Paris, Hatier, 1990. pp. 312. A translation by Patrick Reumaux of “The Prussian Officer”, “The Woman Who Rode Away”, “The Rocking-Horse Winner”, “The Lovely Lady” and *The Man Who Died*. Includes a postface with critical comments on examples of previous French translations of the same stories.

D72.78 . . . L'ETALON . . . Paris, Intertextes, 1990. A translation of *St. Mawr* by Jean-Yves Lacroix. Republished by N. Blandin, Paris, 1991.

D72.79 . . . L'AMANT DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Paris, Librairie générale française, Livre de poche, 1991. pp. 478. A translation of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* by Pierre Nordon; reprinted in 1997.

D72.80 . . . LA BEAUTÉ MALADE . . . Paris, Ed. Allia, 1993. A translation by Claire Malroux of "Introduction to These Paintings".

D72.81 . . . THE VIRGIN AND THE GIPSY . . . Paris, Gallimard, 1993. pp. 318. A bilingual edition with a translation, preface and notes by Bernard Jean.

D72.82 . . . LE NAVIRE DE MORT ET AUTRES POÈMES . . . Paris, La Différence, 1993. A bilingual edition of "The Ship of Death" and other poems, with translations by Frédéric Jacques Temple.

D72.83 . . . POÈMES . . . Paris, Gallimard, 1996. A bilingual edition of selected poems, with translations by Lorand Gaspar and Sarah Clair.

D72.84 . . . AMANTES . . . Paris, Autrement, 2000. A translation of *Women in Love* by Pierre Vitoux.

D72.85 . . . LETTRES CHOISIES . . . Paris: Gallimard, 2000. A translation, with notes and preface, of selected letters by André Topia.

D72.86 . . . L'ODYSSÉE D'UN REBELLE . . . Paris, La Quinzaine littéraire, L. Vuitton, 2001. A translation of selected letters and extracts from other of Lawrence's works by Françoise Du Sorbier.

D72.87 . . . PORNOGRAPHIE ET OBSCÉNITÉ . . . Paris, Mille et une nuits, 2001. A translation by Jérôme Vérain with a postface by Frédéric Jacques Temple.

D72.88 . . . L'HOMME QUI CONNU LA MORT . . . Paris, Editions Alternatives, 2001. A translation by Hélène Starozum

(with illustrations by Michel Biot and calligraphy by Jean-Jacques Grand) of *The Man Who Died*.

D72.89 . . . L'ARC-EN-CIEL . . . Paris, Autrement, 2002. A translation of *The Rainbow* by Jacqueline Gouirand-Rousselon.

D72.90 . . . FEMMES AMOUREUSES I & II . . . Paris, Gallimard, 2002. Revised translations of *The Rainbow* (D64) and *Women in Love* (D48), the former revised by Estelle Roudet and the latter by Antoine Jacottet and Cécile Meissonnier.

D72.91 . . . L'AMOUR, LE SEXE ET LES FEMMES . . . Monaco: Anatolia/Le Rocher, 2003. A translation by Marie-Claude Peugeot of sections V and VI of *Phoenix*.

D72.92 . . . DE LA RÉBELLION À LA RÉACTION . . . Monaco: Anatolia/Le Rocher, 2004. A translation by Béatrice Dunner of section VI of *Phoenix*.

D72.93 . . . ETRE VIVANT . . . Monaco: Anatolia/Le Rocher, 2004. A translation by Marie-Claude Peugeot of selected poems.

D72.94 . . . CONSTANCE CHATTERLEY . . . Paris, Autrement, 2005. pp. 333. A translation, with postface, of *The First Lady Chatterley* by Pierre Vitoux.

D72.95 . . . PSYCHANALYSE ET INCONSCIENT . . . Paris, Editions Desjonquères, 2005. A translation by Elise Argaud of *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*.

GERMAN

530:15 *Add to end of headnote:* See also “D. H. Lawrence und der Insel-Verlag” by Dieter Mehl and Christa Jansohn, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 227 (1990), 38-60 (English version, with revisions, “Lawrence, His German Publisher and His Translators”, in Iida (F690), pp. 85-116); and Dieter Mehl’s “Additional Note” to his review of the *Letters of D. H. Lawrence, Volume VIII* and the third edition of this *Bibliography*, *Archiv* 240 (2003), 199-204 (202-4). Details of the book publications listed in Mehl’s “Additional Note” have been incorporated here, and, where relevant, details of shorter translations listed by him, appearing in periodicals or anthologies,

have been added to related entries either here or in Section C (see (C73), (C116), (C122), (C132.5), (C142), (C157), (C162), (C182), (C217)). For a comprehensive overview of the reception of Lawrence in German-speaking countries, with further details of translations, including periodical and anthology publications, see also the two essays, with related bibliography, by Dieter Mehl and Christa Jansohn in Jansohn and Mehl (F759), pp. 23–52, 53–78, 266–82.

(D74) *Add to entry*: The second section of Chapter 24 appeared as “Jack im Busch; Ein Kapitel aus einem australischen Roman” in *Der Neue Merkur* (8: 793–813), June 1925.

(D76) *Add*: Reissued by Insel, Wiesbaden, 1953.

(D77) *Add*: Republished in 1967, and several times subsequently, by Rowohlt, Reinbek.

(D78) *For DAVONRITT read DAVON RITT and revise note to read*: by Else Jaffe-Richthofen of “The Woman Who Rode Away” and the following stories: “England, My England”, “The Princess”, *The Fox, Glad Ghosts* and “The Border Line”.

(D84) *Add*: Part III of this translation also appeared in *Insel-Almanach auf das Jahr 1933* (82–90), 1932.

(D86) *Add*: A section of the translation of the chapter, “The First Rain”, appeared in *Das Inselschiff* (13: 144–53) in 1932.

(D88) *For pp. 570 read pp. 547. (The former is the number of pages for the 1990 reprint.) Then amend final note, to read*: Reprinted in 1947; republished by Rowohlt, Reinbek, in 1960, and by Aufbau-Verlag, Berlin, 1966 and 1990. Also, *add to end of entry*: Goyert’s translation of part of the chapter, “Defeat of Miriam”, appeared as “Vor Ostern” in *Das Inselschiff* (18: 105–113), 1937.

(D94) *Add*: Republished in Berne 1958, and by Rowohlt, Reinbek, 1962.

(D95) *Add*: Reissued in Germany in 1949 by Toth, Hamburg.

(D97) *Insert new reference in final sentence, to read*: Reproduced as *Etruskische Stätten*, 1963 (D99); ... *Then also add*: Republished

in 1999 as *Etruskische Orte: Reisetagebücher*, Berlin, Wagenbach.

(D97.5) For pp. 319 read pp. 320. Also, add: Republished as *Auf verbotenen Wegen*, Reinbek bei Hamburg, Rowohlt, 1961 and 1976.

(D98) The final sentence here actually relates to the previous entry (D97.5) and should now be deleted (see above). Also, to this entry, add: Republished in 1963 (D99).

(D98.5) Add omitted titles to list of contents: “New Eve and Old Adam”, *The Virgin and the Gipsy* and “Jimmy and the Desperate Woman”. Then also add: See also (D99.25). This translation of *The Fox* was published separately by Wagenbach, Berlin, in 2004, with an afterword by Doris Lessing translated by Adelheid Dormagen.

(D98.6) For pp. 458 read 456. Then delete by Werner Rebhuhn and add new sentence: The translator is not named in the book but, apparently, the translation was produced by a team working from a draft prepared by Maria Carlsson. Also, add: Based on the Grove Press edition (A42i), this translation was published in October of 1960 and was reprinted five times in that same year. It was reissued in 1973 and several times subsequently.

(D98.7) / (D99) Insert new entry:

D98.9 . . . DAS VERLORENE MÄDCHEN . . . Reinbek bei Hamburg, Rowohlt, 1962. pp. 344. A translation of *The Lost Girl* – translator not named.

(D99) For by Alfred Kuoni and Georg Goyert read by Alfred Kuoni (D98), Georg Goyert and Oswalt von Nostitz (D97).

(D99.33) Add: Also published in 1982, by the same publisher, under the title *Liebe, Sex und Emanzipation: Essays* (reissued, 1990, 2002).

(D99.41) Add note at end of entry: See also (D89), (D90), (D96), (D98.5), (D98.7), (D99.15) and (D99.3) for previous publications of many of these translations. For later appearances, see (D99.56) and (D99.66). Also deriving from the same group of translators is a selection of stories (selected by Andreas Paschedag), *Du hast*

mich angefasst, published in 2001 by Wagenbach, Berlin: “You Touched Me” (Karl Lerbs), “The Shadow in the Rose Garden” and *Sun* (Elisabeth Schnack), *Rawdon’s Roof*, “In Love” and “Things” (Martin Beheim-Schwarzbach).

(D99.41) / (D99.42) *Insert new entry:*

D99.415 . . . WIE MRS. HOLROYD WITWE WIRD . . . Berlin, Bloch, 1976. pp. 102. A translation by Andrea Clemen of *The Widowing of Mrs. Holroyd*.

(D99.43) *Add number of pages*, pp. 402.

(D99.5) / (D99.55) *Insert new entries:*

D99.52 . . . DAS LETZTE LACHEN: PHANTAST . . . Bergisch Gladbach, Lübbe, 1984. pp. 187. A translation by Waltraud Götting of “The Last Laugh” and other stories.

D99.53 . . . CHRYSANTHEMUMDUFT . . . Leipzig, Insel-Verlag, 1984. pp. 161. A translation by Heide Steiner of “Odour of Chrysanthemums”, “The Prussian Officer”, “Tickets, Please”, “The Horse-Dealer’s Daughter”, “Things”, “Samson and Delilah” and “The Rocking-Horse Winner”.

(D99.56) *Revise note to correct translation details and add contents, to read as follows:* A selection of stories selected, translated and with an afterword by Elisabeth Schnack: “Odour of Chrysanthemums”, “Tickets, Please”, “The Shades of Spring”, “A Modern Lover”, “The Last Laugh”, “Mercury”, “A Chapel Among the Mountains”, “A Hay Hut in the Mountains”, “Two Blue Birds”, “Smile”, “The Rocking-Horse Winner”, “The Princess”, and “The Woman Who Rode Away”. Reprinted in 1991 and apparently at other times under different titles. See also (D98.5), (D99.15), (D99.41).

(D99.65) *Add:* A dual-language edition.

(D99.68) *Add number of pages*, pp. 333, and *add list of contents, to read:* . . . of that title and contains: “Nottingham and the Mining Country”, “Dull London”, “The Crucifix Across the Mountains”, “A Letter from Germany”, “New Mexico”, “Whistling of Birds”, “Mercury”, “Flowery Tuscany”, “Adolf”, “Pan in America”, “Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine”, *A Propos of Lady*

Chatterley's Lover, “We Need One Another”, “The Real Thing”, “The State of Funk”, “The Nightingale”, “Edgar Allan Poe”, “Whitman”, “John Galsworthy”, “German Books: Thomas Mann”, “Autobiographical Sketch”, “A Bibliography of D. H. Lawrence by Edward D. McDonald”, “Preface to the American edition of *New Poems*”, “Why the Novel Matters”, “Making Pictures”.

(D99.68) / (D99.69) Insert new entry:

D99.681 . . . LADY CHATTERLEY UND IHR LIEBHABER . . .
 Bergisch Gladbach, Lübbe, 1992. pp. 427. A translation by Tom Roberts of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Published as *Lady Chatterley* in 2009 by Anaconda, Cologne, with an introduction by Helmut Werner.

(D99.7) Add number of pages, pp. 297, and add list of contents, to read: ... stories: “Odour of Chrysanthemums”, “Strike Pay”, “A Sick Collier”, “The Christening”, “The White Stocking”, “The Prussion Officer”, “Daughters of the Vicar”, “England, My England”, “Samson and Delilah” and “Tickets, Please”.

Add new post-1992 entries after (D99.7), as follows:

D99.72 . . . DIE APOKALYPSE . . . Düsseldorf, Patmos Verlag, 2000. A translation by Axel Monte of *Apocalypse*, with a postscript by Henning Schröer.

D99.73 . . . VÖGEL, BLUMEN UND WILDE TIERE . . . Bonn, Weidle, 2000. pp. 174. A translation by Wolfgang Schlüter of *Birds, Beasts and Flowers*.

D99.75 . . . LIEBENDE FRAUEN . . . Zurich, Manesse, 2002. pp. 857. A translation by Petra-Susanne Räbel of *Women in Love*, with an afterword by Dieter Mehl.

D99.77 . . . AARONS STAB . . . Bonn, Weidle, 2004. pp. 397. pp. 183. A translation by Stefan Weidle of *Aaron's Rod*.

D99.78 . . . LADY CHATTERLEYS LIEBHABER . . . Düsseldorf and Zurich, Artemis and Winkler, 2004. A translation by Axel Monte of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

GREEK

535 *Add headnote:* See also Pericles Tangas's essay (and related bibliography), "The Greek Response to D. H. Lawrence: Translations and Critical Studies of His Work", in Jansohn and Mehl (F759), pp. 173–186, 320–23. Tangas points out that, while there have been more than fifteen Greek translations of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, many of these have been substantially abridged; similarly, of the five translations of *Sons and Lovers*, only one is unabridged. He cites several translations with no apparent date of publication. As it is not possible to allocate these a chronological number in the main list below, I give brief details here (if known, translator, publisher, and number of pages): – a) *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (*O erastis tis Laidis Chatterly*): i. Polyvios Vovolinis, Damianos; ii. Takis Panagiotou, Gementzopoulos; iii. anonymous translation, Pella (pp. 365); b) *Sons and Lovers* (*Yoio kai erastes*), all anonymous translations: i. Pella (pp. 260); ii. Gutenberg; iii. Sakkalis; c) *The Fox/The Captain's Doll* (*I alepou/I koukla tou lochagou*): Stella Vourdoumpa, Govostis (pp. 227); d) *The Man Who Died* (*O anthropos pou eixe pethanei*): anonymous, Theoria; e) "The Man Who Loved Islands" (*O anthropos pou agapouse ta nisia*): anonymous, Korfi (pp. 76); f) "The Rocking-Horse Winner" (*O nikitis me to Xylino alogaki*): anonymous, Ellinikes Ekdoseis.

(D101) *Add:* Republished (all Athens): Pyksida, 1961; Vivliothiki gia Olous, 1967; and Th. Zouboulakis, c. 1967.

(D102) *For* Popi Stratiki *read* Potis Stratikis *and add:* Republished in 1963 by Darematis, Athens.

(D103) / (D103.2) *Insert new entry:*

D103.1 . . . EROTEVMENES GYNAIKES . . . Athens, Logotechniki, c. 1961. pp. 287. A translation by Yannis Lampsas and Chara Christofi of *Women in Love*.

(D103.2) *For* GHIDI *read* YIOI *and for* Potes Stratikes *read* Potis Stratikis.

(D103.2) / (D103.3) *Insert new entries, as follows*

D103.21 . . . O ERASTIS TIS LAIDIS CHATTERLY . . . Athens, Dodoni, 1963. A translation by Costis Livadeas of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D103.23 . . . O ERASTIS TIS LAIDIS CHATTERLY . . . Athens, Skiouros, 1966. pp. 120. An adapted translation by Vasso Kyrou of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D103.24 . . . O EROTAS TIS LAIDIS CHATTERLY . . . Athens, Sakkalis, 1967. An anonymous translation of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

(D103.3) *Add*: Republished in 1979, and reprinted in 1991, by Plethron, Athens.

(D103.31) / (D103.32) *Insert new entry*:

D103.315 . . . EIKOSI POIIMATA . . . Athens, Dodoni, 1972. pp. 58. A translation of twenty of Lawrence's poems by Olympia Karagiorga.

(D103.32) / (D103.33) *Insert new entries, as follows*:

D103.3203 . . . O ANTHROPOS POU EIXE PETHANEI . . . Imago, 1975. pp. 124. A translation by Zinovia Drakopoulou of *The Man Who Died*.

D103.3204 . . . O ANTHROPOS POU EIXE PETHANEI . . . Athens, Diogenis, 1975. pp. 122. A translation by Z. Konsta of *The Man Who Died*.

D103.3205 . . . I ALEPOU . . . Athens, Angyra, c.1975. A translation by Sophia Simiti of *The Fox*.

D103.3206 . . . PORNOGRAFIA KAI ASEMNOS . . . Athens, Angyra, c.1975. A translation by L. Arvaniti of "Pornography and Obscenity".

D103.3210 . . . EROTEVMENES GYNAIKES . . . Athens, Exantas, 1980. pp. 500. A translation by Yannis Lampsas of *Women in Love*. Reprinted 1993.

D103.3211 . . . O ILIOS KAI ALLA DIIGIMATA . . . Athens, Nefali, 1981. pp. 152. A translation by Alexis Ziras of *Sun* and other stories.

D103.3212 . . . I PASCHALITSA . . . Thessaloniki, Anoichti Gonia, 1982. pp. 102. A translation by Thanasis Georgiadis of "The Ladybird".

D103.3213 . . . O PROSSOS AXIOMATIKOS . . . Athens, Aigokeros, c.1982. pp. 107. A translation by Makis Vainas of "The Prussian Officer".

D103.3216 . . . I PARTHENA KAI O TSINGANOS . . . Athens, Theoria, 1985. A translation by Yannis Lampidonis of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D103.3217 . . . I PARTHENA KAI O TSINGANOS . . . Athens, Erato, c.1985. pp. 155. A translation by Fotis Vasiniotis and Lina Metaksatou of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D103.3218 . . . DYO KEIMENA GIA TON E. A. POE . . . Athens, Iridanos, 1985. pp. 111. A translation of two texts on Poe by Stefanos Bekatoros and Costas Papageorgiou.

D103.3222 . . . O ANTHROPOS POU AGAPOUSE TA NISIA . . . Athens, Gutenberg, 1989. pp. 76. A translation by Spyros Iliopoulos of "The Man Who Loved Islands".

D103.3223 . . . O ERASTIS TIS LAIDIS CHATTERLY . . . Athens, Kaktos, 1989. pp. 232. A translation by Leonidas Christakis of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D103.3224 . . . O ERASTIS TIS LAIDIS CHATTERLY . . . Athens, Govostis, 1990. pp. 348 p. A translation by Yannis Spandonis of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D103.3225 . . . I RAVDOS TOU AARON . . . Athens, Kastaniotis, 1991. pp. 395. A translation by Errikos Belies of *Aaron's Rod*.

D103.3226 . . . O PARAVATIS . . . Athens, Delphini, 1991. pp. 300. A translation by Soti Triantafyllou of *The Trespasser*.

Add new entries after (D103.33), as follows:

D103.332 . . . TO OURANIO TOXO . . . Athens, Kritiki, 1994. pp. 696. A translation by Makis Vainas of *The Rainbow*.

D103.333 . . . O ERASTIS TIS LAIDIS CHATTERLY . . . Athens, Printa, 1995. pp. 302. A translation by Lena Milili of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D103.334 . . . I GYNAIKA POU EFYGE MAKRIA ME T' AL-OGO . . . Athens, Nefeli, 1996. pp. 76. A translation by Alexis Ziras of "The Woman Who Rode Away".

D103.335 . . . ME ANGIXES . . . Athens, Kastaniotis, 1996. pp. 93. A translation by Maria Kralli of "You Touched Me".

D103.336 . . . PIITIS TOU TORA . . . Athens, Odos Panos, 1997. pp. 187. A bilingual edition of Lawrence's poems, with Greek translations, and an introduction, by Costas Ioannou.

D103.337 . . . TO KORITSI KAI O TSINGANOS . . . Athens, Enalios, 1997. pp. 158. A translation by Theano Abatzoglou of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D103.338 . . . MYRODIA CHRYSANTHEMON . . . Athens, Patakis, 1997. pp. 59. A translation by Maria Kati of "Odour of Chrysanthemums".

D103.339 . . . I KORES TOU EFIMERIOU . . . Athens, Patakis, 1997. pp. 110. A translation by Maria Kati of "Daughters of the Vicar".

D103.340 . . . O ERASTIS TIS LAIDIS CHATTERLY . . . Athens, Kastaniotis, 1997. pp. 497. A translation by Giorgos Raikos of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D103.341 . . . O ERASTIS TIS LAIDIS CHATTERLY . . . Thessaloniki, Zitros, 1997. pp. 425. A translation by Maria Dimitriou of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Reprinted 2004.

D103.342 . . . O ANTHROPOS POU AGAPOUSE TA NISIA . . . Athens, Patakis, 1997. pp. 62. A translation by Eleftheria Papoutsaki-Ntriva of "The Man Who Loved Islands".

D103.343 . . . ME ANGIXES . . . Athens, Patakis, 1997. pp. 47. A translation by Eleftheria Papoutsaki-Ntriva of "You Touched Me".

D103.344 . . . O NIKITIS ME TO XYLINO ALOGAKI . . . Thessaloniki, Tziabiris-Pyramida, 1997. pp. 131. A translation by Vasilis Tomanas of "The Rocking-Horse Winner".

D103.345 . . . EROTEVMENES GYNAIKES . . . Athens, Smili, 1998. A translation by Dimitris Kikizas of *Women in Love*.

D103.346 . . . PORNOGRAFIA KAI ASEMNO . . . Athens, Roes, 1998. pp. 74. A translation by Vasilis Roupas of “Pornography and Obscenity”.

D103.347 . . . O ERASTIS TIS LAIDIS CHATTERLY . . . Athens, Papadopoulos, 1999. pp. 516. A translation by Kostas Poulos of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D103.348 . . . O ERASTIS TIS LAIDIS CHATTERLY . . . Athens, DeAgostini, 2000. pp. 359. A translation by Despina Angelou of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D103.349 . . . O ANTHROPOS POU AGAPOUSE TA NISIA . . . Athens, Papadopoulos, 2000. pp. 288. A translation by Vasilis Kallipolitis of “The Man Who Loved Islands” and other stories.

D103.350 . . . I DACTYLITHRA . . . Athens, Biliotto, 2001. pp. 36. A translation by Vania Syrmou Vekri of “The Thimble”.

D103.351 . . . I PRINGIPISSA . . . Athens, Ermeias, 2002. pp. 98. A translation by Angeliki Papasileka of “The Princess”.

D103.352 . . . I PARTHENAI KAI O TSINGANOS . . . Athens, Roes, 2002. pp. 201. A translation by Chrysa Koutra of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D103.356 . . . O ERASTIS TIS LAIDIS CHATTERLY . . . Athens, Metaichmio, 2005. pp. 512. A translation by Yorgos Tzimas of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

HEBREW

(D104) For BANIN read BANIM and add: Reprinted in 1980 – see (D106.55).

(D106.4) For Anir read Amir.

(D106.5) / (D106.55) Insert new entry:

D106.53 . . . NASHIM OHAVOT . . . Tel Aviv, Zmora-Bitan-Modan, 1980. 2 vols. A translation by Abraham Berman of *Women in Love*.

(D106.55) For 1981 read 1980 and add: This is apparently a re-publication of (D104).

(D106.55) / (D106.6) Insert new entries:

D106.56 . . . HA-BETULA WE-HA-ZO'ANI . . . Jerusalem, Keter, 1985. pp. 269. A translation by Efrat Shvili of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D106.57 . . . HA-GEVERET HA-NEHMADA . . . Jerusalem, Keter, 1985. pp. 143. A translation by Tirza Goldstein of "The Lovely Lady" and, presumably from (A63), other stories.

D106.58 . . . MESIGAT GEVUL . . . Tel Aviv, Or-Am, 1985. pp. 207. A translation by Tala Ber of *The Trespasser*.

D106.59 . . . MATE AHARON . . . Jerusalem, Schocken, 1986. pp. 271. A translation by Aharon Amir of *Aaron's Rod*.

Add new post-1988 entries after (D106.6), as follows:

D106.62 . . . WERED KOL HA-OLAM / ROSE OF ALL THE WORLD . . . Tel Aviv, Keshev le-shira, 2001. pp. 94. A bilingual selection of poems with Hebrew translations by Giora Leshem.

D106.625 . . . APOCALYPSE . . . Hod ha-sharon, Astrolog, 2003. pp. 142. A translation by Galia Dor of *Apocalypse*.

D106.63 . . . BANIM WE-OHAVIM . . . Tel Aviv, Pen, 2005. A translation by Mira Narkiss of *Sons and Lovers*.

D106.635 . . . MEAHAVA SHEL LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Tel Aviv, Miskal, 2006. pp. 397. A translation by Ophira Rahat of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

HINDI

(D107) For CONNIE read KONI and add date of publication: 1956.

(D108) Add date of publication: 1956.

(D108) / (D108.5) Insert new entry:

D108.3 . . . LADY CHATTERLEY KA PREMI . . . Allahabad, Rajaranjana, 1961. pp. vi + 288. A translation by Omkara Sarada of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

Add new entries after (D108.5), as follows:

D108.7 . . . LEDI CAITARLI KA PREMI . . . Jaypur, Vitaraka, Anu Prakasana, 2000. A translation by Gopala Sarma of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D108.72 . . . BETE AURA PREMI . . . Mumbai, Samvada Prakasana, 2002. pp. 477. A translation by Gopala Sarma of *Sons and Lovers*.

D108.73 . . . DA PHARSTA LEDI CAITARLI . . . Mumbai, Samvada Prakasana, 2003. pp. 239. A translation by Yuganka Dhira of *The First Lady Chatterley*.

D108.74 . . . PREMIKAEM . . . Mumbai, Samvada Prakasana, 2004. pp. 623. A translation by Vijaya Prakasa of *Women in Love*.

D108.75 . . . GULADAUDI KI MAHAKA . . . New Delhi, S. K. Publishers, 2004. pp. 119. A translation by Rima Tivari of “Odour of Chrysanthemums” and other stories, including “The Prussian Officer”; edited by Ved Prakasa Soni. (I have seen cited what seems to be the same translation, with the same title and number of pages, but published in 2007 by Niti Sahitya Pustaka Kendra, Delhi, and giving the name of a different translator, Lavakusa Sinha.)

HUNGARIAN

(D111.32) *Add*: Republished in 1984 by Árkádia, Budapest, and apparently (possibly in a revised translation) in two volumes in 1993 by Kvműhely, Budapest, as *A vér szava* and *A vér hatalma*.

(D111.4) *Add*: Republished in 1984 by Árkádia, Budapest, and in Romania in 1986 by Kriterion, Bucharest.

(D111.41) *Add*: Republished in 1985 by Árkádia, Budapest.,
Add new post-1975 entries after (D111.41), as follows:

D111.45. . . LADY CHATTERLEY SZERETŐJE . . . Budapest, Magvető, 1983. pp. 468. A translation by Mihály Falvay of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Reissued in 1984 and 2004.

D111.48 . . . A SZŰZ ÉS A CIGÁNY . . . Budapest, Árkádia, 1986. pp. 279. A translation by Árpád Göncz *et al.* of *The Virginia and the Gipsy*, *The Fox*, “Love Among the Haystacks” and “The Captain’s Doll”.

D111.50. . . AZ ÉRINTÉS FÖLTÁMADÁSA: VÁLAGATOTT VERSEK . . . Budapest, Európa, 1988. pp. 98. A translation by József Tornai of poems from *Selected Poems* (A116).

D111.55 . . . SZERELEM A SZÉNABOGLYÁK KÖZÖTT . . . Budapest, Merényi, 1996. pp. 149. A translation by Endre Vajda of “Love Among the Haystacks”.

D111.56 . . . HARC A SZERELEMÉRT . . . Budapest, Merényi, 1997. pp. 157. A translation by Gyula Tellér and Ervin Vályi Nagy of “Daughters of the Vicar” – though the Hungarian title seems to translate as “The Fight for Love”. Published under a new title in (D111.60).

D111.60 . . . A TISZTELETES ÚR LEÁNYAI / A SZÜZ ÉS A CIGÁNY . . . Szeged, Lazi, 2005. pp. 179. A translation by Gyula Tellér and Mária Pap of “Daughters of the Vicar” and *The Virgin and the Gipsy*. See also (D111.56).

D111.62 . . . LADY CHATTERLEY SZERETŐJE . . . Budapest, Ulpius-ház, 2007. pp. 461. A translation by Ágnes Simonyi of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*

537 After (D111.60), insert new language sub-section and new item, as follows:

ICELANDIC

D111.90 . . . REFURRIN . . . Reykjavík, Bókhlaðan, 1985. pp. 38. A translation by Garðar Baldvinsson of *The Fox*.

ITALIAN

537:27–31 Revise and expand headnote to read as follows: *Note*. See “A Checklist of D. H. Lawrence Criticism and Scholarship in Italy, 1924–1976 by Simonetta de Filippis in *The D. H. Lawrence Review* 10:3 (Fall 1977), and “A Checklist of D. H. Lawrence Criticism and Scholarship in Italy, 1976–1985 by Simonetta de Filippis in *The D. H. Lawrence Review* 19:3 (Fall 1987). See, too, de Filippis’s essay in Iida (F690), “Italy and the Lawrence Effect”, pp. 63–83, and the following two essays (and their

related bibliographies) in Jansohn and Mehl (F759): “The Fortunes of D. H. Lawrence in Italy” by Stefania Michelucci, pp. 79–91, 283–286, and “Translation and Reception of Lawrence’s Works in Italy: The ‘Story’” by Nick Ceramella, pp. 92–106, 287–295.

(D112) *Expand at end of note, to read:* See (C253) and (D133). Republished in 1961 by Garzanti, Milan. Linati’s translation of *The Fox* was published alone in 1991, with an afterword by Guido Almansi, by Sellerio, Palermo.

(D113) *Add:* Republished in 1948 by dall’Oglio, Milan, with several subsequent reprints.

(D115) *Add:* Reissued in 1936 and republished by dall’Oglio, Milan, in 1962 and 1965. Bietti, Milan, published *Figli e amanti* in 1936, 1938 and 1951 and it seems probable that these editions used Scalero’s translation, but I have been unable to confirm this.

(D119) *Expand note to read:* ... of *The Virgin and the Gipsy* and other stories, as follows: “A Sick Collier”, “The Shadow in the Rose Garden”, *Sun*, “Smile”, “The Princess”, “The Blind Man”, “Tickets, Please”, “In Love”, “Jimmy and the Desperate Woman”, “Wintry Peacock”, “The Last Laugh”, “England, My England”, “The Primrose Path”, “Samson and Delilah”, *The Man Who Died*. See also (D133), (D134) and (D137.35). Translation reprinted many times by Mondadori.

(D120) *Add:* Included in (D137.21); reprinted in 1980.

(D123) / (D124) *Insert two new entries here, as follows:*

D123.4 . . . LETTERE . . . Rome, Longanesi, 1942. An anonymous translation of Lawrence’s letters.

D123.6 . . . LA RAGAZZA PERDUTA . . . Milan, Mondadori, 1944. A translation by Carlo Izzo of *The Lost Girl*. Included in (D137.12).

(D125.1) *Amend to read:* A translation, apparently from the French (D44), by ...

(D126) *Add:* Reprinted in 1947 and many times subsequently; included in (D136).

(D127) *Add*: Republished in 1966 by Saggiatore, Milan. Issued by Mondadori in 1980 with a translation of *The Man Who Died* by Elio Vittorini (see (D119) and (D133)) with an introduction by Stefano Zecchi.

(D130) *Add*: Republished in 1988 by SE, Milan, and in 1991 by Feltrinelli, Milan, with an appended essay on Lawrence by Martin Jarrett-Kerr (F80), though, for some reason, his name appears here as W. R. Jarrett-Kerr.

(D131) *Add*: Reissued in 1949 and 1968 and then in 2003 in a revised translation based on the 1992 Cambridge edition of *Sons and Lovers*, with new material translated by Stefania Michelucci and an introduction by Giovanni Cianci. Included in Mondadori's Lawrence edition in 1970 (D137.28) and reprinted by Mondadori many times subsequently, for example in 1971 and, with an introduction by Claudio Gorlier, in 1976, 1985, 1988 and 1997.

(D132) *Add*: Included in (D137.12) and reprinted in 1970.

(D133) *Here and in all related entries for Mondadori's edition of Lawrence's works, for Tutti Gli Scritti read Tutte le opere.*

(D134) *In the list of contents, add omitted reference to The Prussian Officer collection, to read: ... "Rex" and the contents of The Prussian Officer and England, My England,*

(D135) *Add*: Reprinted in 1980 and republished by Fabbri, Milan, in 1986, 1997 and 2000. See also (D137.62).

(D136) *Correct the first part of the translation details to read: A translation by Giulio Monteleone of Lady Chatterley's Lover – see (D126) – and by Carlo Izzo of The First Lady Chatterley ... Then also add to the end of the entry: Izzo's translation of The First Lady Chatterley was republished in 1994 by Guanda, Parma, with an introduction by Guido Almansi, and his translation of the second manuscript version was republished as John Thomas e Lady Jane in 1991 by ES, Milan.*

(D137) *For Eli, Italiene read Milan, Eli.*

(D137.1) *Add*: Republished in Mondadori's edition of Lawrence's works in 1964 (D137.22) and separately by Mondadori in 1979;

reissued by Einaudi in 1982 and 1989, and in 1995 with an introduction by Giovanni Cianci and an essay by Anaïs Nin.

(D137.12) / (D137.2) *Insert new item number here – D137.14 – to take in the contents of the (misdated) existing entry at (D137.27). Then, immediately after this, add a further new entry, as follows:*

D137.15 . . . TUTTE LE POESIE . . . Milan, Mondadori, 1959. 2 vols. pp. 1192, 1195. A translation, with introduction and notes, by Piero Nardi of the complete poems. Volume II of Mondadori's eleven-volume edition of Lawrence's works. See (A101.5).

(D137.2) *Add:* The translations of *Sea and Sardinia* (by Vittorini and De Carlo) and *Mornings in Mexico* (by Vittorini) were reissued together by Mondadori in 1981 with an afterword by Enzo Siciliano.

(D137.22) *Correct final word of title to read INNAMORATE and add:* This translation of *The Rainbow* was reissued in 1991 with an introduction by A. R. Falzon and notes by Ornella De Zordo.

(D137.24) *Add:* Republished: Torriana, Orsa Maggiore Editrice, 1989; Rome, Newton Compton, 1991, with an introduction by Bruno Traversetti; Rome, Curcio, 1978; Novara, De Agostini, 1983, with the title *Contrabbando d'amore*.

(D137.26) *For AMANTE read AMANTI and add:* Republished in 2003 by Einaudi, Turin.

(D137.27) *This translation was in fact first published in 1959. Therefore, correct date and move entry to new location at (D137.14), leaving note here:* See (D137.14).

(D137.31) *Correct name at end, to read Giuseppe Gadda Conti and add:* Reissued 1995.

(D137.32) *Add:* Reissued 1987.

(D137.33) *Correct name of translator to read: Delia Piergentili Agozzino and add to entry:* Reissued in 1992 with corrected title, *Donne innamorate*, with an introduction by Bruno Traversetti.

(D137.35) *Add:* See also (D133) where these translations first appeared.

(D137.36) *Add:* This translation first published in (D137.28).

(D137.36) / (D137.5) *Insert the following new entries:*

D137.38 . . . FANTASIA DELL'INCONSCIO E ALTRI SAGGI SUL DESIDERIO, L'AMORE, IL PIACERE . . . Milan, Mondadori, 1978. pp. 281. A translation of *Fantasia of the Unconscious* by Stefano Zecchi, together with a translation, from (D137.34), of *Assorted Articles* by Remo Ceserani.

D137.40 . . . D. H. LAWRENCE: POESIE . . . Milan, Mondadori, 1980. A translation by Giuseppe Conte of a selection of Lawrence's poems.

D137.42 . . . LA DONNA CHE FUGGIÀ A CAVALLO . . . Milan, Guanda, 1980. pp. 79. A translation by Giuseppe Conte of "The Woman Who Rode Away". Republished by Feltrinelli, Milan, 1981.

(D137.5) / (D137.55) *Insert the following new entries:*

D137.505 . . . LA CORONA . . . Milan, SE, 1985. A translation by Remo Ceserani of "The Crown".

D137.51 . . . ROMANZI GIOVANILI . . . Milan, Rizzoli, 1985. pp. 1148. A volume of early novels, including previously published translations of *The White Peacock* (D137.31) and *Sons and Lovers* (D135) along with what appears to be a new original translation of *The Trespasser* by Adriana Dell'Orto.

D137.515 . . . L'AMANTE DI LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Novara, De Agostini, 1985. A translation by Carlo Izzo of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D137.52 . . . PAESI ETRUSCHI . . . Siena, Nuova Immagine, 1985. pp. 181. A translation of *Etruscan Places* by Giovanni Kezich. Reissued in 1989.

D137.525 . . . LUOGHI ETRUSCHI . . . Florence, Passigli, 1985. pp. 149. A translation by L. Gigli of *Etruscan Places*, with a preface by Lidia Storoni Mazzolani.

D137.53 . . . FIGLI E AMANTI . . . Milan, Mondadori, 1985. A translation by Elena Grillo of *Sons and Lovers*.

(D137.535 . . .) FIGLI E AMANTI . . . Sesto San Giovanni, Peruzzo, 1985. pp. 246. A translation by Emanuela Gatti of *Sons and Lovers*.

D137.54 . . . L'AMANTE DI LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Milan, Garzanti, 1987. pp. xiv + 361. A translation by Sandro Melani of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Reissued in 1994 and 2007.

(D137.55) / (D137.6) *Insert the following new entries:*

D137.551 . . . DONNE INNAMORATE . . . Milan, Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, 1989. A translation by Adriana Dell'Orto of *Women in Love*, with an introduction by Anthony Burgess.

D137.552 . . . L'AMANTE DI LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Milan, Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, 1989. A translation by Adriana Dell'Orto of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Reprinted several times: including in 2010 by Rizzoli, in 2004 and 2007 (with an introduction by Doris Lessing) by BUR, Milan and in 1994, 1996 and 2004 by Fabbri Editore, Milan.

D137.553 . . . IL FANTOCCIO . . . Latina, L'argonauta, 1989. A translation by Giuliana Prato of *The Captain's Doll*.

D137.554 . . . L'AMANTE DI LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Milan, Rusconi, 1989. A translation by Amina Pandolfi of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D137.555 . . . ITINERARI ETRUSCHI . . . Rome, Newton Compton, 1989. pp. 173. A translation by Giovanni Paolini of *Etruscan Places*, with an introduction by Giulio Facchetti.

D137.5554 . . . D. H. LAWRENCE, SCRITTI SULL'ARTE . . . Siracusa, Tema Celeste Edizione, 1991. A translation by G. Grasso of "Introduction to These Paintings".

D137.5555 . . . L'UOMO CHE AMAVA LE ISOLE . . . Turin, Lindau, 1991. pp. 51. A translation by Sergio Daneluzzi of "The Man Who Loved Islands". Reissued in 2002.

D137.556 . . . FIGLI E AMANTI . . . Rome, Newton Compton, 1993. A translation by Elena Grillo of *Sons and Lovers* based on the the 1992 Cambridge edition, with an introduction by Tommaso Pisanti.

D137.557 . . . LA DONNA CHE FUGGIÀ A CAVALLO: IL RACCONTO DI UN VIAGGIO DAL CORPO AL COSMO . . . Verona, Demetra, 1993. pp. 62. A translation by Nicoletta Della Casa Porta of "The Woman Who Rode Away".

D137.558 . . . L'AMANTE DI LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Verona, Demetra, 1993. A translation by Francesco Franconeri of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D137.559 . . . LA PRINCIPESSA . . . Venice, Marsilio, 1993. pp. 166. A translation by Serena Cenni of "The Princess".

(D137.6) *For RACCONTI read RACCONTI.*

(D137.6) / (D137.62) *Insert the following new entries:*

D137.61 . . . LA RAGAZZA PERDUTA . . . Rome, Newton Compton, 1994. A translation by Roberta Gefter Wondrich of *The Lost Girl*, with an introduction by Walter Mauro.

D137.611 . . . L'UOMO CHE ERA MORTO . . . Turin, Lindau, 1994. pp. 79. A translation by Sergio Daneluzzi of *The Man Who Died*.

D137.612 . . . L'UOMO CHE ERA MORTO . . . Verona, Demetra, 1994. pp. 92. A translation by Augusto Sabbatini (Shantena) of *The Man Who Died*. Reissued in 2003.

D137.613 . . . L'UFFICIALE PRUSSIANO . . . Milan, Edis, 1994. A bilingual parallel-text of *The Prussian Officer* with Italian translation by Laura Capitano.

D137.614 . . . L'AMANTE DI LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Rome, Newton Compton, 1994. A translation by Bruno Armando of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, with an introduction by Vanni de Simone. Reissued 2010 (pp. 320).

D137.615 . . . TUTTI I RACCONTI E I ROMANZI BREVI . . . Rome, Newton Compton, 1994. A translation by B. Armando, I. Bianciardi, P. Collesi, E. Grillo, P. Meneghelli, M. E. Morin, M. Bianchi Oddera, F. Ricci, and F. Sortino of "Love Among the Haystacks", *The Fox*, "The Captain's Doll", "The Ladybird", *St. Mawr*, "The Princess", *The Virgin and the Gipsy*, *The Man Who Died*.

D137.616 . . . LE FIGLIE DEL VICARIO . . . Palermo, Sellerio, 1994. A translation by Cristina Bertea of "Daughters of the Vicar".

D137.617 . . . LA DONNA CHE FUGGIÀ A CAVALLO . . . Milan, Mondadori, 1994. pp. 181. A translation by Puccio Russo of "The

Woman Who Rode Away" and by Carlo Izzo of "The Prussian Officer". Reissued in 2001 with an introduction by Etaldo Affinati. See also (D134) and (D137.27 [now D137.14]).

(D137.62) *For Dettore read Dettore and add:* Republished in 2008 by BUR, Milan.

(D137.63) / (D137.7) *Insert the following new entries:*

D137.635 . . . LA DONNA CHE FUGGI A CAVALLO . . . Milan, La Spiga, 1995. pp. 48. A translation by Giuliana Bindelli of "The Woman Who Rode Away".

D137.64 . . . L'AMANTE DI LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Milan, Opportunity, 1995. An anonymous translation of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* edited by Marina Premoli with a commentary by Guido Almansi.

D137.645 . . . L'AMANTE DI LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Milan, Peruzzo, 1995. Translator unknown.

D137.65 . . . L'AMANTE DI LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Rimini, Guaraldi, 1995. A translation by Gian Luca Guernieri of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D137.655 . . . L'ARCOBALENO . . . Rome, Newton Compton, 1995. A translation by Maria Eugenia Morin of *The Rainbow*, with an introduction by Guido Bulla.

(D137.66 . . . FANTASIA DELL'INCONSCIO E PSICOANALISI E INCONSCIO . . . Rome, Newton Compton, 1995. A translation by Walter Mauro of *Fantasia of the Unconscious* and *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*.

D137.665 . . . IL SERPENTE PLUMATO . . . Rome, Newton Compton, 1995. A translation by Walter Mauro of *The Plumed Serpent*.

D137.67 . . . LA VERGA DI ARONNE . . . Rome, Newton Compton, 1995. A translation by Walter Mauro of *Aaron's Rod*.

D137.675 . . . LA VOLPE . . . Rome, Newton Compton, 1995. A translation by Flavia Sortino of *The Fox*, with an introduction by Ornella De Zordo.

D137.68 . . . LA COCCINELLA . . . Florence, Passigli, 1996. A translation by Patrizia Bernardini of “The Ladybird”. Reissued in 2001.

Add new post-1999 entries after (D137.8), as follows:

D137.81 . . . MARE E SARDEGNA . . . Nuoro, Ilisso Edizioni, 2000. pp. 294. A translation of *Sea and Sardinia* by Tiziana Serra, with a preface by Luciano Marrocù.

D137.82 . . . L'AMANTE DI LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Venice, Marsilio, 2001. pp. 356. A translation by Serena Cenni of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D137.83 . . . LA DONNA CHE FUGGIÀ A CAVALLO . . . Milan, Adelphi, 2001. pp. 83. A translation by Franco Salvatorelli of “The Woman Who Rode Away”.

D137.84 . . . MARE E SARDEGNA . . . Rome, Newton Compton, 2002. pp. 236. A translation by Davide Mezzacapa of *Sea and Sardinia*, with an introduction by Gabriella Contini.

D137.85 . . . MATTINATE IN MESSICO . . . Turin, Lindau, 2002. A translation by Sergio Daneluzzi of *Mornings in Mexico*.

D137.86 . . . ST. MAWR . . . Siena, Aquitare, 2002. pp. 269. A translation by Laura Garofani of *St. Mawr*.

D137.87 . . . BIGLIETTI PREGO: CINQUE RACCONTI DI DONNE . . . Florence, Passigli, 2003. A translation by Alessandro Ceni of “Tickets, Please”, “Her Turn”, “Once-!”, *Sun*, and “Smile”.

D137.88 . . . OSCENITA E PORNOGRAFIA . . . Florence, Passigli, 2004. A translation by Alessandro Ceni of *Pornography and Obscenity*.

D137.89 . . . CLASSICI AMERICANI . . . Milan, Adelphi, 2009. pp. 256. A translation by Paolo Dilonardo of *Studies in Classic American Literature*.

JAPANESE

542 *Add to headnote:* This sub-section has been revised with kind assistance from Masami Nakabayashi.

(D142) *Add:* Apparently reissued in 1994 by Ōzarasha, Tokyo.

(D185) *Add*: Reissued in 2005 by Keibunsha, Tokyo.

(D185.22) *Add*: Apparently reprinted in 2004 under the title of *Mokusirokuron*.

(D185.65) *Extend end of note, to read*: ... and “The Crown”.

(D185.8) *Replace (wrongly set) English title with the Japanese title UMI TO SARUDÊNYA and add Tokyo as place of publication.*

(D185.39) *Add*: Reissued in 1992.

(D185.75) / (D185.78) *Insert new entry*:

D185.76 . . . HURUI ADAMU . . . Osaka, Ōsaka kyōiku toshu, 1991. pp. 207. A translation by Yoshiro Nakanisi of “The Old Adam” and the following stories: “New Eve and Old Adam”, “The Man Who Loved Islands” and “The Man Who Was Through with the World”.

(D185.78) / (D185.8) *Insert new entry*:

D185.79 . . . HOSIKUSA GOYA NO KOI . . . Tokyo, Hukutako shoten, 1992. pp. 260. A translation by Kōji Nishimura of *Love Among the Haystacks*.

(D185.82) / (D185.84) *Insert new entry*:

D185.83 . . . BUNKAKU TO MORARU [LITERATURE AND MORALITY] . . . Tokyo, Ōzorasha, 1994. pp. 72. A translation by Ryōzō Iwasaki (presumably of Lawrence’s essays on this subject).

(D185.84) / (D185.86) *Insert two new entries*:

D185.851 . . . D. H. RORENSU SHISHŪ . . . Tokyo, Bunkashobō hakubunsha, 1995. pp. 261. A selection of Lawrence’s poems translated by Ryūshō Satake.

D185.852 . . . DABIDE . . . Tokyo, Kobian shobō, 1995. pp. 242. A translation by Masao Yosie of *David*.

Add new post-1996 entries after (D185.86), as follows:

D185.861 . . . TYATARÎ HUZIN NO KOIBITO SINZUI . . . Tokyo, Kindai bungeisha, 1997. pp. 163. A translation by Teruhumi Takeda of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*.

D185.862 . . . ROSUTO GÂRU . . . Tokyo, Sairyūsha, 1997. pp. 560. A translation by Tetuhiko Kamimura of *The Lost Girl*.

D185.863 . . . D. H. RORENSU MEISAKUSHU . . . Tokyo, Bunkashobō hakubunsha, 1997. pp. 194. A translation by Misui Utida of six selected stories, including “Fanny and Annie”.

D185.864 . . . ARUBAINA NO DARAKU . . . Tokyo, Kindai bungeisha, 1997. pp. 586. A translation by Akiko Yamada of *The Lost Girl*.

D185.868 . . . D. H. RORENSU ME ISAKUSHU . . . Tokyo, Sairyūsha, 1998. pp. 339. A translation by Tositaka Sirai of *Three Plays by D. H. Lawrence* (A108.7).

D185.870 . . . AMERIKA KOTEN BUNGAKU KENKYU . . . Tokyo, Kodansha, 1999. pp. 377. A translation by Ônisi Naoki of *Studies in Classic American Literature*.

D185.871 . . . SIN'YAKU TYATARE HUZIN NO KOIBITO . . . Tokyo, Sairyūsha, 1999. pp. 339. A translation by Katuo Nagamine of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D185.875 . . . RORENSU TANPENSHU . . . Tokyo, Sintyōsha, 2000. pp. 509. A translation by Kazuo Ueda of thirteen selected stories, including “Odour of Chrysanthemums”, “The Shadow in the Rose Garden” and “Second Best”.

D185.876 . . . KITSUNE . . . Tokyo, Sairyūsha, 2000. pp. 307. A translation by Yoshiharu Niwa of *The Fox, The Captain's Doll, The Ladybird*.

D185.880 . . . TORI TO KEMONO TO HANA . . . Tokyo, Sairyūsha, 2001. pp. 227. A translation by Yukio Mateda of *Birds, Beasts and Flowers*.

D185.885 . . . SYOZYO TO ZIPUSI . . . Tokyo, Sairyūsha, 2003. pp. 203. A translation by Ikuo Mibu of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D185.886 . . . D. H. RORENSU TANPEN ZENSHIŪ . . . Osaka, Ôsaka kyōiku toshu, 2003–2006. Five volumes: 1 and 2 (2003), pp. 395, 432; 3 and 4 (2005), pp. 458, 457; 5 (2006), pp. 440. A translation by Kōji Nishimura, Tetuhiko Kamimura, Haruo Tetumura and Hitosi Toda of *The Complete Short Stories*.

D185.887 . . . GORAN BOKUTACHI KATTANDAYO . . . Toyohashi, Aichi, San-ai kikaku, 2003. pp. 218. A translation by Akiko Yamada *et al.* of *Look! We Have Come Through!*

D185.889 . . . KAITEN MOKUBA . . . Tokyo, Riberu shuppan, 2004. pp. 157. A translation by Katuaki Takahasi of *The Merry-Go-Round*.

D185.890 . . . TYATARE HUZIN NO KOIBITO . . . Tokyo, Tikuma shobō, 2004. pp. 616. A translation by Hirosi Muto of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D185.892 . . . TORI KEMONO HANA: VIZYON NO SEKAI . . . Tokyo, Tyuo koron zigyō shuppan, 2005. pp. 304. A translation by San Monzyu of *Birds, Beasts and Flowers*.

D185.893 . . . TYATAREYOU HUZIN NO KOIBITO: SHOKOU . . . Tokyo, Sairyūsha, 2005. pp. 452. A translation by Mituru Masuguti of *The First Lady Chatterley*.

D185.894 . . . D. H. RORENSU SHOKANSHŪ . . . Tokyo, Shōhakusha, 2005–. This is a continuing project of translation, by Hirokazu Yoshimura *et al.*, of the Cambridge edition of Lawrence's *Letters* (A121). Six volumes have been published by Shōhakusha to 2011, and these are as follows (in chronological order of publication):

Vol 3 (1912), 2005, pp. 469, translated by H. Yoshimura and Yoshiko Tabei

Vol 4 (1913), 2007, pp. 556, translated by H. Yoshimura.

Vol 2 (1910–11), 2008, pp. 530, translated by H. Yoshimura and Yasushi Sugiyama.

Vol 5 (1914), 2008, pp. 424, translated by H., Yoshimura and Kaien Kitazaki.

Vol 1 (1901–10), 2008, pp. 544, translated by H. Yoshimura and Yasushi Sugiyama.

Vol 6 (1915), 2011, pp. 774, translated by H., Yoshimura, Haruko Imaizumi, and Yoshikuni Shimotori.

D185.900 . . . RORENSU AI TO KUNŌ NO TEGAMI . . . Tokyo, Takashobōyumipuresu, 2011. pp. 489. A translation by Kōichi Kimura, Masami Kurata, and Yoshiko Itō of the Cambridge edition of *Selected Letters* (A121h).

KOREAN

(D186.1) *Add*: Republished in 1990 in two volumes by Hyejin sogwan, Seoul.

(D186.4) *Add*: Apparently reissued in 1995 as *P'iano* (pp. 200).

(D186.52) / (D186.6) *Insert new entry*:

D186.53 . . . JIBSI UI YEONIN . . . Seoul, Taechang munhwasa, 1978. pp. 331. A translation by Gyeong-Sig I of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

(D186.6) / (D186.65) *Insert new entries, as follows*:

D186.62 . . . CH'AET'OLLI PUINUI SARANG . . . Seoul, Ilweolseo-gag, 1986. pp. 386. A translation by Hwang Chin-min of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D186.63 . . . CH'AET'OLLI PUINUI SARANG . . . Seoul, Yangudang, 1986. pp. 526. A translation by Kwon U-hyon of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D186.64 . . . CH'AET'OLLI PUINUI SARANG . . . Seoul, Ilshinsojokkongsa, 1986. pp. 260. A translation by O-sok Kwon of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Reissued in an apparently longer version in 1989 and 1992 (with pp. 513).

Add new entries after (D186.65), as follows:

D186.651 . . . LAWRENCE DANPYONSON . . . Seoul, Shisayongosa, 1987. pp. 196. A translation by Shisayonosapyonkupkuk of selected stories.

D186.652 . . . MIKUKKJONMUNHAKYONGU . . . Seoul, Hanshin munhwasa, 1987. pp. 213. A translation by Om Chongok of *Studies in Classic American Literature*.

D186.653 . . . ADULKWA YONIN . . . Seoul, Ilsinsojokkongsa, 1988. pp. 247. A translation by Kim Un Chong of *Sons and Lovers*.

D186.654 . . . CH'AET'OLLI BUIN UI SALANG . . . Seoul, Choengmogsa, 1989. pp. 464. A translation by Kan Manshik of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D186.655 . . . ADULGWA YON-IN . . . Seoul, Kumsong ch'ulp'ansa, 1990. pp. 555. A translation by Kyu-chae Hwong of *Sons and Lovers*.

D186.656 . . . CH'AET'OLLI BUIN-UI SARANG . . . Seoul, Kumsong ch'ulp'ansa, 1990. pp. 486. A translation by Tong-ho Kim of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D186.657 . . . CH'AET'OLLI PUIN-UI SARANG . . . Seoul, Hyewon ch'ulp'ansa, 1991. pp. 437. A translation by Nan-yong Paek of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D186.658 . . . MUJIGAE (HA, SANG) . . . Seoul, Hangilsa, 1992. 2 vols. A translation by Yong-jong Chin and Ui-bang Hwang of *The Rainbow*.

D186.659 . . . YONINDUL . . . Seoul, Hyesowon, 1992. 2 vols. A translation by Sang-jin Chong of *Women in Love*.

D186.660 . . . CH'AET'OLLI PUINNUUI SARANG . . . Seoul, Hongshin munhwasa, 1992. pp. 436. A translation by Tōk-su Kim of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D186.661 . . . TIJYONGÜI YÖNGGWANG . . . Seoul, Taeahktang ch'ulp'ansa, 1993. pp. 114. A translation by Ki-t'ae Kim (possibly of "Gloire de Dijon" and other poems).

D186.662 . . . ADÜLGWA YÖNIN . . . Seoul, Choengmogsa, 1993. pp. 533. A translation by Man-shik Kang of *Sons and Lovers*.

D186.663 . . . CH'AET'ÖLLI PUINÜI SARANG . . . Seoul, Madang, 1993. pp. 384. A translation by Tong-sön Kim of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Republished in two volumes in 1994 by Hagwonsa, Seoul.

D186.664 . . . CH'AET'OLLI PUINUI SARANG . . . Seoul, Yomyong ch'ulp'ansa, 1994. pp. 352. A translation by Chun-hui Hong of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D186.665 . . . CH'AET'ORI PUINUI SARANG . . . Seoul, Samsonggihoek, 1994. pp. 445. A translation by Chong-hwan Kim of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Republished Seoul, Yungmunsa, 1995.

D186.666 . . . ADULGWA YONIN . . . Seoul, Kyemongsa, 1994. pp. 395. A translation by Yu Yong of *Sons and Lovers*. This is apparently a first volume of the translation; a second volume (pp. 392), published in the same year, appears also to contain a

translation of Somerset Maugham's *The Moon and Sixpence* translated by Pak Chin-a.

D186.667 . . . ADULGWA YONIN . . . Seoul, Samsonggihoek, 1994. pp. 557. A translation by Chong-hwan Kim of *Sons and Lovers*. Republished Seoul, Yungmunsa, 1995.

D186.668 . . . ADEULKWA YUNIN . . . Seoul, Koreawonmedia, 1997. pp. 373. A translation by Hyekyung Lee of *Sons and Lovers*.

D186.669 . . . CEONYEOWA JIBSI . . . Seoul, Hanbat, 1997. pp. 195. A translation by Imjeonghyi of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D186.670 . . . RORENSEUYI MUGSIROG . . . Seoul, Nanam ch'ulp'an, 1998. pp. 247. A translation by Gimmyeongbog of *Apocalypse*.

551 Insert new language sub-sections for Latvian, Lithuanian and Malayalam, as follows:

LATVIAN

D186.6800 . . . DĒLI UN MĪLĀKIE . . . Rīga, Liesma, 1996. pp. 458. A translation by Mārtiņš Poišs of *Sons and Lovers*.

D186.6801 . . . VARAVĪKSNE . . . Rīga, Artava Latvia, 1996. pp. 510. A translation by Ingūna Bekere of *The Rainbow*.

LITHUANIAN

D186.6850 . . . MYLINČIOS MOTERYS . . . Vilnius, Vaga, 1994. pp. 493. A translation by Lilija Vanagienė of *Women in Love*. Reprinted 1998.

D186.6851 . . . LEDI ČATERLI MEILUŽIS . . . Vilnius, Tyto alba, 1995. pp. 364. A translation by Nijolė Chijenienė of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Included in (D186.6853) and republished in 2006 by Lietuvos rytas, Vilnius.

D186.6852 . . . SŪNŪS IR MEILUŽIAI . . . Vilnius, Tyto alba, 1996. pp. 558. A translation by Milda Keršienė of *Sons and Lovers*.

D186.6853 . . . LEDI ČATERLI MEILUŽIS, MERGINA IR ČIGONAS . . . Vilnius, Tyto alba, 1997. pp. 398. A translation by Zigmantas Ardickas and Nijolė Regina Chijenoiéné of *The Virgin and the Gipsy* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. See (D186.6851).

MALAYALAM

D186.6950 . . . CHATTARLI PRABHVIYUTE KAMUKAN . . . Kottayam, Kerala, D. C. Books, 1983. pp. 152. A translation by O. P. Joseph of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D186.6951 . . . MAZHAVILLU . . . Kottayam, Kerala, D. C. Books, 1983 (2nd edition, 2008). pp. 164. A translation, in an abridged version, by Thankam Nair of *The Rainbow*.

D186.6955 . . . LADY CHATTERLIYUDE KAMUKAN . . . Kottayam, Kerala, D. C. Books, 1994 (8th impression, 2010). A translation by M. P. Sivadasan of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D186.6956 . . . LADY CHATTERLIYUDE KAMUKAN . . . Kottayam, Kerala, DC Books, 1994 (8th impression, 2010). A translation by M. P. Sivadasan of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D186.6960 . . . LOKOTHARA KATHAKAL, D. H. LAWRENCE . . . Kottayam, Kerala, D. C. Books, 2010. A translation by Venu V. Desam of a selection of short stories, as follows: "Smile", "The Last Straw" ("Fanny and Annie"), "The Rocking-Horse Winner", "The Prussian Officer" ("Honour and Arms"), "The White Stocking", "Odour of Chrysanthemums".

NORWEGIAN

551 *Add headnote:* See also Peter Fjagesund's essay (and related bibliography), "In Hamsun's Shadow: The Reception of D. H. Lawrence in Norway", in Jansohn and Mehl (F759), pp. 244–54, 341–2.

(D191) *Add:* Reprinted in 1989 and 1995.

D191.51 . . . SVIGERDOTTERA . . . Oslo, Fjernsynsteatret, 1974. A translation by Finn Kvalem of *The Daughter-in-Law*.

D191.55 . . . DIKT I UTVAL OG GJENDIKTING . . . Oslo, Samlaget, 1985. pp. 157. A translation by Per Olav Kaldestad of selected poems.

D191.58 . . . SOENNER OG ELSKERE . . . Oslo, Aschehoug, 1997. pp. 612. A translation by Mona Lyche Ramberg of *Sons and Lovers*. Issued by Den norske bokklubben, Oslo, in 1998 and reprinted by Aschehoug in 2004.

POLISH

551 Extend headnote sentence to read: ... and her essay (and related bibliography) in Jansohn and Mehl (F759), “D. H. Lawrence’s Reception in Poland”, pp. 222–31, 334–38. See the latter essay for details of translations appearing in periodicals.

(D192) Correct form of translator’s name and clarify source of translation, to read: ... by Janina Sujkowska of “Wintry Peacock” and the other stories from *England, My England* (A23), as follows: “Tickets, Please”, ... Also, amend final note, to read: Reprinted in 1936 and by Czytelnik, Warsaw, in 1971 (with an epilogue by Wałław Sadkowski). See also (D195).

(D193) Correct form of translator’s name to Marceli Tarnowski and amend final note to read: Reprinted in 1933 by Fruchtman, Warsaw, and in 1987.

(D194) Correct form of translator’s name to Marceli Tarnowski.

(D195) Correct first word of title to read: DOTKNĘŁAŚ and correct form of translator’s name to Janina Sujkowska. Also, add to end of entry: This would appear to reprint the translations first published in (D192).

(D195.3) Add: Reissued in 1987 and republished by Comfort, Warsaw, in 1992.

(D195.5) Extend note to read: . . . from *Complete Poems* (A98) with the English originals printed in parallel.

(D195.7) Revise entire entry, to read: . . . LISTY . . . Kraków and Wrocław, Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1984. pp. 502. A translation by Zofia Sroczyńska of selected letters from *Collected Letters* (A102) with an introduction and notes by Krystyna Stamirowski.

(D195.8) *Revise entire entry, to read: . . . ZAKOCHANE KOBIETY . . .* Warsaw, Czytelnik, 1986. pp. 448. A translation by Irena Szymańska of *Women in Love*, with an afterword by Piotr Kuhuczak. Republished by Comfort, Warsaw, in 1991.

Add new entries to follow last item (D195.8):

D195.81 . . . KOCHANEK LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Warsaw, Almapress, 1987. pp.250. A translation by Zofia Sroczyńska of *The First Lady Chatterley*. Reprinted in 1991 and also published by Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, Warsaw.

D195.82 . . . WIĘZY CIAŁA . . . Warsaw, Książka I Wiedza, 1989. pp.302. A translation of “The Mortal Coil” and other stories, as follows: “The Prussian Officer”, “The Rocking-Horse Winner”, “The Woman Who Rode Away”, *Sun* and *The Man Who Died*. Republished by Folium, Warsaw, in 1993 but excluding “The Rocking-Horse Winner” and *The Man Who Died*.

D195.83 . . . PRUSKI OFICER . . . London, Puls Publications, 1993. pp. 304. A translation by Juliusz Kydryński of “The Prussian Officer” and other stories taken from the 1961 Viking Compass edition of *The Complete Short Stories* (A94): “The Thorn in the Flesh”, “Daughters of the Vicar”, “The Shades of Spring”, “Second Best”, “The White Stocking”, “A Sick Collier”, “The Christening”, “Odour of Chrysanthemums”, *Sun*, “The Woman Who Rode Away”, “Jimmy and the Desperate Woman”, “The Rocking-Horse Winner”, “Mother and Daughter”. Kydryński’s translation of the title story was first published in 1983 in the periodical *Życie Literackie* (Kraków) 30: 8–10.

D195.4 . . . DZIEWICA I CYGAN, ST MAWR . . . Warsaw, ALFA, 1993. A translation by Małgorzata Fabianowska of *The Virgin and the Gipsy* and *St. Mawr*.

PORTUGUESE

552 *Add to end of headnote:* See also – especially for translations appearing in periodicals and anthologies – Isabel Fernandes’s essay (and related bibliography) in Jansohn and Mehl (F759): “The Taming of Chatterley’s Creator: D. H. Lawrence in Portugal

after Seventy Years", pp. 158–72, 314–19. Note that many of the translations listed briefly in the existing headnote are now listed as full entries in this update.

(D196) / (D197) *Insert new item, as follows:*

D196.5 . . . MULHERES APAIXONADAS . . . Lisbon, Portugália Editora, 1940. A translation by Cabral do Nascimento of *Women in Love*. Reissued 1944 and c.1950 and reprinted many times subsequently, including in 1987 and 2005 by Relógio d'Água, Lisbon. Also republished several times in Brazil in an adaptation by Ruth de Biasi (e.g., São Paulo, Abril, 1979 and 1983; Rio de Janeiro, Record, 1982 and 1990, and Ediouro, 1993).

(D197) *Add:* Republished in 2003 by Europa América, Mem Martins, and see also (D200.65) which may derive from this same translation.

(D198) *Add:* Republished in 1971 and 1982 by Círculo de Leitores, Lisbon, and in Rio de Janeiro by Tecnoprint in 1989 and by Ediouro in 1993.

(D199) / (D200) *Insert new items, as follows:*

D199.1 . . . HISTÓRIA DE UMA RAPARIGA . . . Lisbon, Portugália Editora, 1945. A translation by Albano Nogueira of *The Lost Girl*. Issued in 1983 as *A Joven Perdida* by Círculo do Livro, São Paulo (pp. 388).

D199.5 . . . O PAVAO BRANCO . . . Lisbon, Albatroz, 1949. pp. 379. A translation by Cabral do Nascimento of *The White Peacock*. Republished in 1996 by Círculo de Leitores, Lisbon.

(D200) / (D200.5) *Insert new items, as follows:*

D200.1 . . . A SERPENTE EMPLUMADA . . . Lisbon, Portugália Editora, 1958. A translation by Maria Franco and Cabral do Nascimento of *The Plumed Serpent*. Republished in 1973 (D200.5) and in 1994 by Círculo de Leitores, Lisbon.

D200.2 . . . CANGURU . . . Lisbon, Portugália Editora, 1959. A translation by Cabral do Nascimento of *Kangaroo*. Republished in 1994 by Círculo de Leitores, Lisbon (pp. 336).

D200.25 . . . O RAPOSO . . . Lisbon, Livros do Brasil, 1962. pp. 154. A translation by Alexandre Pinheiro Torres of *The Fox*.

D200.3 . . . O AMANTE DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Alfragide, Galeria Panorama, 1970. pp. xi + 334. A translation by António Rodrigues of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, with a preface by Lawrence Durrell.

(D200.5) *Add*: This is, in fact, a new issue of an earlier translation now listed as (D200.1).

(D200.5) / (D200.6) *Insert new items, as follows:*

D200.51 . . . O AMANTE DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Lisbon, Delfos, 1975. pp. 518. A translation by António R. Salvador of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, with an introduction by H. T. Moore, a preface by André Malraux, and illustrations by Cipriano Dourado. Republished in 1981 and 2007 by Círculo de Leitores, Lisbon, and in 2011 in a revised edition by Relógio d'Água, Lisbon, with, apparently, textual revisions by Mariana Portela translated by Cristina Matos, and with a preface by Octavio Paz.

D200.53 . . . O ARCO-ÍRIS . . . Porto, Inova [?1970s]. A translation by Cabral do Nascimento of *The Rainbow*. Republished in 2010 by Portugália, Lisbon (pp. 425).

D200.54 . . . JOHN THOMAS AND LADY JANE . . . Porto, Inova, 1978. pp. 599. A translation by Eduardo Alberto de Gouveia Aguiar and Virgínia Motta of *John Thomas and Lady Jane*.

D200.55 . . . O AMANTE DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . São Paulo, Companhia Editora Nacional, 1980. pp. 308. A translation by Rodrigo Richter of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D200.56 . . . O AMANTE DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Lisboa, Círculo de Leitores, 1981. pp. 366. A translation by António R. Salvador of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D200.57 . . . O AMANTE DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Mem Martins, Europa-América, 1982. pp. 291. A translation by Maria Teresa Pinto Pereira of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Reissued in 1994, 1997 and, as a supplement to the newspaper *Público*, 2003. Also published in 2002 by Mediasat, Madrid.

D200.58 . . . A SERPENTE EMPLUMADA: QUETZALCOATL . . . São Paulo, Círculo do Livro, 1982. pp. 458. A translation by

Aurea Weissenberg of *The Plumed Serpent*. Republished in Rio de Janeiro in 1988 (Record), 1989 (Tecnoprint) and 1993 (Ediouro).

D200.59 . . . AMOR NO FENO E OUTRAS HISTÓRIAS . . .
Lisboa, Assírio & Alvim, 1982. pp. 207. A translation by Maria Teresa Guerreiro of “Love Among the Haystacks” and other stories. Reissued 1988.

(D200.6) *Add name of translator:* Emanuel Godinho.

(D200.63) *Delete bracketed note and correct publication details to read:* Mem Martins, Europa-América, 1984. *Then add:* An incomplete translation, ending at chapter eight; reissued in 1990 and, apparently in one volume, in 1994 (pp. 409) and 2010.

(D200.63) / (D200.65) *Insert new items, as follows:*

D200.631 . . . HISTORIAS DE AMOR . . . Rio de Janeiro, Tecnoprint, 1984. pp. 137. A translation by Luiz Fernandes of *Sun*, “The Mortal Coil” and “The Prussian Officer”.

D200.632 . . . PORNOGRAFIA E OBSCENIDADE PRECEDIDO DE REFLEXÕES SOBRE A MORTE DE UM PORCO ESPINHO . . . Lisbon, & Etc., 1984. pp. 44. A translation by Aníbal Fernandes of *Pornography and Obscenity* and “Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine”.

D200.635 . . . A BARCA DO MORTE / THE SHIP OF DEATH . . . Lisbon, Hiena, 1985. pp. 27. A dual-language edition with Portuguese translation by Rui Rosado, illustrated by Ângela Solla.

D200.636 . . . A VIRGEM E O CIGANO . . . São Paulo, Brasiliense, 1985. pp. 117. A translation by Luiz Roberto Mendes Gonçalves of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*. Reissued 1987.

D200.637 . . . A PRINCESA . . . Lisbon, Assírio & Alvim, 1985. pp. 88. A translation by Aníbal Fernandes of “The Princess”. Reissued 2002; republished in 2000 by Bibliotex, Barcelona.

D200.638 . . . O AMANTE DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Rio de Janeiro, Tecnoprint, 1985. pp. 349. A translation by Fernando B. Ximenes of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Republished by Ediouro, Rio de Janeiro, in 1992 and 1998.

D200.639 . . . UM AMANTE MODERNO . . . São Paulo, Círculo do Livro; Rio de Janeiro, Record, 1985. pp. 296. A translation by Maria Célia Castro of “A Modern Lover” and other stories.

(D200.65) *Add*: It has come to light that this is a translation by “A. C.”, which suggests that it derives from the 1941 translation by Alberto Candeias (D197).

(D200.65) / (D200.7) *Insert new items, as follows:*

D200.655 . . . A VIRGEM E O CIGANO . . . Lisbon, Assírio & Alvim, 1986. pp. 135. A translation by Aníbal Fernandes of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*. Reissued 2002.

D200.66 . . . O OFICIAL PRUSSIANO . . . Lisbon, Hiena, 1987. pp. 62. A translation by Aníbal Fernandes of “The Prussian Officer”. Republished by Assírio & Alvim, Lisbon, in 2004.

Add new post-1988 items after (D200.7), as follows:

D220.71 . . . A VIRGEM E O CIGANO . . . Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 1988. pp. 146. A translation by Manuel Cordeiro of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D200.72 . . . ST MAWR E OUTROS CONTOS . . . Lisbon, Livros do Brasil, 1990. pp. 292. A translation by Clarisse Tavares of *St. Mawr and Other Stories* (A31c), with an introduction by Melvyn Bragg.

D200.73 . . . APENAS UMA MULHER . . . São Paulo, Círculo do Livro, 1992. pp. 110. A translation by Jose Veiga of *The Fox*.

D200.735 . . . APOCALIPSE . . . Lisbon, Hiena, 1993. pp. 126. A translation by António Moura.

D200.740 . . . FILHOS E AMANTES . . . Lisbon, Dom Quixote, 1994. pp. 563. A translation by Ana Maria Chaves of *Sons and Lovers*. Reissued 1995.

D200.741 . . . OS ANIMAIS EVANGÉLICOS E OUTROS POEMAS . . . Lisbon, Relógio d'Água, 1994. pp. 243. A dual-language edition of 53 poems, selected and translated into Portuguese by Maria de Lourdes Guimarães.

D200.742 . . . WALT WHITMAN . . . Lisbon, Relógio d'Água, 1994. pp. 35. A translation of the essay by Ana Luísa Faria.

D200.745 . . . A VARA DE AARAO . . . Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 1995. pp. 337. A translation by Maria Carlota Pracana of *Aaron's Rod*. Republished in 1996 by Dom Quixote, Lisbon.

D200.746 . . . HISTÓRIA DUMA RAPARIGA . . . Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 1995. pp. 403. A translation by Maria Carlota Pracana of *The Lost Girl*.

D200.747 . . . MULHERES APAIXONADAS . . . Mem Martins, Europa-América, 1995. pp. 474. A translation by Lucília Rodrigues of *Women in Love*.

D200.748 . . . O ARCO-ÍRIS . . . Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 1995. pp. 517. A translation by Maria Carlota Pracana of *The Rainbow*.

D200.750 . . . A MORTE DE SIEGMUND . . . Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 1996. pp. 227. A translation by Ana Falcão Bastos of *The Trespasser*.

D200.751 . . . A SERPENTE EMPLUMADA . . . Mem Martins, Europa-América, 1996. pp. 459. A translation by Lucília Rodrigues of *The Plumed Serpent*.

D200.753 . . . O AMANTE DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Rio de Janeiro, Graal, 1997. pp. 397. A translation by Gloria Regina Loreto Sampaio of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D200.760 . . . O HOMEM QUE MORREU . . . Lisbon, Assírio & Alvim, 2004. pp. 92. A translation by Aníbal Fernandes of *The Man Who Died*.

D200.761 . . . LUGARES ETRUSCOS . . . Lisbon, Assírio & Alvim, 2004. pp. 211. A translation by Hélder Moura Pereira of *Etruscan Places*, with an introduction by Anthony Burgess.

D200.762 . . . A VIRGEM E O CIGANO . . . Mem Martins, Europa-América, 2004. pp. 163. A translation by Isabel Sequeira of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

ROMANIAN

(D208.5) For Catinea read Catinca and extend note to read: ... Chrysanthemums" and other stories. Republished, Bucharest, Romhelion, 1993.

(D208.6) Translations of *Sons and Lovers* by the same translator have also been published subsequently and I assume they are based on this original translation. They are as follows: as *Fii și Amați*, Bucharest, Miron, 1991, pp. 464; as *Fii și Amați*, 2 vols, Craiova, Apollo and Oltenia, 1993; as *Fii și îndrăgostiți*, Iași, Polirom, 2002, pp. 612.

(D208.6) / (D208.8) Insert new entries:

D208.65 . . . MAREA ȘI SARDINIA, LOCURI ETRUSCE . . . Bucharest, Sport-Turism, 1982. pp. 391. A translation by Mihailă, Rodica of *Sea and Sardinia* and *Etruscan Places*.

D208.68 . . . CURCUBEUL . . . Bucharest, Univers, 1985. pp. 431. A translation by Carmen Pațac of *The Rainbow*. Republished by Polirom, Iași, 2005.

(D208.8) Add: Republished in two volumes by Apollo and Oltenia, Craiova, 1993.

Add new entries after (D208.8), as follows:

D208.801 . . . ARMĂSARUL DOAMNEI LOU . . . Bucharest, Universalia, 1990. pp. 215. A translation of *St. Mawr* (translator unknown). See also (D204) and (D208.808).

D208.805 . . . AMANTUL DOAMNEI CHATTERLEY . . . Chișinău, Hyperion, 1991. A translation by Jana Duma of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D208.806 . . . AMANTUL DOAMNEI CHATTERLEY . . . Vălenii de Munte, Datina, 1991. pp. 200. A translation by Eduard Ellenberg of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D208.807 . . . AMANTUL DOAMNEI CHATTERLEY . . . Bucharest, Cartea Românească, 1991. pp. 271. A translation by Antoaneta Ralian of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D208.808 . . . ARMĂSARUL ST. MAWR . . . Bucharest, Doina, 1991. pp. 168. A translation of *St. Mawr* (translator unknown). See also (D204) and (D208.801).

D208.809 . . . FECIOARA ȘI ȚIGANUL . . . Bucharest, Jupiter, 1991. pp. 103. A translation of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D208.811 . . . FATA PIERDUTĂ . . . Bucharest, Victoria, 1992. pp. 463. A translation by Ștefan Darie of *The Lost Girl*.

D208.812 . . . IUBIRE TOTALĂ: CANGURUL . . . Bucharest, Valahia, 1992. pp. 415. A translation by Mona Momescu of *Kangaroo*.

D208.813 . . . PRINȚESA . . . Craiova, Apollo, 1992. pp. 206. A translation by Catinca Ralea of “The Princess” and, presumably, other stories. Reprinted 1993.

D208.815 . . . AMANTUL DOAMNEI CHATTERLEY . . . Bucharest, Baricada, 1993. pp. 384. A translation by Rodica Bretin of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*.

D208.816 . . . APĂRAREA DOAMNEI CHATTERLEY . . . Bucharest, Vivaldi, 1993. pp. 132. A translation by Petronela Negoșanu of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*.

D208.817 . . . O DOAMNĂ ÎNCÂNTĂTOARE . . . Craiova, Apollo, 1993. pp. 208. A translation by Catinca Ralea of “The Lovely Lady” and, presumably, other stories.

D208.819 . . . CHEMAREA DRAGOSTEI . . . Bucharest, Zafira, 1994. pp. 424. A translation by Livia Bălăceanu of one of Lawrence’s novels. I have been unable to identify which one (the title appears to translate only as “Call to Love”).

D208.820 . . . CURCUBEUL . . . Bucharest, Luceafărul, 1994. pp. 426. A translation by Livia Bălăceanu of *The Rainbow*.

D208.821 . . . NELEGIUITUL . . . Bucharest, Romhelion, 1994. pp. 272. A translation by Teodor Athanasiu of *The Trespasser*.

D208.822 . . . OMUL CARE MURISE . . . Brașov, Arania, 1994. pp. 138. A translation by Andrei Bantaș of *The Man Who Died*.

D208.823 . . . PĂPUŞA CĂPITANULUI . . . Brașov, Arania, 1994. pp. 164. A translation by Carmen Ardelean and Andrei Bantaș of “The Captain’s Doll”.

D208.825 . . . PĂUNUL ALB . . . Oradea, Crican, 1995. pp. 320. A translation by Sergiu Bălătescu and Daniela Bălătescu-Pop of *The White Peacock*.

D208.827 . . . BĂIATUL DIN PUSTIE . . . Bucharest, Doina, 1996. pp. 320. A translation of *The Boy in the Bush*.

D208.832 . . . AMANTUL DOAMNEI CHATTERLEY . . . Iași, Polirom, 2001. pp. 300. A translation by Antoaneta Ralian of *The First Lady Chatterley*. Reprinted 2010.

D208.835 . . . AMANTUL DOAMNEI CHATTERLEY . . . Bucharest, Leda, 2004. pp. 352. A translation by Bianca Iazmin of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, with a preface by Dan Grigorescu. Reprinted 2008.

D208.836 . . . FEMEI ÎNDRĂGOSTITE . . . Bucharest, Leda, 2004. pp. 592. A translation by Monica Taliu of *Women in Love*.

D208.838 . . . FEMEI ÎNDRĂGOSTITE . . . Bucharest, 100+1 Gramar, 2005. pp. 424. A translation by Alexandru Dima of *Women in Love*.

D208.839 . . . PĂUNUL ALB . . . Iași, Polirom, 2005. pp. 560. A translation by Nora Iuga and Carmen Pațac of *The White Peacock*.

D208.842 . . . FII ȘI ÎNDRĂGOSTIȚI . . . Bucharest, Leda, 2007. pp. 480. A translation by Lidia Grădinaru of *Sons and Lovers*.

RUSSIAN

554 *Add headnote:* This sub-section has been revised and updated with generous assistance from Maria Smirnova, as well as by reference to Natalya Reinhold's essay (and related bibliography), "Russian Culture and the Work of D. H. Lawrence: An Eighty-Year Appropriation", in Jansohn and Mehl (F759), pp. 187–97, 323–28. See the latter essay for further details of translations appearing in periodicals and anthologies, but, for their importance to Lawrence's reception in Russia, I have also tried to incorporate many of these within relevant entries here – and readers may also like to note the following translations: of "The Prussian Officer" ("Prusskii ofitser"), translated by P. Okhrimenko, *Znamya*, 8 (1935): 152–171; "The Rocking-Horse Winner" ("Pobeditel' na derevyannoi loshadke"), translated by R. Kostanyan, *Nedelya*, 37 (7–13 September 1970): 21–2; "The Ladybird" (*Zolotoy Medalyion*),

translated by An. Gorskiy, *Ogonyok*, 5–14 (1972); *Rawdon's Roof (Krysha Rodona)*, translated by S. Rayushkin, *Kodry*, 2 (1991): 133–139.

(D209) For Izd-Bo read Izd-vo. Then add to end of entry: Translation reprinted by Gramatu Draugs, Riga, in 1929. (See related correction for D211.3 below – and note correction of “Dragus” to “Draugs”.)

(D210) The translation of *The Rainbow* to which this item refers was in fact published in two volumes, but the current entry records only the first volume. Therefore, revise the whole entry to read as follows:

D210 . . . [THE RAINBOW] . . . Moscow, Izd-vo Nedra, 1925. A translation in two volumes by V. Minina: *Sem'ya Brenguenov: Raduga*, pp. 367 (chapters 1–9) and *Ursula Brenguen: Raduga*, pp. 302 (chapters 10–16). Republished in one volume by Izd-vo Sovetskiy pisatel', St. Petersburg, 1993 (pp. 440).

(D211) Close up SYN OV'YA to read SYNOV'YA and for N. read Nikolai. Also, add to note: Republished by Gramatu Draugs, Riga, in 1929. (See related correction for D211.2 below).

(D211) / (D211.2) It is now known that the translation of *The Boy in the Bush* recorded in item (D212) was published in 1927. Therefore, move the contents of (D212) – after correction as below – to the appropriate chronological position here, with the new number, D211.1.

(D211.2) This is not a new translation but a reprinting of Chukovskii's 1927 translation above (D211). Therefore, delete the contents here and replace with: See (D211).

(D211.3) This is not a new translation but a reprinting of Shik's 1925 translation (D209). Therefore, delete the contents here and replace with: See (D209).

(D211.5) For Tatiany Lishchenko read Tatiana Leshchenko. Then, at the end of the entry, add: Leshchenko reports in her memoir, *Long Future* (Moscow, 1991), that this translation was authorised by Aldous Huxley. Since 1991, it has been reissued several times by different publishers, including five times in 1991, three times in

1992 (once together with *Pornography and Obscenity* (D212.58)) and once in 2000 and 2005.

(D212) *As explained above (D211 / D211.2), this translation appeared in 1927. Therefore, move the contents to the new entry (D211.1) and replace with See (D211.1) after making the following amendments: add the date of publication in square brackets after the abbreviation n.d., correct the first initial of the translator from I. to N., and add: Translation probably made from the 1925 German translation (D74).*

(D212.5) *Amend title (noting ‘-nika’ rather than ‘-inka’ in the second word), to read DOCH LOSHADNIKA: RASSKAZY Then, after the pagination, amend the whole of the further details to read: A translation of “The Horse-Dealer’s Daughter” and other stories, edited and introduced by N. Pal’tsev, and including an abridged translation by Dmitri Urnov of a commentary by Richard Aldington. The stories and translators are as follows: “Odour of Chrysanthemums”, “The Christening” (Yulia Zhukova); “The Shadow in the Rose Garden”, “The Prussian Officer”, *Sun* (M. Koreneva); “England, My England”, “Samson and Delilah”, “The Horse-Dealer’s Daughter”, “Things” (M. Kan); “The Border Line” (I. Bagrov); “The Rocking-Horse Winner” (E. Shvarts). E. Shvarts published an earlier abridged translation of the latter story in the periodical, *Sem’ya i shkola*, 3 (1983): 44–48. Maria Kan’s translation of “England, My England” first appeared in *Angliyskaya novella XX veka*, ed. V. Skorodenko, Izd-vo Khudozhestvennaya literatura, Moscow, 1981, pp. 145–180.*

Add new post-1985 entries after (D212.5), as follows:

D212.55 . . . SYNOV’YA I LYUBOVNIKI . . . Moscow, Izd-vo Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1990. pp. 477. A translation by R. Oblonskaya of *Sons and Lovers*. Reprinted by Pressa, Moscow, in 1993 and then by other publishers in 2001, 2003, 2005, 2006, 2008 and 2010. Issued in 2006 as volume 2 of the seven-volume edition of Lawrence’s “Collected Works”, *Sobranie Sochineniy*, published by Vagrius, Moscow, 2006–08. Published together with *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* and *The Virgin and the Gipsy* in 2004

(Pushkinskaya biblioteka, AST, Moscow) and again with *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in 2010 (Moscow, AST, Astrel').

D212.56 . . . LYUBOVNIK LEDE CHATTERLI . . . Moscow, Knizhnaya palata, 1991. pp. 272. A translation by I. Bagrov and M. Litvinova of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. This translation first appeared serially in 1989 in three numbers (9–11) of the Moscow periodical, *Inostrannaya literatura*. It has been issued at least ten times throughout the 1990s and 2000s by several different publishers. See (D212.55) for appearances with *Sons and Lovers* and *The Virgin and the Gipsy*. Issued in 2006 as volume 1 of the seven-volume edition of Lawrence's "Collected Works", *Sobranie Sochinieniy*, published by Vagrius, Moscow, 2006–08.

D212.57 . . . LYUBOVNIK LEDE CHATTERLEE . . . Riga, Avize, 1991. pp. 302. A translation by I. Gul' of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. With an afterword by N. Pal'tsev.

D212.58 . . . LYUBOVNIK LEDI CHATTERLEE / PORNOGRAPHIYA I NEPRISTOYNOSTI . . . Cheboksary, Chuvashskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 1992. pp. 288. A reprinting of Leshchenko's translation of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (D211.5) together with a translation by Yurii Komov of *Pornography and Obscenity*. The latter translation first appeared in the periodical, *Inostrannaya literatura*, 5 (1989): 232–236.

D212.59 . . . IZBRANNYE PROIZVEDENIYA . . . Riga, Kondus, 1993 (vols 1–3) and 1994 (vols 4–5). pp. 320, 300, 334, 316, 350. Selected works of Lawrence in five volumes, edited by L. Iliynskaya. It appears that the novels and stories included here are all reprints of previously published translations (although the translators are not acknowledged in the first four volumes). The short stories, spread throughout volumes 1–4, are all taken from (D212.5). The novels included are as follows: in volume 1, *Sons and Lovers*, taken from (D211); in volume 2, *Aaron's Rod*, taken from (D209); in volume 3, an abridged version of *The Rainbow*, taken from (D210); in volume 3, *The Virgin and the Gipsy*, translated by I. Bagrov (first published in the periodical, *Inostrannaya literatura*, 3 (1986): 153–200); in volume 4, *The Boy*

in the Bush, taken from (D211.1); published alone in vol. 5, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, taken from (D212.56). Note that this would seem to be the first book publication of Bagrov's translation of *The Virgin and the Gipsy* – a translation which was also issued in 2004 (together with reprinted translations of *Sons and Lovers* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*) by Pushkinskaya biblioteka, AST, Moscow; in 2006 (together with *Lady Chatterley's Lover*) by AST Moskva, Tranzitkniga, Moscow; and in 2010 (see D212.71).

D212.6 . . . TERZANIE PLOTI: BELYI PAVLIN I RASSKAZY . . . Moscow, Lokid, 1996. pp. 393. A translation of “The Thorn in the Flesh”, *The White Peacock*, “A Fragment of Stained Glass” and “The Shades of Spring”. The translator is not named. With a preface by R. Aldington.

D212.61 . . . LYUBOVNIK LEDE CHATTERLEY . . . Moscow, Eksmo-press, 2001. pp. 592. A translation by V. Chukhno of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Also included are a selection of short stories in the translations which appear in (D212.5). Reprinted in 2005 and 2007.

D212.62 . . . PSYKHOANALIZ I BESSOZNATEL'NOYE. PORNOGRAFIYA I NEPRISTOINOST'. . . Moscow, Eksmo, 2003. pp. 478. Translations by V. Chukhno of *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and by V. Zvinyatskovskiy of *Pornography and Obscenity*.

D212.63 . . . UTRO V MEKSIKE. PO SLEDAM ETRUSKOV . . . Moscow, B.S.G.-Press, 2005. pp. 336. A translation by A. Nikolaevskaya of *Mornings in Mexico* and *Sketches of Etruscan Places*.

D212.64 . . . SCHASTLIVYE PRIVIDENIYA . . . Moscow, B.S.G.- Press, 2006. pp. 491. A translation, with preface, by Ludmila Volodarskaya of *Glad Ghosts* and other stories: “The Witch à la Mode”, “New Eve and Old Adam”, “You Touched Me”, “The Princess”, “Two Blue Birds”, “Smile”, “The Last Laugh”, “In Love”, “The Lovely Lady”, *Rawdon's Roof*, “Mother and Daughter”.

D212.65 . . . ZHENSHCHINY V LYUBVI . . . Moscow, Azbuka-klassika, 2006. pp. 640. A translation by E. Koltukova of *Women in Love*. Reprinted in 2008 and 2009.

D212.66 . . . TEN' V ROZOVOM SADU . . . Moscow, Vagrius, 2006. pp. 574. Volume 3 of this publisher's seven-volume edition of Lawrence's "Collected Works" (*Sobranie Sochineniy*). Volumes 1 and 2 contain previously published translations, of, respectively, *Lady Chatterley's Lover* by Bagrov and Litvinova (D212.56) and *Sons and Lovers* by Oblonskaya (D212.55). This volume ("The Shadow in the Rose Garden") contains both new and previously published translations of Lawrence's short fiction, as follows (with translators' names in brackets and an asterisk to indicate previous publication in earlier entries): *St. Mawr* (Marina Litvinova and Tatyana Shabaeva); "Odour of Chrysanthemums", "The Christening" (Yulia Zhukova)*; "The Shadow in the Rose Garden", "The Prussian Officer", *Sun* (Marina Koreneva)*; "England, My England", "Samson and Delilah", "The Horse-Dealer's Daughter", "Things" (M. Kan)*; "The Border Line" (I. Bagrov)*; "Second Best" (E. Volkova); "The White Stocking" (Olga Varshaver); "Monkey Nuts" (D. Psurtsev); "Wintry Peacock" (A. Kurt); "You Touched Me" (Irina Alekseeva); "Two Blue Birds" (E. Rubinova); "Smile" (N. Derevyagina); "The Lovely Lady" (V. Lanchikov).

The volume also contains translations of the following poems: "Cherry Robbers", "A Winter's Tale", "Southern Night", "Purple Anemones", "Twilight", "Leda" (Yulia Fokina); "End of Another Home-Holiday", "How Beastly the Bourgeois Is", "Editorial Office", "People", "Delight of Being Alone", "Search for Love", "Search for Truth", "Flowers and Men" (Sergei Sukharev); "Brooding Grief", "Embankment at Night Before the War", "Piano", "Snake" (Valentin Stenich); "Almond Blossom", "St. Matthew", "The Gods! The Gods!", "The Work of Creation", "Lord's Prayer" (Valeriy Minushin); "Humming-bird", "Bavarian Gentians" (Vladimir Britanishskii); "Middle of the World", "For the Heroes are Dipped in Scarlet", "Demiurge", "The Body of God", "The Man of Tyre", "Whales Weep Not!", "Pax", "Only

Man”, “In the Cities”, “Anaxagoras”, “When Satan Fell”, “Death is Not Evil, Evil is Mechanical”, “The Ship of Death” (Alexander Gribanov). The translations by Stenich first appeared anonymously (together with translations of “Kangaroo” and “Bubbles”) in *Antologiya novoy angliiskoi poezii*, ed. M. Gutner, GIKhL, Leningrad, 1937, pp. 321–337. Britanishskii’s translations first appeared in *Zapadnoevropeiskaya poeziya XX veka*, Izd-vo Khudozhestvennaya literatura, Moscow, 1977, pp. 69–70 (these were reprinted, along with Stenich’s translations of “Embankment at Night Before the War” and “Snake”, in a bilingual anthology, *Angliyskaya poeziya v russkikh perevodakh: XX vek*, ed. L. M. Arinstejn et al., Raduga, Moscow, 1984, pp. 200–215). Sukharev’s translations first appeared in the periodical, *Inostrannaya literatura*, 3 (1986): 200–204, and Gribanov’s translations also first appeared in the same periodical, 1 (1990): 162–171.

D212.67 . . . RADUGA V NEBE . . . Moscow, Vagrius, 2006. pp. 539. A translation by Elena Oseneva of *The Rainbow*. Volume 4 of Vagrius’s “Collected Works” edition.

D212.68 . . . VLYUBLENNYE ZHENSHCHINY . . . Moscow, Vagrius, 2007. pp. 557. A translation by Valeria Bernatskaya of *Women in Love*. Volume 5 of Vagrius’s “Collected Works” edition.

D212.69 . . . PERNATYI ZMEI . . . Moscow, Vagrius, 2007. pp. 506. A translation by Valerii Minushin of *The Plumed Serpent*. Volume 6 of Vagrius’s “Collected Works” edition.

D212.7 . . . SUMERKI ITALII . . . Moscow, Boslen, 2008. pp. 560. Volume 7 of Vagrius’s “Collected Works” edition, containing a translation by M. Koreneva of *The Fox*; by A. Nikolaevskaya of *Twilight in Italy* and of *Sketches of Etruscan Places and Mornings in Mexico* (D212.63; by Yurii Komov of *Pornography and Obscenity* (212.58); by N. Pal’tsev of “Why the Novel Matters” (first published in *Pisateli Anglii o literature*, Progress, Moscow, 1981, pp. 326–31); by E. Bogatyrenko of “Nathaniel Hawthorne and *The Scarlet Letter*” and “Hawthorne’s *Blithedale Romance*”; by A. Nikolaevskaya of the reviews of *Solitaria* and *Fallen Leaves* by

V. V. Rozanov (first published in the Moscow periodical, *Nachala*, 3 (1992): 79–90).

D212.71 . . . ZAPAKH KHRIZANTEM I DRUGIE PROIZ-
VEDENIYA . . . Moscow, AST, Astrel', Poligrapgizdat, 2010. pp.
288. This compilation (“Odour of Chrysanthemums and other
works”) reprints previously published translations by I. Bagrov of
The Virgin and the Gipsy; by Yulia Zhukova of “Odour of
Chrysanthemums” and “The Christening”; by Marina Koreneva of
“The Shadow in the Rose Garden”, “The Prussian Officer” and
Sun; by I. Bagrov of “The Border Line”; by D. Psurtsev of
“Monkey Nuts”. For previous printings, see (D212.5), (D212.59)
and (D212.66).

SINHALESE

Add new entries after (D212.8), as follows:

D212.82 . . . AVASARA KAL RAHAS THENA . . . Nugegoda, Sri
Lanka, W. Wijesekera, 1983. pp. 532. A translation by M.
Wijesekera of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D212.83 . . . SANAHASA BADUNA TENA . . . Colombo, S.
Godage and Brothers, 1995. pp. 452. A translation by Wijeyapala
Wickremasinghe of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D212.84 . . . LOMALIKA . . . Colombo, S. Godage and Brothers,
1995. pp. 152. A translation by Sucharitha Gamlath of *The Fox*.

D212.85 . . . PIDURU PAWARE YOVUN ADARE . . . Colombo,
S. Godage and Brothers, 1998. pp. 144. A translation by
Anadapiya Kudatihi of “Love Among the Haystacks”.

SPANISH

555 *Add to headnote:* See also Jacqueline A. Hurtley's essay (and
related bibliography), “Lusting for Lawrence: Poetry, Prose and
Prohibition in Spain, 1920–1980”, in Jansohn and Mehl (F759),
pp. 138–157, 309–314.

(D228) *Add:* Republished in 1988 by Edhsa, Barcelona.

(D231) / (D232) *Insert new entry:*

D231.5 . . . UN ENAMORADO . . . Madrid and Barcelona, Grano de Arena, 1941. An anonymous translation of “In Love”.

(D232) *Add*: Republished in 1987 by Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico.

(D233) *Add*: Republished in 1949 and 1961 by Aguilar, Madrid, with revisions by Benigno Ferrer and again in 1964 by Planeta and Plaza y Janés, Barcelona.

(D235) / (D236) *Insert new entry*:

D235.5 . . . EL RESCUCITADO: EL HIJO DEL HOMBRE RETORNA A LA VIDA . . . Mexico, Leyenda, c. 1944. pp. 125. A translation by Daniel Tapia Bolívar of *The Man Who Died*.

(D236) *Add*: Republished in 1984 as *Correspondencia*, Barcelona, Nuevo Arte Thor.

(D238) *Add*: Republished, with three translated novels of Henry Miller, in *La novela erótica contemporánea*, Madrid, Edaf, 1976

(D242) *Add*: Reissued in 1962 and, together with (D246), in 1969.

(D243) *Add*: Republished in 1998 by Abraxas, Barcelona.

(D246) *Add*: Reissued 1980.

(D246.2) *Add*: Republished in 1999 by Epoca, Mexico.

(D246.3) / (D246.4) *Insert new entries, as follows*:

D246.35 . . . PORNOGRAFÍA Y OBSCENIDAD . . . Buenos Aires, Nueva Visión, 1967. pp. 96. A translation by Aldo Pellegrini of *Pornography and Obscenity* (and of Henry Miller’s “Obscenity and the Law of Reflection”). Republished: Santafé de Bogotá, Colombia, Fundación Fica, 1996; Barcelona, Argonauta, 1981 and 2003.

D246.37 . . . VIVA Y MUERA MÉXICO . . . Mexico, Diógenes, 1970. pp. 210. Pieces related to Mexico selected and introduced by Emmanuel Carballo. I have been unable to establish further details and assume the translations are taken from previously published works.

(D246.4) *For 1975 read 1963 and add*: Reissued 1975, 1976, 1984.

(D246.4) / (D246.42) *Insert new entry*:

D246.41 . . . HACIENDO EL AMOR CON MÚSICA . . . Mexico, Premià, 1977. pp. 83. Reissued 1978, 1979, 1981 and 1985. A

translation by León Mirlas of “We Need One Another”, “Women Are So Cocksure” and other essays.

(D246.42) / (D246.5) *Insert new entries, as follows:*

D246.430 . . . EL AMANTE DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Madrid, Turner, 1979. pp. 388. A translation by Bernardo Fernández of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Republished in Barcelona by Bruguera, 1980, 1981 and 1983, by Orbis 1982, 1988 and 1997, and by Ediciones B in 1997; also in Bogotá, Colombia, by Ediciones Nacionales, 1981.

D246.440 . . . EL AMANTE DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Barcelona, Círculo de lectores; Planeta, 1980. pp. 306. A translation by Andrés Bosch of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Reissued 1981 and many times subsequently to at least 2002. Also issued in Barcelona by several other publishers, including Seix Barral, 1985, ORIGEN, 1992, RBA Editores, 1992, 1995, 1996, 2003, and Plaza & Janés, 1999; and issued by El País, Madrid, 2003.

D246.441 . . . EL AMANTE DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Barcelona, Ediciones 29, 1980. A translation by Jacinto León Ignacio of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Reissued 2001.

D246.442 . . . EL AMANTE DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Barcelona, Bruguera, 1980. pp. 410. A translation by Leopoldo Lovelace of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D246.443 . . . EL AMANTE DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Madrid, Alianza Editorial, 1980. pp. 373. A translation by Francisco Torres Oliver of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Reissued 1982, 1990, 1992, 2001. Issued by Mundo Actual de Ediciones, Barcelona, in 1981, and by Unidad Editorial, Madrid, 1999.

D246.444 . . . EL ARCO IRIS . . . Barcelona, Bruguera, 1980. pp. 509. A translation by Pilar Giralt Gorina of *The Rainbow*. Reissued 1983. Republished in 1997 by Orbis, Barcelona.

D246.445 . . . EL GALLO ESCAPADO . . . Barcelona, Laertes, 1980. pp. 86. A translation by Carlos Agustín and Santiago Hileret of *The Escaped Cock*.

D246.446 . . . EL MUÑECO DEL CAPITÁN . . . Salsadella, Los Libros de Plon, 1980. A translation by Pablo Mañé of "The Captain's Doll".

D246.447 . . . EL OFICIAL PRUSIANO Y OTRAS HISTORIAS . . . Madrid, Bruguera, 1980. pp. 281. A translation by Marcelo Cován of *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories*. Republished, Madrid, Compañía Europea de Comunicación e Información, 1991.

D246.448 . . . HISTORIAS DE LO OCULTO . . . Barcelona, Fontamara, 1980. pp. 152. A translation by Rufo G. Salcedo of "The Border Line", *Glad Ghosts*, "The Last Laugh", "The Rocking-Horse Winner", "Mother and Daughter", "The Blue Moccasins" and "Things". Reissued 1981. Republished in 1984 by Forum, Barcelona.

D246.449 . . . LA MARIQUITA / EL ZORRO . . . Salsadella, Los Libros de Plon, 1980. A translation by Pablo Mañé of "The Ladybird" and *The Fox*.

D246.450 . . . LA SERPIENTE EMPLUMADA . . . Barcelona, Bruguera, 1980. pp. 505. A translation by Pilar Giralt Gorina of *The Plumed Serpent*. Reissued 1983; republished Bogotá (Colombia), Oveja Negra, 1985.

D246.451 . . . MUJERES ENAMORADAS . . . Barcelona, Bruguera, 1980. pp. 573. A translation by Antonio Escobatado of *Women in Love*. Reissued 1981, 1983. Published also in Madrid by Turner, 1980 (pp. 603), and Orbis, 1997.

D246.452 . . . MUJERES ENAMORADAS . . . Barcelona, Planeta, 1980. pp. 473. A translation by Andrés Bosch of *Women in Love*. Reissued 1984. Republished in 2004 by RBA, Barcelona.

D246.453 . . . MUJERES ENAMORADAS . . . Madrid, Alianza Editorial, 1980. pp. 454. A translation by José Jiménez Blanco and Balbina Ruiz Campuzano of *Women in Love*. Reissued 1985. Republished in Barcelona by Mundo Actual de Ediciones, 1982, and MDS Books/Mediasat, 2002.

D246.454 . . . POEMAS . . . Barcelona, Dilema; Buenos Aires, Argonauta, 1980. pp. 89. A translation by Mario Satz of selected poems.

D246.460 . . . CANGURO . . . Barcelona, Bruguera, 1981. pp. 444. A translation by Marta Eguía of *Kangaroo*.

D246.461 . . . HIJOS Y AMANTES . . . Buenos Aires, Centro Editor de América Latina, 1981. 2 vols. A translation by Virginia Erhart of *Sons and Lovers*.

D246.462 . . . HISTORIAS DE AMOR . . . Barcelona, Fontamara, 1981. pp. 121. A translation by Rufo G. Salcedo of “The Prussian Officer”, “The Mortal Coil” and *Sun*. Reissued 1981 and 1998.

D246.463 . . . LA VIRGEN Y EL GITANO . . . Barcelona, Fontamara, 1981. pp. 120. A translation by Marta Pérez of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D246.464 . . . SEXO Y LITERATURA . . . Barcelona, Fontamara, 1981. pp. 92. A translation by Francisco Cusó of *A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

(D246.5) / (D246.6) Insert new entries, as follows:

D246.51 . . . MAÑANITAS MEXICANAS . . . Barcelona, Editorial Laertes, 1982. pp. 149. A translation by Alberto Cardín of *Mornings in Mexico*. Reissued as *Mañanas en México* in 2002.

D246.52 . . . POEMAS ESCOGIDOS . . . Madrid, Visor, 1982. pp. 126. A translation by Marcelo Covián of selected poems.

D246.53 . . . EL AMANTE DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Mexico, Mexicanos Unidos, 1983. pp. 324. A translation by Ernesto Breals of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Reissued 1990.

D246.54 . . . EL AMANTE DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Buenos Aires, Losada, 1983. pp. 336. A translation by Carlos Gardini of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

D246.55 . . . ESTUDIOS SOBRE LA LITERATURA CLÁSICA NORTEAMERICANA . . . Buenos Aires, Centro Editor de América Latina, 1983. pp. 168. A translation by Elvio E. Gandolfo of *Studies in Classic American Literature*.

D246.56 . . . HIJOS Y AMANTES . . . Madrid, Alianza, 1983. pp. 545. A translation by Luis de la Plaza of *Sons and Lovers*. Reissued 1990 and republished in 1987 by Círculo de lectores, Barcelona.

(D246.61) / (D246.8) *Insert new entries, as follows:*

D246.62 . . . CARTAS 1908–1930 . . . Mexico, UAM, 1986. pp. 242. A translation by Marta Amorin and James Valender of selected letters.

D246.63 . . . D. H. LAWRENCE: NARRATIVA COMPLETA . . . Barcelona, Seix Barral, 1986. 5 vols, as follows: (1) *The White Peacock*, *The Trespasser* and *Sons and Lovers*, pp. 644 – translations by, respectively, José Ferrer Aleu, Verónica Fernández Muro and Luis de la Plaza; (2) *The Rainbow*, *Women in Love*, pp. 660 – translations by Pilar Giralt Gorina and Andrés Bosch; (3) *The Lost Girl*, *Aaron's Rod*, pp. 526 – translations by Max Dickmann and Ricardo Atwell de Veyga, and José Ferrer Aleu; (4) *Kangaroo*, *The Boy in the Bush*, pp. 595 – translations by Marta Eguía and Víctor Salvador; (5), *The Plumed Serpent*, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, pp. 634 – translations by Pilar Giralt Gorina and Andrés Bosch. The translations of *The White Peacock*, *Aaron's Rod* and *The Boy in the Bush* appear to be published here for the first time – the other translations have been published in separate editions noted earlier. Seix Barral reissued *Sons and Lovers* and *The Trespasser* in one volume in 1987, and *The White Peacock* and *Aaron's Rod* in one volume in 1988; in 1987 *The Plumed Serpent* was reissued together with the previously published translation of *The Escaped Cock* (D246.445), and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* was reissued with the previously published translation of *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories* (D246.447).

D246.64 . . . MUJERES ENAMORADAS, LA MEDIA BLANCA Y OTROS CUENTOS . . . Barcelona, Seix Barral, 1987. pp. 411. A translation by Andrés Bosch of *Women in Love* (D246.451) and by Marcelo Covíán of “The White Stocking” and other stories.

D246.65 . . . CANGURO, LA LÍNEA FRONTERIZA Y OTROS RELATOS . . . Barcelona, Seix Barral, 1987. pp. 402. A translation by Marta Susana Eguía of *Kangaroo* and “The Border Line” and other stories.

D246.66 . . . EN EL ERIAL, DOS PÁJAROS AZULES Y OTROS RELATOS . . . Barcelona, Seix Barral, 1988. pp. 396. A translation by Víctor Salvador of *The Boy in the Bush* and “Two Blue Birds” and other stories.

D246.67 . . . MUJERES ENAMORADAS . . . Madrid, Catedra. 1988. pp. 951. A translation by María Lozano of *Women in Love*.

D246.68 . . . LADY BIRD . . . Mexico, Premià, 1989. pp. 101. A translation by Carles Millet.

D246.69 . . . LA CORONA . . . Madrid, Hiperión, 1990. pp. 108. A translation by Alberto Manzano of “The Crown”.

D246.70 . . . APOCALIPSIS . . . San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Haviláh, 1990. pp. 180. A translation by José Luis Palomares Arribas of *Apocalypse*. Republished in 2008 by Langre, Madrid.

D246.71 . . . LA FERIA DE LOS PATOS Y OTROS RELATOS. . . Madrid, Compañía Europea de Comunicación e In-formación, 1991. pp. 94. A translation by Marcelo Covián of “Goose Fair” and other stories.

D246.72 . . . ATARDECERES ETRUSCOS . . . Barcelona, Laertes, 1993. pp. 157. A translation by Emilio Olcina Aya of *Etruscan Places*.

D246.73 . . . APOCALIPSIS . . . Mexico, CNCA, 1994. pp. 189. A translation by Bertha Ruiz de la Concha of *Apocalypse*.

D246.76 . . . ESTRELLA DEL ALBA Y DEL ATARDECER: ALGUNOS ESCRITOS AMERICANOS . . . Mexico, Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes, 1997. pp. 243. A translation by Elisa Ramírez of short stories and other writings from Lawrence’s American period.

Add new post-1998 entries after (D246.8):

D246.805 . . . EL AMANTE DE LADY CHATTERLEY . . . Barcelona, Edicomunicación, 1999. pp. 378. A translation by Elena

Cortada de la Rosa of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Republished in 2004 by RBA, Barcelona.

D246.806 . . . LA MARIQUITA . . . Donostia-San Sebastián, Marjinalia, 1999. pp. 99. A translation by Xabier Galarreta of "The Ladybird".

D246.808 . . . LA FRONTERA; EL GANADOR; COSAS . . . Barcelona, Plaza & Janés, 2000. pp. 126. A translation by Verónica Fernández-Muro of "The Border Line", "The Rocking-Horse Winner", and "Things".

D246.810 . . . HEROÍNAS MODERNAS . . . Madrid, Celeste, 2001. pp. 102. A translation by Pilar Mañas of "Odour of Chrysanthemums", "You Touched Me", "Tickets, Please" and *Sun*.

D246.811 . . . ST. MAWR . . . Mexico, CONACULTA, 2001. pp. 169. A translation by Elisa Ramírez Castañeda.

D246.816 . . . INGLATERRA, MI INGLATERRA Y OTRAS HISTORIAS . . . Buenos Aires, El Cuenco de Plata, 2004. pp. 254. A translation by Inés Pardal of "England, My England" and other stories.

D246.817 . . . HIJOS Y AMANTES . . . Barcelona, Círculo de lectores, 2004. pp. 603. A translation by Miguel Martínez-Lage of *Sons and Lovers*.

D246.818 . . . ST. MAWR . . . Madrid, Losada, 2004. pp. 262. A translation by Gregorio Cantera.

D246.820 . . . LA SERPIENTE EMPLUMADA . . . Madrid, Losada, 2005. pp. 575. A translation by Carmen Gallardo de Mesa of *The Plumed Serpent*.

D246.822 . . . APOCALIPSIS . . . Madrid, Losada, 2006. pp. 194. A translation by Gregorio Cantera of *Apocalypse*.

D246.824 . . . EL HOMBRE QUE AMABA LAS ISLAS . . . Girona, Atalanta, 2007. pp. 197. A translation by Jordi Fibla Feito of "The Man Who Loved Islands".

D246.825 . . . EL JARDÍN DE LAS HESPÉRIDES: NOVELAS BREVES . . . Barcelona, Debolsillo, 2007. pp. 754. A translation by Carlos Agustín *et al.* of the complete short novels, with an

introduction by Pilar Mañas. Also published as an ebook by Random House Mondadori, 2007.

D246.826 . . . TÚ ME ACARICIASTE Y OTROS CUENTOS . . . Barcelona, Debolsillo, 2007. pp. 700. A translation by Marcelo Covián *et al.* of “You Touched Me” and other stories.

D246.828 . . . LA VIRGEN Y EL GITANO . . . Madrid, Impedimenta, 2008. pp. 171. A translation by Laura Calvo Valdivielso of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D246.829 . . . ESTUDIOS SOBRE LITERATURA CLÁSICA NORTEAMERICANA . . . San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Langre, 2008. pp. 203. A translation by Ana Antón-Pacheco and Ignacio Rey Agudo of *Studies in Classic American Literature*.

D246.830 . . . CERDEÑA Y EL MAR . . . Barcelona, Alhena Media, 2008. pp. 317. A translation by Miguel Martínez Lage of *Sea and Sardinia*.

SWEDISH

559 *Extend headnote to read: ... (Fall 1969) and Anne Odenbring’s essay (and related bibliography), “Feeding a Fire of Change: The Reception of D. H. Lawrence in Sweden”, in Jansohn and Mehl (F759), pp. 232–43, 338–41.*

(D256) *Add: A revised version of this abridged translation was published anonymously in 1950 by Folket i Bilds, Stockholm.*

(D261.11) *Add: The first unabridged translation, republished many times since 1961, including in 1978 by Trevi, Stockholm; in 1981 by Bra böcker, Höganäs; in 1984 by Alba, Stockholm; in 1985 by Bokorama, Höganäs; and in 2007 by Bonnier, Stockholm.*

Add new entries after (D261.15), as follows:

D261.25 . . . MR NOON . . . Lysekil, Pontes, 1986. pp. 392. A translation by Margareta Marin, Gudrun Ward and Karin Widegård.

D261.28 . . . KVINNAN SOM RED BORT . . . Örebro, Samspråk, 1989. A translation of “The Woman Who Rode Away” by Ingrid Maria Ingemark.

D261.33 . . . JUNGFUN OCH ZIGENAREN . . . Stockholm, Fabel, 1994. A translation by Sylvia Berggren of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

TURKISH

(D263) For AŞ İĞ I read ÂŞIKI and add to note: Reprinted in c.1945 and in 1960. Note that, with only 188 pages (222 in the 1960 reprint), it seems unlikely that this is a complete translation of Lady Chatterley's Lover (compare D265.52 which has 463 pages).

(D265.42) Complete, and corrected, title should read: GÜNAHKÂR RUHLAR

(D265.43) Change name of publisher to Adam and add: Reprinted in 1985.

(D265.5) Extend note to identify original text, to read: . . . Akşit Göktürk of essays from *Phoenix*. Republished in 1982 by Adam, Istanbul, and in 2007 by Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat, Istanbul.

(D265.51) This is in fact a translation of Women in Love – not The Rainbow.

(D265.52) Add: Republished by Can Sanat/CAN, Istanbul, in 1981, 1982 and 1985.

(D265.53) Make title two words, AŞIK KADINLAR, and add: Republished in 1986 by E. Bilge, Istanbul.

(D265.54) / (D265.7) Insert new entries, as follows:

D265.56 . . . BAKIRE ILE ÇINGENE . . . Istanbul, Koza, 1976. pp. 144. A translation by Mehmet Harmancı of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*. Republished in 2004 by Say, Istanbul.

D265.58 . . . KAYIP KIZ . . . Istanbul, Adam, 1982. pp. 421. A translation by Murat Belge of *The Lost Girl*. Reprinted in 1994.

D265.59 . . . GÖKKUŞAĞI . . . Istanbul, Oda, 1984. pp. 422. A translation by Mehmet Harmancı of *The Rainbow*. Republished in 2000 by Oğlak, Istanbul

D265.60 . . . OĞULLAR VE SEVGİLİLER . . . Istanbul, CAN, 1985. pp. 488. A translation by Tülin Nutku of *Sons and Lovers*.

D265.61 . . . D. H. LAWRENCE'IN MEKTUPLARI . . . Istanbul, Düşün, 1985. pp. 189. A translation by Yekta Ataman of selected letters.

D265.62 . . . OĞULLAR VE SEVGILILER . . . Istanbul, E. Bilge, 1986. pp. 679. A translation by Cem Taylan of *Sons and Lovers*.

D265.64 . . . BAKIRE ILE ÇINGENE . . . Istanbul, CAN, 1990. pp. 127. A translation by Tülin Nutku of *The Virgin and the Gipsy*.

D265.65 . . . PRUSYALI SUBAY . . . Istanbul, Bebekus, 1990. pp. 93. A translation by Turhan Aksu of “The Prussian Officer”.

D265.67 . . . OĞULLAR VE SEVGILILER . . . Istanbul, Engin, 1992. pp. 655. A translation by Mete Ergin of *Sons and Lovers*.

D265.68 . . . 4 KISA ROMAN . . . Ankara, Gece, 1992. pp. 360. A translation by Suzan Akçora of four short novels. I have been unable to establish which novels these are nor whether there is any overlap of contents with (D265.7).

(D265.7) *Add number of pages, pp. 174, and add to note:* A new and apparently expanded edition of this title (which translates as “Love Among the Haystacks: Stories”) was published in 2011 by Helicopter, Istanbul: it has 322 pages, but I have been unable to establish which (if any) stories have been added.

Add new entries after (D265.7):

D265.71 . . . ADALARI SEVEN ADAM . . . Istanbul, Kitaplığı, 2002. pp. 63. A translation by Celâl Üster of “The Man Who Loved Islands”.

D265.72 . . . AŞKTAN DAHA DERIN [DEEPER LOVE] . . . Istanbul, Artshop, 2006. pp. 69. A translation by Tozan Alkan of selected poems.

After the above item, add new language sub-section and new item, as follows:

UKRAINIAN

D265.78 . . . KOKHANETS' LEDI CHATERLEI . . . Kiev, Osnovy, 1999. pp. 460. A translation by S. D. Pavlychko of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

SECTION E

(E13.5) 569 *The abbreviation UT should be moved one line down and add note:* Typescript apparently produced after first publication of the essay (C74), possibly for its later printing in *Phoenix* (A76)

(E14.3c) 570 *Change location from UT to Unlocated*

(E54) 582 *Revise sub-entries, as follows:*

Under E54b, add note: From the same original as (E54d) below

Under E54c, amend existing note and add two notes, to read:

MS entitled *Introduction to Edward Dahlberg's novel, for Putnams*

Also added at top of first page, apparently in Lawrence's hand:
Bottom Dogs by D. H. Lawrence

Typescript probably used as setting copy for first publication (B26)

Under E54d, add further note:

From the same original typescript as (b) above, probably produced for *Phoenix* (A76) in the 1930s

(E63b) 584 *Given that typescript (c) below has 23 pp., it seems possible that the pagination given for this unlocated typescript is erroneous; therefore, for 28 pp. read 28 (223) pp.*

(E63.3) 584 *Add note:* Typescript seems to derive from the essay's first printing in 1922 (C100) and was probably typed in the 1930s

(E65) 584 *Revise sub-entries and add new sub-entry, E65d:*

Under E65a, add to note: Signed and dated "Villa Mirenda, Scandicci, 29th April 1928"

Under E65b, add note: Typed and revised by Lawrence himself, with some corrections by him in ink; dated "Scandicci, May 1st 1928"

Under E65c, add note: From a later typing, probably made in the 1930s for *Phoenix* (A76)

Add new sub-entry:

d. Carbon typescript, 10 pp.

UCLA

From a separate typing, made by an unknown typist, from (b) above; also dated "Scandicci, May 1st 1928"

(E83.5a) 588 *Change location from Private to Unlocated. (This MS was reportedly auctioned at Sotheby's in 2003 but the new owner is not known. Information from Virginia Hyde, the editor of Mornings in Mexico (A37b), suggests it may be lost.)*

(E84) 588 *Under E84d, for Typescript read Carbon typescript and then also add new item:*

e. Typescript, 138 pp.

UN

This is the ribbon copy for (d) above (which has many extra performance-related pages interleaved)

(E106) 593 *Revise sub-entries, as follows:*

Under E106a, for First version read Second version, unfinished

*Under E106b, add note: From typing of second version, probably made in 1933 or 1934 for appearance in *Phoenix* (A76) with above title*

Under E106c, amend note to read: Copies from same typing as (b) above

Under E106d, for Second version read First version and for Published as read Published in (A76) as

*Under E106e, amend note to read: From typing of first version, probably made for appearance in *Phoenix* (A76), along with (f) below, which is identical*

(E116) 596–7 *Add preliminary note immediately below the head-title: For a precise account of the complex history of, and relationships between, the items listed below, see the introduction to *The Virgin and the Gipsy and Other Stories* (A168), pp. xxiv–xxvii, xxxv–xlii, liv–lv. Then revise sub-entries, as follows:*

Under E116a, extend note to read: An early version (April 1927), untitled; first printed in (A168)

Under E116b, add note: Corrected in Lawrence's hand and used as setting-copy for first publication (C167)

Under E116c, replace note with: Originally part of the same typing as (b) above; corrected in Lawrence's hand

Under E116d, replace note with: Typed and corrected by Enid Hilton with some corrections in Lawrence's hand

Under E116e, add note: Copy of (d), corrected by Enid Hilton; used as setting copy for Part I of (k) and (l) below

Under E116f, add to note, to read: ...incomplete, titled “The Escaped Cock”; first printed in (A168)

Under E116h, add note: Final version, used as base-text for publication in (A168)

Under E116i, add note: Typing of (h) above, by Enid Hilton, with corrections by her and some in Lawrence’s hand; used as setting-copy for Part II of (k) below

Under E116j, replace note with: A typing of (e) and (i), apparently from Curtis Brown’s London office, with corrections in an unknown hand and re-titled “The Man Who Died” (possibly by Laurence Pollinger)

(E124) 598 *Revise sub-entries, as follows:*

Under E124b, for Carbon typescript read Typescript Also, add note: A typing of (a) above and probably used as setting-copy for first publication (C196)

Under E124c, add note: With (e) below, a copy of a typescript probably made for *Phoenix* (A76)

Under E124d, extend note, to read: Incomplete copy of (b) above

(E125) 598–9 *For both (a) and (b), make the opening description read:* Corrected ribbon and carbon typescript ... *Under (c), line 3, italicise MS title, then add note:* This and the following item (d) are copies of typescripts probably made for the essays’ publication in the *Adelphi* in 1923 (see (A22))

(E145b) 604:10 *Add note:* From a typing of (a) above probably made for *Phoenix* (A76)

(152) / (152.5) 605 *Insert new entry as E152.3, as follows:*

E152.3 *Green Ring, Afterword to The*

Holograph manuscript, 10 pp.

UCLA

Lawrence seems to have helped Koteliansky with his translation of this play by Zinaida Hippius. The manuscript is a translation of Hippius’s own “Afterword”; it is in Lawrence’s hand and is signed “transcribed by D. H. Lawrence” (see *Introductions and Reviews* (A167), p. xxxviii, n. 40)

(E156) / (E156.7) 606 Insert new entry as E156.3, as follows:

E156.3 *Hand of Man, The*

Holograph manuscript, 2 pp.

UT

In pencil, with a note in ink by E. H. Brewster indicating that it was written as a suggestion for an article Brewster was planning; possibly written in June–July 1928 or August–September 1929 and first published in *Introductions and Reviews* (A167)

(E158b) 607 Add note: A different version from (a) above; possibly typed by Lawrence himself, with some corrections in his hand

(E159) 607 Add note: First printed in (A168) as “The Woman Who Wanted to Disappear”

(E164b) 607 Add note: TS seems to derive from the second periodical publication of the essay in the *Adelphi* (C127) and the corrections are not by Lawrence

(E170.8) 609 Revise sub-entries, as follows:

Under E170.8a, add note: One editorially deleted page of this typescript belongs to “Certain Americans and an Englishman”: see p. lxxvi of the introduction to the Cambridge edition of *Mornings in Mexico* (A37b)

Under E170.8b, add note: TS probably typed in 1933 from the first periodical printing (C102) in preparation for the essay’s appearance in *Phoenix* (A76)

(E181.9) 612 Insert missing “the” in essay title; then add note to E181.9b: Dated August 1924; probably typed by Willard Johnson

(E199.5a) 620 Add note: MS dated 12 October 1922

(E203.5b) 620 Add note: These typescripts were derived from, and produced somewhat later than, (E203.5c)

(E231) 627–8 Revise sub-entries, as follows:

Under E231a, amend first note to read: First version, first published in *Introductions and Reviews* (A167)

Under E231c, amend first note to read: Second version of (a) above, published as ...

Under E231d, add note: From (b) above and probably used as setting copy for (A28a)

Under E231e, first note, for Third version, *read* First version of *Introduction*, ...

Under E231f, replace first note with: From an original typing of (e), possibly made for *Phoenix* (A76)

Under E231g, replace first note with: Second version of (e) above, first published in *Introductions and Reviews* (A167)

(E255b) 632 *Replace all the notes here with the following revised description:* MS consists of two sequences of pages torn from a school-style exercise book: an incomplete chapter, pp. 12–22, representing a very early draft of the second half of Chapter 3, “Christianity”, in the published volume (A17); and, starting on the verso of p. 22, a complete chapter, pp. 1–7, entitled *The Germans, Goths, and Vandals* (with two deleted titles, *Attila* and *The Huns*), representing an early draft of Chapter 4, “The Germans”, in (A17). New chapter begun and abandoned (after eight lines) on p. 7, entitled, Ch. IV *Invasions of Barbarians*

(E269c) 635 *Add note:* Neither of the above typescripts (b) and (c) derives directly from (E269a), nor from the essay’s first periodical printings (C206); they seem to relate, rather, to the essay’s later appearance in *Phoenix* (A76)

(E271c) 637 *Add note:* This and the preceding typescript (b) are from a typing probably made for *Phoenix* (A76)

(E297) 642 *Revise sub-entries, as follows:*

Under E297a, add note: Includes a letter to Nancy Pearn dated 21 November 1925

Under E297c, add note: This and the preceding typescript (b) are from a typing probably made for *Phoenix* (A76) in 1933 or 1934

(E307) 645 *Under E307b, add note:* From a typing of (a) above, probably made in the 1930s

Then also add new sub-entry, E307d, as follows:

d. Typescript, ?? pp. UTul

A typing of (c) above, probably produced in the early 1930s at Gotham Book Mart

(E313) 646 *Revise sub-entries, as follows:*

Under E313a, for 594 pp. read 479 pp. and add note: Published as
Quetzalcoatl (A33c and A33d)

Under E313b, expand entry to read:

b. Corrected typescript of (E313a), 360 pp. HU

The first 81 pages were typed by Spud Johnson in Chapala in May–June 1923; the rest were typed at the office of Thomas Seltzer later that summer. Only the corrections in Johnson’s section of the TS are in Lawrence’s hand

(E326.6) 663 *Note change of location and revise entry, to read:*

Mixed and partially corrected page proofs, dated October 1914, 310 pp. NCR

Lawrence sent this set of proofs as a present to William Hopkin in January 1915. They are mainly uncorrected duplicate proofs, but Lawrence had replaced signatures “E” and “O” with the corresponding signatures from the master set of Duckworth proofs and consequently these have his preliminary corrections on them; he used the clean signatures from the duplicate set of proofs on which to make his final corrections

(E334b) 664 *Revise sub-entries, as follows:*

Under E334b, amend first line to read: Corrected carbon typescript

Also, add to note: Original ribbon copy typed from (c) below; revised in Lawrence’s hand

Under E334c, add note: Extensively revised and extended in Lawrence’s hand

(E352.6d) 669 *For Revised read Corrected and add note:* Although corrected in Lawrence’s hand, with thirty-nine small corrections, this was a spare set of proofs which Lawrence did not return to Secker for (A31) but gave away as a present to his friend Mrs Anne Conway. For further details, see (A170)

(E357) 670 *Revise sub-entries, as follows:*

Under E357d, add note: A fair copy of (e) below, possibly typed by Lawrence himself

Under E357e, add note: Typed by Dorothy Brett in January 1925

Under E357f, add note: With (g) below, probably made in the 1930s for the essay’s publication in *Phoenix* (A76)

(E368) 673 *Revise sub-entries, as follows:*

Under E368c, add note: This and the preceding typescript (b) are from a typing probably made for *Phoenix* (A76)

Under E368d, add note: Used as setting copy for first publication (C156)

(E373a) 674:3 *Replace note to read:* Fragments of the third MS. Published in facsimile in (A4b); printed in (A4i), Appendix III.2

(E373b) 674:5 *Amend first note to read:* A fragment from the third MS, pp. 204–226, representing most of Chapter IX, “First Love”, which later evolved into “Lad-and-Girl Love” in the final MS. Printed in (A4i), Appendix IV

(E373c) 674:10 *Amend to read:* Five fragments, in the hand of Jessie Chambers; printed in (A4i) Appendix V

674:11 *For On read One*

674:18 *Amend to read:* Commentary on Chapter IX

(E373d) 674 *Revise entry to read as follows and then add new item as E373dd:*

d. Holograph manuscript, 271 pp. UT
Incomplete second MS, entitled *Paul Morel*, pp. 72–353 (with some intervening pages missing). Published as *Paul Morel* (A4i)
Powell 3

dd. Holograph manuscript, 7 pp. UT
Although held together with E373d above, this is a later MS representing an abandoned start on a third draft of Chapter I; printed in (A4i), Appendix III

(E373e) 674 *Expand entry to read:*

e. Holograph manuscript, 530 pp. (numbered 1–540) UCB
Fourth and final MS version, used as setting-copy for first publication, Duckworth, 1913 (A4a), and as base-text for the Cambridge edition (A4c); published in facsimile in (A4b). Contains Edward Garnett’s revisions and deletions for (A4a). MS includes 93 pp. incorporated by Lawrence from the third MS and 13 pp. from the second MS

(E382p and E382q) 678:10, 27 *For both instances of Chapter III's bracketed title, add missing "de" and grave accent, to read: Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur*

(E382.5c) 679 *Add note:* Typed from (a) above

(E392) 681:12–13 *Under head-note, second sentence, for (B88) read (B87) – and, after final page reference, add: and Paul Morel (A4i), Appendix I*

(E397d) 682 *Add note:* Proofs for *Fortnightly Review* printing (C173); corrections not in Lawrence's hand

(E415) 686 *Revise sub-entries, as follows:*

Under E415b, add note: A later typing than (d) below

Under E415c, replace note with: From (d) below; probable source of first publication in (A76)

Under E415d, add note: Printed version in (A168)

(E428a) 688 *For misprint OUCB read UCin*

“THE INSIDIOUS MASTERY OF SONG”: D. H. LAWRENCE, MUSIC AND MODERNISM

SUSAN REID

Around 1907 or 1908 traditional ideas concerning the tonality of music collapsed.¹ Since the concept of tonality is broad – encompassing all aspects of melody and harmony, particularly hierarchical relationships – the disruption caused by musical innovations in the period is perceived by some to have been seismic in its effects. It is on a par, perhaps, with Virginia Woolf’s much-quoted pronouncement that “on or about April 1910 human nature changed”.² Woolf was, in part, reflecting on a new era in the visual arts heralded by the first Post-Impressionist Exhibition,³ but how might the equally radical developments in music have affected what she called “human nature” and, most particularly, the writer’s expression of it?

Musicologist Carl Dahlhaus defines modernism in music as the progressive music of the period 1890-1910, with the music of Mahler, Strauss and Debussy marking an historic transformation.⁴ It can therefore be argued that modernism in music preceded and even shaped literary modernism. Indeed, by 1910, Sergei Diaghilev was shocking audiences with performances by the Ballets Russes which combined avant-garde music, choreography and design, in a way that seems quintessentially modernist according to Daniel Albright’s conception that “the arts seem endlessly interpermeable, a set of fluid systems of construing and reinterpreting, in which the quest for meaning engages all our senses at once”.⁵ To what extent, then, did Lawrence belong and contribute to this stream of modernism? Did he respond to developments in music in the way that critics suggest that he responded to art, literature and philosophy? And what might we learn about his creative development by putting music at its centre?

Between 1906 and 1908, while Arnold Schoenberg was composing his *Second String Quartet* op. 10 – the piece purported to crystallize the collapse of tonality in modern music – Lawrence was experimenting with his poetic voice in verses with musical references, including three with “Song” in their titles, plus ‘A Tarantella’ and ‘The Piano’.⁶ The evolution of the latter poem, widely anthologized in its revised form ‘Piano’ (1918), suggests much about Lawrence’s responses to music at two key stages in his development, at the very beginning of his writing career and in the post-war period. The early draft of the poem is longer, more sentimental, and less elegant in its interweaving of past with present. The first verse, which is entirely cut in the later version, mentions his mother three times, recalling in detail the family’s “little and brown” piano which is metaphorically engulfed by a “superb sleek black” piano in the speaker’s present (*Poems* 943). The third verse, which would also be excised, reminisces about his sister singing of her first love, and a “full-throated woman”, who in the final stanza bares her arms, bosom and soul in singing “a wild Hungarian air”, but becomes simply “the singer” in revision.

The later version, then, is more compact and the vocabulary more precise: significantly the piano is no longer “clamouring” but “appassionato”, a musical term from the Italian directing the music to be played with passion, as, for example a love duet in an opera might be played. Even the revised title, ‘Piano’ rather than ‘The Piano’, carries an extra suggestion of the adverb, again from the Italian, meaning softly, or low of sound. In the early draft, the poet still “*must belong, / To the old Sunday evenings*”, but in the later version “*the heart of me weeps to belong*” (*Poems* 148, *my emphasis*). Now we have a poem tightly focused on the man who weeps as he remembers being a child, his “manhood cast down” as he is betrayed back by “the insidious mastery of song”. Here the themes of music and memory become more tightly bound up with the idea of loss, and particularly with the erasure of manhood. These themes particularly resonate with his later novels, for example *Aaron’s Rod* (1922), which Lawrence began around the

time of re-writing ‘Piano’. The two versions of this poem thus provide an apt frame in which to consider how Lawrence experimented with music in his early poetry, his second, supposedly “Wagnerian” novel *The Trespasser* (1912) and his rather strange seventh novel about a flute-player.

• • • •

The importance of the real family piano is emphasized in the biography written by his sister, Ada Lawrence – this was where they spent “[s]ome of our happiest hours”, enjoying some fairly standard fare:

Bert bought me Chopin waltzes, music by Tschaikowsky [sic] and Brahms, Boosey’s song books, and opera selections. He could not play but sat by my side for hours at a time encouraging me to practise difficult pieces ... he insisted that I should persevere and hummed the air while I struggled with its complications. We sang duets – Mendelssohn’s “Maybells and Flowers”, “The Passage Bird’s Farewell”, and Rubenstein’s “Song of the Birds”.⁷

Although Ford Madox Hueffer rather fancifully recollects that the musical influences in Eastwood extended to Wagner and Debussy (*IL* 9), it seems more likely that Lawrence’s exposure to music increased when he moved to Croydon. Thereafter his letters contain enthusiastic references to the Covent Garden Opera, while his notebooks for 1909 contain more verses with musical themes, including ‘Baby Songs: Ten Months Old’, ‘The Songless’, and an intriguing series of poems called ‘A Life History in Harmonies and Discords’.⁸ Originally these formed part of a long poem, ‘Discord in Childhood’, which Lawrence destroyed (*Poems* 850), but the surviving fragments have been reproduced as an Appendix in the first volume of the *The Cambridge Biography*, in which John Worthen also supplies an engaging reading.⁹ The titles suggest a

very real interest in the structure of musical composition, with a sequence of five ‘Harmony’ poems (five being the upper limit for acts in an opera or movements in a symphony), interspersed with four different poems called ‘Discord’. This structure is used to describe the progress of ‘A Life’, from birth to the strife and harmony of mature relationship between two people, thus equating life with the harmonies and discords of a piece of music. The idea of dissonance between men and women would become a core theme of his work, of course, but dissonance was also a defining feature of modernist music, which Lawrence may have perceived as a technique which he could deploy to heighten feelings of conflict in his writing.

Music historian Richard Taruskin asserts that an “area in which Wagner had set a benchmark to be emulated and, if possible, exceeded, was the sheer level of tolerable (or at least tolerated) dissonance” and that dissonance was one of the areas which his Germanic successors – Gustav Mahler, Richard Strauss and Arnold Schoenberg (Austrian-American) – sought to maximize.¹⁰ This was also an idea which literary modernists began to expound some two years or so later than Lawrence’s poetic experiments in ‘A Life History’ and indeed Lawrence seems to anticipate some of the principles espoused by *Rhythm* magazine, founded by John Middleton Murry in mid-1911. In the Bergsonian little magazine, the tension between harmony and discord becomes a recurrent theme, sometimes expressed in musical terms, but usually in the context of painting – the paradigm being J. D. Fergusson’s iconic figure of “Rhythm” which appeared on the front cover.¹¹ While it’s possible that Lawrence may also have absorbed something of Bergson’s thought that was circulating in intellectual circles at this time, he doesn’t mention the French philosopher until a letter of 23 April 1913, and then he writes “The Bergson book was very dull. Bergson bores me. He feels a bit thin” (*IL* 544).

Despite its claims to be an “Art Music Literature Quarterly”, there is little discussion of music within the pages of *Rhythm*. But there is an article in its second number written by Rollo H. Myers

on ‘The Art of Claude Debussy’, which references among other things Debussy’s innovations with harmony, his adoption of “the old church modes”, his rejection of Wagnerian drama, and his settings of Verlaine’s lyrics.¹² This description of Debussy immediately suggests some affinities with Lawrence, for whom hymns were a childhood influence that lasted throughout his life (in fact “hymns” is one of only a few constant features in his two versions of ‘Piano’).¹³ He was also a Verlaine enthusiast from at least 17 July 1908, when he quotes from the French symbolist poet: “Let us have music before everything, and, to obtain it, we will choose a subtle irregularity with nothing which balances and makes weight” (*IL* 63).

At this time, Lawrence had little experience of or liking for Wagner. Helen Corke claims that before meeting her in Croydon, his “only experience of Wagner’s music had been a performance, in Nottingham Theatre, of *Tannhäuser*, when he reacted against the stridency of the Venusberg music” (*IL* 99, n. 3). Then, in a letter of October 1909, Lawrence wrote: “I went to Wagners *Tristan and Isolde* last night, and was very disappointed. I would much rather have seen *Strife*. *Tristan* is long, feeble, a bit hysterical, without grip or force. I was frankly sick of it” (*IL* 140). He refers here to John Galsworthy’s working-class play *Strife* (1909), but the idea of strife also underlies his poem sequence ‘A Life History’ which was written around this time. As John Worthen (whose 1909-1910 chapter of *The Cambridge Biography* is titled ‘Strife’) observes: “The whole sequence of ‘A Life History’, with its contrasted ‘Harmonies’ and ‘Discords’, is constructed out of such oppositions. The first two poems together suggest (on the one hand) the necessity of contraries and (on the other) the violence that inevitably accompanies their co-existence”.¹⁴

Lawrence first mentions his “love” of Debussy in a letter to Louie Burrows of 17 December 1910, after attending a concert which featured his work (*IL* 138). By then, Debussy’s music was well-known in England. Although first noted by the English press as recently as 1901, by “1908 the warmth of interest in Debussy

turned into a veritable heatwave”, according to Roger Nichols.¹⁵ Yet, despite references in his first two novels, we cannot be certain that Lawrence had heard Debussy at the time of writing ‘A Life History in Harmonies and Discords’. We can be certain, however, of Lawrence’s shared enthusiasm for the French symbolist poets who inspired Debussy. The imagery of the ‘Harmony’ poems echoes Verlaine, particularly in their references to the moon, sea and music, while the preoccupation throughout with flesh and blood and lips, with hate and anger and death owes more perhaps to Baudelaire, whose *Fleurs du Mal* Lawrence found to be “better than Verlaine” (*IL* 179). But there may be a nod, too, towards George Egerton, whose first two collections of short stories, *Keynotes* (1893) and *Discords* (1894), seem to chime both with the title of Lawrence’s verse experiment and its theme of conflict between men and women. Again there are similarities in imagery. The ash-tree whipping and shrieking in the third ‘Discord’ poem seems to anticipate themes and images from *Sons and Lovers*, with the trees whipping outside as the parents quarrel within. But the description also resembles the opening of Egerton’s story, ‘Under Northern Sky I: How Marie Larsen Exorcised a Demon’, which begins “There has been a mighty storm, it has been raging for two days. A storm in which the demon of drink has reigned like a sinister god in the big white house … Only the pale little mistress has stood unmoved through the whirlwind of his passion”.¹⁶

Nonetheless, ‘A Life History in Harmonies and Discords’ contains much of Lawrence’s own invention or adaptation and I concur with Worthen that the series represents “some of his most inventive early poetry”.¹⁷ I agree too, that the final poem is “in a way the most fascinating of all”. Worthen describes how this poem, which begins “I trace a pattern”, uses an artistic sense of over-lining and plotting to “describe an artist confronting the patterns made by the lives and conflicts of others”.¹⁸ However, I would add that many of the terms deployed are mathematical, while also hinting at musical notation.

LAST HARMONY

Watch each pair of stepping feet trace a strange design
 With broken curves and faltering lines
 I trace a pattern, mine or thine
 Patiently, and over-line

Ah the blindly stepping kindly feet
 Watch them tracing their design
 The curves waver and meet and intertwine
 Twisting and Tangling mine and thine

With pain did I carefully overline
 What part of my graph was plainly plotted
 Where the curves were knotted I must define
 Pains that were clotted over mine

I have come¹⁹

What is striking here is the repetition of pattern words – design, curves, line, feet – which could apply equally to visual, musical or poetic art. The more puzzling term “over-line”, which appears twice, was attested for mathematical notation since around 1899, meaning also overbar or overscore and coined in analogy to underline and underscore. In Lawrence’s poem, then, “line” may double as bar or score, which are musical terms, while the term over-line also seems to chime with a discussion of “overtones” in relation to Debussy in the *Rhythm* article discussed above. Here Meyers describes how Debussy builds chords consisting of harmonies “higher in the harmonic series than former composers”, with the effect that he seems “to have inked in, as it were, lines that before were merely suggested, or even, like a water-mark, invisibly ingrained in the texture of ordinary diatonic music”.²⁰

Indeed, it seems that Debussy may have applied mathematical principles to his musical composition; for example Roy Howat has

suggested that some of Debussy's pieces can be divided into sections that reflect the golden mean, frequently by using the numbers of the standard Fibonacci sequence.²¹ While the specifics of this musical analysis may well have escaped Lawrence, his proficiency in both music and mathematics – at Nottingham University “he enjoyed the Music course” and gained a distinction in Mathematics – and his ability to link the two should not be under-estimated.²² His understanding of the science of sound, too, is revealed by a reference to Chladni figures in a letter to Edward Garnett which explicitly links words and rhythm in his search for a new novelistic form:²³

Again I say, don't look for the development of the novel to follow the lines of certain characters: the characters fall into the form of some other rhythmic form, like when one draws a fiddle-bow across a fine tray delicately sanded, the sand takes lines unknown. (2L 184)

In ‘A Life History’, then, we can see Lawrence beginning to work out a form which very consciously deploys musical techniques. Of course, the form seems clumsy in comparison with Debussy’s apparent formlessness. At least that is how Debussy’s music struck some early critics, although W. H. Daly (one of the first to publish a book on Debussy in English in 1908) noted that: “It has been laid to his charge that his forms and harmonies are alike vague and incoherent. There is, however, a conceivable stage in the mastery of form ... which may be so complete that form, in the sense of limit or restriction, disappears”.²⁴ Debussy’s “mastery of form” is often seen as quintessentially modernist, in a way that many contemporary writers sought to replicate. When Lawrence declares that he hates his novel *The Trespasser* (1912) “for its fluid, luscious quality” (IL 351) or describes it as “execrable bad art: it has no idea of progressive action, but arranges gorgeous tableaux-vivants which have not any connection one with the other” (IL 229-30), these perceived faults would seem to derive more closely from

his emulation of music like Debussy's than that of Wagner. However, Lawrence's second novel is usually considered to be Wagnerian both in its themes and its prose style.

Michael Bell, for example, notes that "the Wagnerian tragic conception of passion is what Lawrence spent his early years as a writer shedding".²⁵ His brief analysis of what is generally regarded as one of Lawrence's "lesser" novels notes a passage (*T* 98-9) in which "Siegmund's reference to a 'symphony' becomes an image of cosmic merging by which all separateness is lost", invoking "a specifically Wagnerian conception of the orchestra".²⁶ In *The Trespasser*, then, it seems that the Wagnerian idea of synthesis works to dissolve individuality, with the effect noted by the contemporary review in *Rhythm* magazine that: "the story simply doesn't matter; the characters even don't matter. What is important is the curious mood of passion exhibited by Siegmund and Helena on their holiday in the Isle of Wight".²⁷ And yet, can we really accuse Lawrence of sharing what Adorno described as "Wagner's indifference towards the inner life of the individual", since really this is *all* that his novel is concerned with?²⁸ In a sense, if not altogether successfully, Lawrence's attempts to depict the inner consciousness of Siegmund and Helena lead us to "the somewhat dark and secret shadows of the wood" that Arthur Symons perceives in Debussy's music – "filled with an instinctive quality of beauty, which can pass from mood to mood, surprise us, lead us astray, but end by leading us to the enchantment of what I have called the wood".²⁹

And so *The Trespasser* would seem to mirror a conflict between Wagnerian and post-Wagnerian styles, that was being enacted by modernist composers of the time. Taruskin asserts that it is difficult to overstate the influence of Wagner; not only was he "the most radically inventive composer of the nineteenth century", but his legacy split composers of the early twentieth century into opposing camps – the early modernists within the German sphere, like Mahler, Strauss and Schoenberg, who chose to maximize the effects begun by Wagner, and those in the French camp, epitomized

by Satie and Debussy, who sought to minimize, even to exorcize Wagner's legacy.³⁰ Stoddard Martin detects a similar backlash in the classicism of Pound, Eliot and Joyce, arguing that by 1914 "the English front against Wagnerism in literature had certainly opened".³¹ And while Tony Pinkney detects an element of "'Northern' revolution against that classicising restoration" in the seemingly belated Wagnerism of *The Trespasser*, it is also possible to argue that a clash between musical styles is being worked out on the pages of Lawrence's novel.³²

There is an intriguing reference to *Pelléas et Mélisande*, Debussy's only opera (first performed in Paris in 1902 and in London in 1909), in Chapter II of *The Trespasser*, which prepares the reader both for some of the themes and stylistic devices of the novel and its ambivalent Wagnerism. As Helena stands "fingering the score of 'Pelléas'", Siegmund struggles to explain why he considers this music "cold" (T 52). His inability to explain himself hints at some of the deliberate opacity of Debussy's opera, particularly if compared with the more elemental drive underlying Wagnerian drama. As Taruskin observes, Golaud, one of the main characters in *Pelléas*, "wants definite and rational answers, but nobody understands his questions. Nor can anyone connect Golaud's actions with their consequences".³³ The music then may seem "cold" both in contrast with the Wagnerian conception of passion and in the sense that contemporaries often found Debussy difficult to get to grips with, or even "vague and incoherent" as Daly suggests.

In selecting Maeterlinck's play as the basis for his libretto, Debussy nods towards the mythical settings of Wagner, but is ultimately more interested in symbolism than in following history or myth. As Richard Langham Smith observes, "Most notable ... is the use of different types of water mirroring different stages in the psychological development of the drama ... here are the sources of the water-imagery which was to preoccupy Debussy throughout his life".³⁴ Similar effects can be seen in *The Trespasser*, where the island setting makes the sea a constant presence and a ready

metaphor for states of mind. For example, Helena “watched the far-off floating of the ships, and the near wading of children through the surf. Endless trains of thought, like little waves, rippled forward and broke on the shore of her drowsiness” (T 122). Here, as in *Pelléas*, liquidity helps to create a somnambulistic feeling which pervades the work. Siegmund’s first words to Helena on their way to the Isle of Wight – ““You *here!* ... Is it a dream now, dear?”” (T 57) – set the tone for what follows and what comes to resemble the parallel dreams of two people. The novel’s dreamlike quality and stillness resembles what Taruskin characterizes as the “strikingly static effect of Debussy’s harmony”.³⁵ One of the first descriptions of Siegmund is that “he sat at the window, motionless, watching things move” (T 49) and one of Helena’s great attractions for him is that “It was a great rest to be with her” (T 52).

But one of the potential problems posed by Debussy’s music, and by Lawrence’s novel, is that despite the intention to highlight the individual, sometimes character seems indistinct from background. Meyers is able to perceive that in Debussy as compared to Wagner:

The characters speak in a kind of psalmodic declaration, expressed in melodic curves, and thus their personalities and actions stand out more poignantly against the shimmering, pulsing, harmonic background than if they had to sing to the accompaniment of the orchestra.³⁶

However, other early critics of *Pelléas* found it difficult to perceive such distinctions. The *Times* review of the London premiere in May 1909 noted that “so rarely does any part move melodically except in the treble that the ear is apt to tire of the sort of balance which goes on through all five acts” and the *Monthly Musical Record* regretted the lack of sung tunes, remarking that “that which hitherto has been considered the most powerful factor in music-drama plays altogether too insignificant a part”.³⁷ Debussy’s music, then, is often identified with an impressionist style that crosses thresholds

between the arts. As Daniel Albright suggests in this description: “Debussy’s music is typically an art of delicate temporal adjustments, discursive, an artful sequence of instabilities ... Debussy’s works are like French impressionist painting ... in that the mind tries to grasp fleeting phenomena from a puzzling density of events”.³⁸ In *The Trespasser*, too, Lawrence seems to attempt, and sometimes succeed in achieving, the density of an impressionism which combines words, music and sound, and which seems very different to the Wagnerian notion of *Gesamtkunstwerk*.³⁹ And yet, a struggle against Wagner persisted in his later work, with “the early pages of *The Rainbow*” being “the most Wagnerian in Lawrence” according to Elizabeth Mansfield (*T* 327) and Stoddard Martin claiming that *The Trespasser, Sons and Lovers, The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* together represent Lawrence’s own version of the *Ring* saga.⁴⁰

However, by the time of writing *Aaron’s Rod*, modernist music had moved on again and so too had Lawrence. Following Edward Dent’s championing of English versions of Mozart’s operas – on stage as well as in his book which appeared in 1913 – Lawrence saw the *Magic Flute* in November 1917 (*3L* 181), just as he was developing his ideas for what would become *Aaron’s Rod*, and which he mentions for the first time on 21 February 1918 as “another daft novel” (*3L* 216). The project suffered a difficult and prolonged gestation, finally completed in 1922, and remaining if not daft, then at the very least baffling – a description that has also been applied to Mozart’s opera. But “reading” the two together may prove productive. If, as Peter Conrad asserts, “opera depends on the basic incompatibilities of the nonverbal imagery of music and tendency of words to try to pin down meaning”, this interplay may yield new insights into Aaron’s seemingly inexplicable behaviour.⁴¹

The revival of Mozart was in part facilitated by the modernist backlash against Wagner, which allowed the rediscovery of a composer whose reputation had languished during the nineteenth-century. Influential to Debussy and also to Strauss (see for example, *Der Rosenkavalier*, 1911), Mozart would become key to the

neoclassical movement of the 1920s led by Stravinsky. Indeed, according to Taruskin “‘Delicious’ neoclassicism begins with Mozart”.⁴² And it is also to Mozart that Daniel Albright turns to explain his notion of “the hieroglyphic character of ... much ... in Modernist art”. Returning to the critic who perceives that “For one stream of Modernism, the arts seem endlessly interpermeable”, Albright argues that “The hieroglyph is the right name for the unit of equivalence between one artistic medium and another – the core of astonishment”.⁴³ Interestingly, too, when writing about the need for art to transcend the “unimpeachable Kodak”, Lawrence regrets the loss of ancient signs and symbols: “Through many ages, mankind has been striving to register the image on the retina *as it is*: no more glyphs and hieroglyphs. We’ll have the real objective reality” (*STH* 164).

Albright uses examples of the set designs by some of Stravinsky’s collaborators to reveal their sensitivity to the pictorial character built into the music. In particular, he singles out Mikhail Larionov’s set design for Stravinsky’s *Renard* (1929), in which “the backdrop shows a large, unmodeled, naked figure, depicted in a combination of profile and frontal view, with a vaguely bestial head and a squiggle coming out of its mouth; below it are schematic simplifications of a bird, a fox, several pine trees, and several houses”.⁴⁴ What Larionov captures from what Albright calls “the spirit of the work” by Stravinsky is the frontality and profile of Cubist art together with something primitive – a prototypically modernist conjunction. Something of this is present too in Fergusson’s image of ‘Rhythm’ as early as 1911, but Larionov’s designs also remind me of Lawrence’s sketches for the cover of his poetry collection *Birds, Beasts and Flowers* (1923). Sensitive to the pictorial character of his poetry, Lawrence’s seemingly crude sketches might be interpreted as hieroglyphs; his simplified drawings represent the contents of the book but also work to suggest unity by depicting the tree of life and a core of astonishment which lies at the heart of Lawrence’s poems about the natural world.

But when Albright looks for hieroglyphic equivalents in music he turns to Mozart's opera the *Magic Flute*. So, too, I will suggest does Lawrence in his novel *Aaron's Rod*. Set in the aftermath of the Great War, the novel depicts the shattering of old ideas of masculinity and gender relations through a series of broken and displaced men. Aaron Sisson is a union official in a Midlands colliery, who deserts his wife and two children and gains social and geographical mobility by wooing the rich with his flute-playing, first in London and then in Italy. The significance that is usually imputed to his flute – the rod of the title – is as a phallic symbol, while the smashing of the flute at the climax of the novel is interpreted as a metaphor for the war's breaking of manhood. But this seems to oversimplify the part played by the flute in this novel. The flute is first and foremost a woodwind instrument – thus allied with breath – another important theme of the novel. In an early chapter titled 'A Punch in the Wind', Aaron's alter ego Rawdon Lilly, the oratorical Lawrence-figure in the text, has the wind literally knocked out of him by a companion who does not like what he says. The contrast between words and wind is compounded through the novel, which alternates between periods of inner reflection by Aaron and periods of intense philosophizing by Lilly. And the closing chapter titled 'Words' undermines the power of mere words to effect the changes discussed in the novel, closing with the enigmatic message that "Your soul will tell you" from a Lilly who now resembles "a Byzantine eikon" (AR 299).

The final message of the book, then, is beyond words, but this has been frequently signposted throughout. A pivotal episode involves an Italian Marchesa who has lost her singing voice – a symptom of war trauma. When Aaron's playing inspires her to sing again, she feels: "For the first time her soul drew its own deep breath. All her life, the breath had caught half-way. And now she breathed full, deep, to the deepest extent of her being" (AR 256). Previously, she has described feeling sickened "when any number of musical notes, different notes, come together, harmonies or discords. Even a single chord struck on the piano. It makes me feel

sick. I just feel as if I should retch”” (*AR* 225). ““But””, she goes on to suggest, ““perhaps the flute is different”” (*AR* 226). And indeed it is:

It was a clear, sharp, lilted run-and-fall of notes, not a tune in any sense of the word, and yet a melody: a bright, quick sound of pure animation: a bright, quick, animate noise, running and pausing. It was like a bird’s singing, in that it had no human emotion or passion or intention or meaning—a ripple and poise of animate sound. But it was unlike a bird’s singing, in that the notes followed clear and single one after the other, in their subtle gallop. A nightingale is rather like that—a wild sound. To read all the human pathos into nightingales’ singing is nonsense. A wild, savage, non-human lurch and squander of sound, beautiful, but entirely unaesthetic. (*AR* 227)

While these words evoke the qualities of modernist music, the power of Aaron’s music can also be likened to that of Mozart’s *Magic Flute* and we can discern a similarity with one of the major themes of Mozart’s opera; that is, as Albright perceives it, “the contrast between discursive language and some more powerful means of communication”.⁴⁵ Once noted, the intertexts become glaring. *The Magic Flute* is set in Egypt, while *Aaron’s Rod* is a biblical reference to the time of the Israelites there. One could almost cast Rawdon Lilly – the wordy Lawrence character – and his equally vocal wife Tanny in the roles of Papageno the compulsive chatterer and his female counterpart Papagena. Besides the coincidence of a flute which enables its player to charm his way onwards in a journey of self-discovery, there are many parallel themes between these two works: the clash between male and female worlds, ideas of brotherhood and leadership, the questioning of social values, and some elements of fantasy.

But the influence of the *Magic Flute* becomes more profound if, according to Albright, we consider how Mozart provides “an example of a ‘pure and simple sensation’ in music that acts

hieroglyphically upon the listener, as sheer atemporal grasp of meaning".⁴⁶ I would argue that in *Aaron's Rod*, the passages of flute-playing act as hieroglyphs – we come to understand that these are the only times that Aaron recognizes the division within himself. For example, the first time he plays the flute in the novel, the bliss of playing is at odds with his inner mood:

He tried his flute. And then at last, with the odd gesture of a diver taking a plunge, he swung his head and began to play. A stream of music, soft and rich and fluid, came out of the flute. He played beautifully. He moved his head and his raised bare arms with slight, intense movements, as the delicate music poured out. It was sixteenth-century Christmas melody, very limpid and delicate.

The pure, mindless, exquisite motion and fluidity delighted him with a strange exasperation. There was something tense, exasperated to the point of intolerable anger, in his good-humoured breast, as he played the finely-spun peace-music. The more exquisite the music, the more perfectly he produced it, in sheer bliss; and at the same time, the more intense was the maddened exasperation within him. (*AR* 12-13)

The “peace-music” is also at odds with the violence of the recent war, palpable in the opening paragraph of the novel, like a “nightmare released now into the general air” (*AR* 5). By a strange coincidence the music which Aaron proceeds to play, to the annoyance of his daughter, is Mozart (*AR* 14) – Mozart of course wrote an unusually high number of pieces for woodwind – and this piece also perfectly expresses the dissonance created by modernist music and the “pure potency of sound” that Meyers identifies in Debussy.⁴⁷ After this scene, amidst the family’s preparations for Christmas, Aaron leaves the house and does not return. His decision is never explained in words, only implied by the effects of the music. How can he carry on in the same old ways when the world has changed beyond recognition? Aaron’s journey is in part a trial

of silence, such as Tamino undergoes in the *Magic Flute*, as he struggles to find new modes of understanding the world.

Much later in the novel, when Aaron plays to the Marchesa, his music, as we have already heard, is wilder, savage, “still beautiful, but entirely unaesthetic” (AR 227). His music seduces her but he feels “withered” by their intimacy. The contrast between the significance of his music and her perception signals the end of his relationships with women. The Marchesa regards him as a fetish – a phallic object. “Strange, she was afraid of him! Of his actual male physique she was afraid as of a fetish. Fetish afraid, and fetish-fascinated” (AR 273). The fetish must be broken and symbolically the book climaxes with the smashing of his flute.

Aaron’s repulsion towards the Marchesa calls to mind Adorno’s criticism of Stravinsky’s music as “fundamentally a kind of fetishism”.⁴⁸ Adorno instead praises Schoenberg for his shattering of idols. The relevant work here is Schoenberg’s *Moses und Aron*, the very Aaron invoked by Lawrence, Moses’s brother who built a false idol of a golden calf; a strange coincidence, since the opera was composed after Lawrence’s death (1930-32). Schoenberg’s music proceeds by a series of “shocks, traumata”, which “assault the taboos of form”.⁴⁹ This also suggests a useful way of reading Lawrence’s novel, which proceeds by way of a series of shocks, each of which destroys an idol. The novel begins with the smashing of a blue glass Christmas tree bauble, which symbolizes the fragility of Christmas rituals as well as family life and by extension western civilization; this is followed by the shock of Aaron deserting his wife with no explanation beyond the equation of conventional marriage with the worship of false idols in a later chapter titled “Pillar of Salt”; and culminating, of course, in the smashing of the flute. Even this is described in musical terms as feeling right: “It chimed with something in his soul: the bomb, the smashed flute, the end” (AR 285).

In what sense is this “the end”? There is a suggestion that Aaron’s rod will “grow again. It’s a reed, a water-plant – you can’t kill it” (AR 285), which holds out the potential for rebirth and a new

manhood, but this seems impossible now in old Europe. For Aaron, Florence with its statue to manhood – Michelangelo’s *David* – does not fulfil its promise and for Lawrence this novel is something of an elegy to Europe. After this, he sought out the primitive rhythms of New and Old Mexico, although it could be said that Aaron’s flute and Papageno’s pan pipes prefigure the “Pan in America” phase and that Lawrence had not yet completely abandoned his interest in David, who would feature in his last play written in 1925, with themes of brotherhood and embodied manhood which are very much a continuation of the ideas in *Aaron’s Rod*. Intriguingly, too, he wrote a musical setting for this play, the fragments of which are the only surviving musical compositions he wrote.

• • • •

Although never a musician himself, Lawrence’s sensitivity to music was acute, as demonstrated in a range of his writing discussed here, which, while not considered his best work, deserves to be regarded as among his most experimental. His engagement with post-Wagnerian developments in music shows Lawrence to be at the centre of the modernist impulse to integrate and extend the range of artistic expression. But a novel such as *Aaron’s Rod* also reveals Lawrence’s awareness of “the insidious mastery of song” (*Poems* 148). While Pater’s notion that “All art aspires to the condition of music” may well have inspired modernist writers like Woolf, Lawrence remains wary of the purely cerebral effects of music.⁵⁰ Aaron thinks in musical terms: “his thoughts and his ideas, were dark and invisible, as electric vibrations are invisible no matter how many words they may purport ... His mind was music” (*AR* 164). It is therefore important that Aaron’s music is sometimes “wild” or “unaesthetic” in order that he can recognize his feelings. And it is for Lawrence, the writer, to find words for Aaron’s experiences: “I do but make a translation of the man. He would speak in music. I speak with words” (*AR* 164). This relationship between words and music was a key issue for Lawrence in his quest to find a “language

for the feelings" (STH 203) and opera, in particular, enabled him to explore new dimensions in his writing, across a gamut of composers from Mozart, via Wagner, to Debussy and Schoenberg.

I would like to acknowledge my gratitude to Delia da Sousa Correa for her encouragement and advice since the inception of this article at a workshop convened by the Literature and Music Research Group of the Open University in September 2010.

¹ For a discussion of this popular claim within music studies see Richard Taruskin, *Music in the Early Twentieth Century* (Oxford: OUP, 2010), 359.

² Virginia Woolf, 'Mr Bennett and Mrs Brown', in *Collected Essays*, Vol. 3 (London: Hogarth Press, 1966), 422-3.

³ The *Manet and Post-Impressionism* exhibition, curated by Roger Fry at the Grafton Galleries, London, November 1910-January 1911, first introduced to the British public the work of Seurat, Van Gogh, Gauguin and Cézanne.

⁴ Carl Dahlhaus, *Nineteenth-Century Music*, trans. J. Bradford Robinson (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 334.

⁵ Daniel Albright, *Untwisting the Serpent: Modernism in Music, Literature, and Other Arts* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 6-7.

⁶ John Worthen, *D. H. Lawrence: The Early Years 1885-1912* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), 479-80.

⁷ Ada Lawrence and G. Stuart Gelder, *Young Lorenzo: Early Life of D. H. Lawrence* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1966), 53.

⁸ Worthen, *D. H. Lawrence: The Early Years*, 481-4.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 495-9 and 274-6.

¹⁰ Taruskin, *Music in the Early Twentieth Century*, 5.

¹¹ Angela Smith. 'J. D. Fergusson's Painting *Rhythm*', *Katherine Mansfield Studies*, Vol. 2 (2010), 184-7.

¹² Rollo H. Meyers, 'The Art of Claude Debussy', *Rhythm*, 1.2 (Autumn, 1911), 31.

¹³ See for example 'Hymns in a Man's Life' (LEA 130-4), written in 1928.

¹⁴ Worthen, *D. H. Lawrence: The Early Years*, 274.

¹⁵ Roger Nichols, ‘The Reception of Debussy’s Music in Britain up to 1914’, in *Debussy Studies*, ed. Richard Langham Smith (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 139, 143.

¹⁶ George Egerton, *Keynotes and Discords* (London: Virago, 1983), 124.

¹⁷ Worthen, *D. H. Lawrence: The Early Years*, 274.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 276.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 499.

²⁰ Meyers, ‘The Art of Claude Debussy’, 32.

²¹ See particularly Chapter 1 of Roy Howat, *Debussy in Proportion: A Musical Analysis* (Cambridge: CUP, 1983), 1-10.

²² Worthen, *D. H. Lawrence: The Early Years*, 187, 189.

²³ I am grateful to Leo Salter for showing a video demonstration of the Chaldni experiment at the *Bloomsbury Adaptations* conference, Bath Spa University, May 2011. At the time of writing, various examples were available on *YouTube*, but a particularly creative version is “Chaldni’s Song”: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n-tYVjngvyo&feature=related> [accessed 12 October 2011].

²⁴ Quoted in Nichols, ‘The Reception of Debussy’s Music in Britain up to 1914’, 147.

²⁵ Michael Bell, *D. H. Lawrence: Language and Being* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), 204.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 34.

²⁷ *Rhythm*, Vol. 2.10 (1912), 278.

²⁸ Theodor Adorno, *In Search of Wagner*, trans. Rodney Livingstone (London: NLB, 1981), 117.

²⁹ Nichols, ‘The Reception of Debussy’s Music in Britain up to 1914’, 142.

³⁰ Taruskin, *Music in the Early Twentieth Century*, 3. Of course, some critics have responded that Taruskin overstates and oversimplifies Wagner’s influence: see, for example, the blog page:

<http://taruskinchallenge.wordpress.com/2010/10/05/wagners-influence/>

[accessed on 29 September 2011]. Nonetheless, Taruskin’s analysis provides a useful context in which to consider Lawrence’s assimilation of the various strands of contemporary music.

³¹ Stoddard Martin, *Wagner to 'The Waste Land': A Study of the Influence of Wagner on English Literature* (Barnes & Noble, 1982), 168-9.

³² Tony Pinkney, *D. H. Lawrence* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1990), 58.

³³ Taruskin, *Music in the Early Twentieth Century*, 88.

³⁴ Richard Langham Smith, 'The play and its playwright', in Roger Nichols and Richard Langham Smith, *Claude Debussy: Pelléas et Mélisande* (Cambridge: CUP, 1989), 10.

³⁵ Taruskin, *Music in the Early Twentieth Century*, 78.

³⁶ Meyers, 'The Art of Claude Debussy', 33.

³⁷ Nichols, 'The Reception of Debussy's Music in Britain up to 1914', 150 and 151.

³⁸ Albright, *Untwisting the Serpent: Modernism in Music, Literature, and Other Arts*, 56.

³⁹ The *Gesamtkunstwerk* or "total work of art" is a disputed term even within Wagnerian studies, which was later rejected by Stravinsky as being yoked to "the murky inanities of the Art-Religion" (Taruskin, *Music in the Early Twentieth Century*, 471).

⁴⁰ Quoted in Sandra Corse. Martin, *Wagner to 'The Waste Land': A Study of the Influence of Wagner on English Literature*, 178. See also Carl Krockel, *D. H. Lawrence and Germany: The Politics of Influence* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007).

⁴¹ Sandra Corse, *Opera and the Uses of Language: Mozart, Verdi, and Britten* (Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1987), 13.

⁴² Taruskin, *Music in the Early Twentieth Century*, 451.

⁴³ Albright, *Untwisting the Serpent: Modernism in Music, Literature, and Other Arts*, 39.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 39.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 42.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 42.

⁴⁷ Meyers, 'The Art of Claude Debussy', 33.

⁴⁸ Albright, *Untwisting the Serpent: Modernism in Music, Literature, and Other Arts*, 15.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 15.

⁵⁰ For an example of the influence of music on Woolf's writing see Blissett's claim that *The Waves* is Woolf's "most Wagnerian" novel: William Blissett, 'Wagnerian Fiction in English', *Criticism* 5.3 (1963), 239-60, 257.

**“THE DAY OF MY LETTERS IS OVER”:
D. H. LAWRENCE’S PICTURE POSTCARDS
FROM THE AMERICAS**

OLIVER TAYLOR

In the introduction to his 1932 edition of Lawrence’s letters, Aldous Huxley regarded his friend’s time of “wandering” in the “after-war years” as one in which he seemed “to have written very little” correspondence. Excusing the lack of letters from this intermediate period in his edition, he explained that “not more than a dozen or two have so far turned up; and there seems to be no reason to believe that further enquiries will reveal the existence of many more”. The scarcity, he explained, was not because they had been destroyed or withheld, rather that, “for one reason or another, [Lawrence] did not then care to write letters, that he did not want to feel himself in relationship with anyone”. After a while, Huxley goes on, the stream of correspondence begins again “but the later letters, though plentiful and good, are neither so numerous nor so richly and variously delightful as earlier”.¹

The correspondence from the Americas included in Huxley’s edition represents roughly a tenth of that which is now printed in volumes four and five of the Cambridge Edition. Reviewers of these two volumes have also found them comparatively flat, “seldom rising to great heights”, “quiet affair[s] compared with [their] predecessors”, and “not display[ing] the *force majeure* of the first three, which contain some of Lawrence’s best writing”.² They find Lawrence’s letters “bitty”, “lack a prevailing passion”, and that a large amount of the correspondence in them “is of no great interest to posterity”.³ Lawrence, Lyndall Gordon writes, “cries out for a selected edition”. Only R. P. Draper has found merit in these scrappy notes which have, he says, “the immediacy of direct speech” and in whose “haphazard jumble” he finds, contra Huxley,

“a man who lives relationships in every word he writes. His correspondents are his community”.⁴

Even had Huxley had all the letters the editors of the Cambridge Edition had at their disposal, his “simple and obvious” editorial principles would have omitted many of them (trivial notes, business letters, and postcards among them). But whereas for Huxley and certain critics duplication and repetition is undesirable, others such as David Bradshaw have found critical value in the inclusion of “shopping lists and clusters of almost identical postcards”.⁵ Not only does such inclusiveness and the apparatus of the Cambridge Edition permit, as Bradshaw says, “a detailed scrutiny of the novelist’s business affairs”, it also permits a detailed understanding of the writer’s emotional affairs, enables readers to observe the evolution of his letter-writing style, observe his rhythms of correspondence and what shapes them (be it sickness, emotional upheaval, or simply the timetables of the mail boats), appreciate how similar correspondence is minutely personalised, and with regard to the postcards (be they in clusters or not) even makes it possible for readers to observe changing patterns in the selection of picture postcard brands and images.

An important consideration, overlooked by the reviewers of these editions, and one that the present essay takes as its focus, is that these editions are not simply comprised of letters. In the Americas, more than ever before, Lawrence turned to the picture postcard as the most expedient medium through which to keep in touch. No wonder, then, that his correspondence is sometimes bitty. Readers of the Cambridge volumes can learn a little information about these postcards from the apparatus, but it is often only the caption summarising the image of the card. This provides a general idea of the card’s subject in most cases, but in others these sometimes allusive captions can leave readers guessing. For instance, one might assume that letter 3271 captioned “Drawing the Threads in Mexico” might have something to do with sewing, but the reader would have no way of knowing that it was, in fact, a colour-printed card depicting three Mexican women at a table,

across which is stretched fabric that they are weaving into traditional blankets that surround the room in which they are sat. Likewise, the reader might assume that letter 3198 captioned “San Ildefonso” would be a picture postcard of the pueblo of that name, but they would not know that it was, in fact, a “real photo” card of a group of its Indians involved in a display of ritual drumming. The Cambridge Edition apparatus also omits any pre-printed information about a card’s image, common on the cards chosen by Lawrence and which supplement his own message. Knowing that such information is printed on a postcard can help the reader to understand why information about the place from which it is written is absent from his message, or rather brief when compared with his earlier correspondence.

In this essay, then, I return to the postcards themselves and aim to elucidate certain trends in Lawrence’s use of postcards and significant features of his postcard correspondence. It does not aim to be a “master-interpretation”⁶ of his letter-writing as a whole in these years. Rather, it focuses on an important and overlooked aspect of his correspondence from the Americas. In part I, I give a brief history of the picture postcard and some background on Lawrence’s use of them prior to his arrival in America. In part II, I begin by contextualizing Lawrence’s use of postcards from the Americas amongst his attitudes to correspondence in these years before discussing his use of commercially-produced picture postcards. Finally, in part III, I address his use of the photograph as postcard, or what are called “real photo” postcards. Throughout this essay, I have provided stable hyperlinks to the images of the cards under discussion wherever possible, and given their pre-printed text where relevant. These appear in the essay’s endnotes.

I. A Brief History of the Postcard⁷

The rise and popularity of the postcard coincide with Lawrence’s youth. The United Kingdom issued its first postcards on 1 October 1870, a year after they first came into being on the continent. These thin buff cards were made in two sizes (measuring either 4.75 x 3.5

or 4.75 x 3 inches) along the top of which were printed in lilac the words POST CARD above the Royal Arms under which was printed the instruction THE ADDRESS ONLY TO BE WRITTEN ON THIS SIDE. The back of the card was for the message only. The cards were sold for 6d per dozen, a price which irritated stationers and paper manufacturers who felt that the Post Office was creating a monopoly by including the card with the price of its halfpenny postage. The private printing of postcards began on 17 June 1872 and was greatly appreciated by the general public and especially by those in business. However, for many years to come the use of the postcard was restricted by Post Office regulation.

It was because of the Post Office regulations governing them that picture postcards – already being used in some countries – were not permitted to be published at this time in Britain. By the 1890s, pictorial view cards were widely sold in many European countries, but no such cards were available in Britain or America, where regulations were as severe as those in Britain and prevented the issue of privately-printed picture postcards, probably to protect the sales of their own Post Office cards. The Post Office finally allowed privately-printed postcards of a specified size from 1 September 1894 (privately-printed picture postcards were not in general use in America until after the World Columbia Exposition of 1893, when, for the first time, coloured view cards of the exhibition were sold). In January 1902, an important step forward for the use of picture postcards was taken when the British Post Office took the initiative in allowing messages to be written on half of the side reserved for the address, thereby leaving the whole of the other side of the card for the picture (commonly called the “Divided Back” postcard). However, such cards could not be sent abroad until other members of the Universal Postal Union agreed to do the same, with France the next to follow suit two years later, then Germany in 1905, and America in 1907.

Until the 1890s and the era of privately-printed cards, the public had been indifferent to the use of picture postcards printed simply in one colour. In England they were scarcely known, and only the

advertiser saw their possibilities. But when it became possible for people to send artistically-printed souvenirs in the form of brightly-coloured picture postcards showing the exciting and interesting places from which they were written (especially from exotic locations abroad), postcard writing became immensely popular. This golden age of the picture postcard was summed up well by the London journalist James Douglas in 1907:

When archaeologists of the thirtieth century begin to excavate the ruins of London, they will fasten upon the Picture Postcard as the best guide to the spirit of the Edwardian era ... For the Picture Postcard is a candid revelation of our pursuits and pastimes, our customs and costumes, our morals and manners ... Like all great inventions, the Picture Postcard has wrought a silent revolution in our habits. It has secretly delivered us from the toil of letter-writing ... It is sad to think of the books that dead authors might have written if they had saved the hours which they squandered upon private correspondence ... Now he merely buys a picture postcard at each station, scribbles on it a few words in pencil, and posts it. This enhances the pleasures of travel ... The Postcard is, indeed, a very curt and unceremonious missive. It contains no endearing prefix or reassuring affix. It begins without prelude and ends without an envoy. The Picture Postcard carries rudeness to the fullest extremity. There is no room for anything polite. Now and then one can write on a blue sky or a white road, but, as a rule, there is no space for more than a gasp.⁸

Some of Lawrence's earliest correspondence was written on picture postcards and these reveal him to be a typical Edwardian postcard writer, as described by Douglas. The messages on those to Gertie and Ethel Cooper from 1903-4 showing views of Eastwood and other nearby attractions, such as Lincoln Cathedral, are little more than conventional comments on the places pictured. However, they are lightened by Lawrence's ironic touches: "I guess you know this

place", he wrote jokingly to Ethel Cooper of "Nottingham Castle" and to her sister quipped "This is *not* a coloured one" on a black and white image of "Swans Black and White" (IL 23-4). These brief and humorous cards not only reveal Lawrence's early taste and a concern for his friend's preferences when choosing a picture postcard for them – "Send me the Chapel if you have any of our own views, I should like it"; "This is absolutely the prettiest card I could get, do you like it?" (IL 24) – they also reveal his knowledge of the picture postcard market and the images then available and popular. For example, his joke on the picture postcard of Nottingham University to Gertie Cooper – "Do you like this, it's not cats" (IL 23) – might not have been as "obscure" to her as the Cambridge Edition apparatus suggests. As Richard Storey observes, Lawrence's comment alludes to "the then current popularity of postcard reproductions of Louis Wain's drawings of cats as human characters, in fashionable hats and recognizable social situations",⁹ and thereby shows him to be informed about the current postcard trends.

A similar care to choose a fitting and pleasing picture postcard for his correspondent continued throughout his life: "I tried to buy you Noah", he wrote on one to Percy Whittley, who had been a sailor himself in the navy, "but could only find *Adam!*" (3L 604). However, this is balanced, in the cards sent following his post-war departure from England, with an increasingly utilitarian approach to picture postcards. The series of postcards announcing his arrival in Florence in November 1919 illustrates this well: although they repeat a similar message, he chooses a different picture and personalised line for each of them. In the years between his arrival in Italy and sailing for Ceylon, picture postcards are used to give his family and close friends views of the places he visited and stayed in. "The house by the lamp-post is the one we're staying in – in the picture" he wrote to Ada from Florence (3L 428). The messages of these postcards give their recipients a unique and intimate insight into the scene of their writing and thus reach across space and time: the reader inhabits later the view which the writer

looks upon while addressing them and which he shows to them in his message. “Here we sit in the Piazza Cavour drinking orange ice”, he began one to Lucy Short, “a little table just at the corner of that bit of green grass in the bottom corner of this card” (3L 587); and to his niece, Margaret King, he opened another: “I arrived here two days ago – we have come out of Baden about three miles, and are living in one of the houses you see in the picture” (3L 706). On one occasion he even marked the picture itself: “This is a picture of the house where we are living. I make an X over my room” (3L 729). This use of commercially-printed picture postcards anticipates the way in which he would use “real photo” cards from the Americas (although none of the extant cards from the Americas are marked).

Creating intimacy in this way through the post was particularly important during these years. His feeling in (emotional) connection with his correspondent can often be seen to underpin his “will-to-correspond”, which, he told S. S. Koteliansky (Kot) in November 1921, had “collapsed” (4L 113). The ground on which such a connection might be established was something he increasingly lacked with Kot, whom he saw languishing in England (“What do you want from me? That I close myself in grotto number 5, as you do? God deliver me!”). This is reflected in his correspondence with Kot, that often took place on postcards in which Lawrence excused himself for not being able to write a proper letter (3L 632; 4L 253, 583) although Kot was by no means the only correspondent to whom he wrote in this way: “Remember me to \mathcal{A} ” he wrote to Cecily Lambert, “I did send her a postcard. I get so tired of writing letters” (3L 449); and later he wrote to Robert Mountsier: “Live in hopes of seeing you – But you are so evanescent. I can’t even write you a letter, you don’t seem at the other end” (3L 524). But perhaps more than anything, simply the length of time which the post took to be delivered to him in Italy (and later the Americas) and its unreliability contributed to him feeling out of connection with others and certainly made him less eager to write lengthy letters and more inclined to send a postcard. “Burn a farthing candle for me to

the saint of the post office", he wrote to Francis Brett Young, "or much better, singe his posterior well, if you can lay hold of him, for being such an irresponsible thievish clown" (3L 514).

II. Postcards from the Americas¹⁰

The memoirs of those who spent time with Lawrence during his stays in the Americas make the record of his habits of, and his attitudes towards, correspondence there particularly rich. Knud Merrild remembers the stage coach that brought the mail to Taos arriving in the late afternoon and that, at the ranch, after breakfast Gøtzsche would go for a walk and fetch the mail, then Lawrence, after his domestic work, would answer his letters and go to post his letter in the mail box, and on his way back, always stop at their cabin for a cup of tea at about one o'clock (Merrild 39, 84). When he moved and established himself in Mexico City and Guadalajara his rhythms of correspondence changed again, becoming more of an evening activity (Bynner 24, 149-51). Both accounts suggest that letter-writing was an activity secondary to his domestic obligations and creative writing proper, whereas his postcards were written when travelling, or shortly after arriving somewhere using cards he had picked up along the way.

As a man whose belief in spontaneity guided the principles and practice of his writing, the postcard was a natural form for Lawrence. "I don't care about form, in a letter" he wrote to Henry Savage in September 1913, "I just like people to give me a real bust of themselves" (2L 70). His letters and the memoirs of others from America show him to be especially ready to satirise the conventions of epistolary style in this period too. When Witter Bynner was hospitalised after their canoa trip on Lake Chapala, he remembered Lawrence visiting him with a note from a Guadalajaran provision store and pointing out for his amusement the "floral formality" of its salutation ("Appreciable cavalier and friend") and signature ("your most affectionate and attentive friend servant") (Bynner 174). His letters also lampoon these conventions, beginning one to Amy Lowell upon hearing of her doctorate, "So you are a Doctor

by now: of Divinity I nearly said! And shall one address you as Doctor Amy Lowell? – and ‘My dear Doctor –’? Well well – all titles seem to me comical: even Mr. and Miss and Mrs. I like my stark name best”, closing it, “mon cher Docteur” (3L 556-7). He also resented what he called “the American habit of getting familiar by addressing people by their Christian names” (Merrild 63) and told Eduardo Rendón after an amusing mix-up over the authorship of an article: “I am never David always DH” (5L 286). The option of dispensing with the salutation, signature, and correspondent’s title and name on a postcard, as well as the terse rather than “floral” style encouraged by the medium, would therefore have been all the more attractive to him at this time.

By all accounts, including his own in ‘The Flying-Fish’ and ‘Accumulated Mail’, Lawrence was an often bad-tempered recipient of letters, in the habit of blowing his nose on those he received (Brett 118; Foster 150-1; Bynner 151; 5L 101 n. 1), although there is no equivalent record of his dissatisfaction with any postcards. The Cambridge Edition records his irritation at the “squilchy” (8L 57) and “rather feeble” letters (4L 353) he received early on in his time in America, and that one correspondent, a Mrs Wroe, who had written him a letter about Mexico when he had been in Italy, had been “rather a twaddler” (4L 159). In contrast, he found Mabel’s photographs of Taos “very interesting” (4L 278), and these may have been pictures similar to the “real photo” cards she helped him to acquire and send, in turn, to his correspondents from Taos.

On one occasion, Merrild remembered him receiving a large batch of mail from friends, relatives and business connections and him reading each letter rapidly, crumpling the envelope in the palm of his hand and throwing it in the fire as he went: “He read them with a sort of loathing, one after the other, piling them up on his left for Frieda to read. He made remarks on each one, mostly sarcastic. He found them materialistic, empty and meaningless, dull as dishwater, and of no use to anybody” (Merrild 90). Despite frequent impatience at others’ “non-answering” of his letters (4L 349; Brett

181), time spent letter-writing also seems to have been held in low regard by him at this time. As he told Dorothy Brett on one occasion: “I am sure your letter will be all the better for not being written” (Brett 118).

Merrild’s anecdote is also important because it is instructive of Lawrence’s attitude towards privacy and correspondence. Whilst it is understandable that Lawrence should have shown Mabel’s long and “intimate” letters to his wife to make everything “square and open” (Luhan 86; Brett 96), other memoirs show that, although he was usually in the habit of destroying letters upon reading them, occasionally he saved ones that had particularly displeased him to show to others when feeling “savage” (Bynner 149). It seems that Lawrence could also take an unwelcome interest in the letters others were writing. Brett remembered him peering inquisitively at one she had been writing and exclaiming “Oh, how like a woman to hide her letters. Why do women always do that?” when she shuffled it away (Brett 62). As well as Brett herself, the “women” Lawrence may have had in mind here probably included Frieda, whom Mabel and Merrild both recalled asking them to help her correspond with her children (because it would anger Lawrence to find that she had done so) (Luhan 104; Merrild 139; Bynner 61). This open attitude to correspondence meant that the lack of privacy inherent in the postcard never seems to have bothered Lawrence as it did some critics of the postcard as a medium. Some of his earliest letters had been addressed to the Chambers family “in general”¹¹ and years of corresponding with publishers had perhaps made him more comfortable with the fact that the addressee of his letters sometimes would not have been the only reader of them. As he concluded a letter to Curtis Brown from Taormina: “Wonder if you are back from America – or if you are Miss Easterbrook” (4L 159).¹²

So, although sections of the public were wary of postcards because they imagined they would make it all too easy for other people to read their messages and private concerns,¹³ Lawrence was not one of them. His occasional self-consciousness when sending them seems to have occurred when he lacked either the time,

materials, inclination or emotional energy to write a letter. “Excuse post cards – I can’t find a sheet of note paper” (4L 470) he wrote to George Purnell on arriving in New Orleans from Mexico in July 1923. Although he had asked Brewster to “pardon” a “rag of a note” he had sent when leaving Chapala (4L 466), none of the other postcards he sent on the journey to New York contain any such self-consciousness about postcard correspondence. He had also asked Bessie Freeman to “Forgive the post-cards” (4L 421) on one of the ten “real photo” cards sent from Mexico City between 11-12 April, and, again, none of the other nine (including one to the Brewsters) contain any such apology. These apologies to Freeman and Purnell show Lawrence’s sensitivity to his correspondent’s feelings about postcards. As Frank Staff notes, “for many years the use of postcards was frowned upon by a certain class of person”¹⁴ and Purnell, at least, seems to have been one of Lawrence’s correspondents for whom this was true. “I remember how Dr Purnell hates postcards”, Lawrence wrote on one to his daughter, Idella, from Baden-Baden, “hope you don’t” (4L 579).¹⁵

Regardless of his correspondent, however, Lawrence does seem to have been concerned about how he presented himself in a letter. “I rival the Spoodle in rags of paper” he closed one to Bynner in July 1924 (5L 66), written on reporter-style lined notebook paper. His notes from the ranch throughout that year, especially those to William Hawk, show that letter-writing materials were a rare and valuable commodity. Written on paper torn to the size of the message – and, occasionally, on the reverse of a music programme from Paris (5L 44) and a shredded wheat advertisement (5L 82) – they show why postcards provided an attractive, neat, and cheap material for correspondence when travelling to and from his ranches.

Such “rags of paper” illustrate how the conditions of ranch life made correspondence for Lawrence harder to conduct than at any time before: isolation meant not only a lack of privacy when sending and receiving correspondence but also a lack of ready access to the materials necessary for letter-writing (on occasion,

William Hawk seems to have been responsible for stamping and posting his letters [5L, 44]). Moreover, the physical effort of ranch life also affected Lawrence's correspondence: "We lead such a strenuous life I get no letters written", he complained to Mary Cannan on their first move to Del Monte (4L 352); and again, this time to Seltzer, on first moving to Lobo: "naturally I don't write when I slave building the house – my arms feel so heavy, like a navvy's, though they look as thin as ever" (5L 45). Such manual labour might have occasioned more extended passages of correspondence from the younger Lawrence (such as those written to Blanche Jennings in the summer of 1908), but now writing as an older, married man, more honest (with himself) about his body, he lacked the energy and the correspondents to adopt the registers of his younger epistles, as well as the means on which to write "yards and yards and yards of letters" (1L 448).

Of course the major exertion, mentioned recurrently in the letter-writing of these years, and which had the most disruptive effect on it, was that of travel itself, and it was then that he often turned to writing postcards. Upon first arriving in San Francisco he sent postcards and letters on The Palace Hotel's headed notepaper, which was big enough to also have its own "post" (4L 289). His correspondence on his arrival in Taos was written exclusively on postcards, with the exception of letters to his American publisher and agent (which also show his location pictorially, being written on beautifully illustrated notepaper headed with the outline of Taos pueblo in yellow on the green scrub of the desert, behind which appears the blue of the sky and white cloud). Having arrived in America with "less than \$20" (4L 288), the expense of letter-writing paper, envelopes and stamps would not have been a priority either. The Cambridge Edition shows that it was customary for him to follow this pattern of sending postcards to his family and a few close friends with his first impressions of a place and (if settling there) an address for further correspondence upon arrival. It was a practice that was followed regularly after his departure from England in 1919, both when travelling to establish himself in a new

location or when going on an excursion from one. Read together, these postcards sum up Lawrence's mood and feeling about a place (such as the sequence sent from Orizaba on 21 April 1922), often summed up by a phrase he repeated to many correspondents ("had about enough of this" is the one used from Orizaba, just as the word "dazed" is repeated in his initial correspondence from Taos, or the word "buffeted" in his initial correspondence from Capri).

That said, Lawrence could take great care to write a personalised line for each correspondent when choosing to send many of them the same postcard and travel information simultaneously (the sequence sent exactly a month earlier on 21 March 1922 is a good example), or to specially select certain cards for certain correspondents (for example, the note-cards decorated with "wonderful Aztec feather-work" to resemble a swallow next to a hand-painted vine sent "nicely wrapped in tissue paper" to his niece, Margaret King, and the artist Knud Merrild [4L 509; Merrild 335]). Critics who suggest that the letters of this period should be read from a selected edition would do well to remember that it is not only the text of the correspondence itself that is important and from which judgements about Lawrence as a correspondent can be made.

The postcards Lawrence sent on and shortly after his first journey to Taos are worth consideration in themselves because, when compared with later cards, they are the basis from which we can interpret a change in Lawrence's choice of picture postcards during his time in the Americas. With the exception of letters 2591 and 2593 (half-tone black and white reproductions of photographs of Indians published by J. F. Collins of Santa Fe – where Lawrence probably bought them – sent upon his first arriving in Taos), the picture postcards Lawrence bought on his way to Taos (letters 2589a1,¹⁶ 2590, 2592) and whilst motoring to Apache country to see an Indian dance (letter 2606) were all published by the Detroit Publishing Company for The Fred Harvey Company.¹⁷ Originally the Detroit Photographic Company, in 1905 the firm became the Detroit Publishing Company, continuing to use the trade name

“Phostint” for its patented colour reproduction process, one which it used to produce cards for The Fred Harvey Company and which led it to become one of the largest and best quality American publishers of postcards and photographic views during the early decades of the twentieth century. In addition to their beautiful colour images, The Fred Harvey “Phostint” cards included a caption in the white border beneath the image and a short pre-printed paragraph or two on the “message” side of the back, giving the reader a little more information about the place pictured.

In most cases the pre-printed information simply supplements Lawrence’s message (which partly explains the lack or brevity of his descriptions of the places pictured). He clearly intended these pre-printed paragraphs to be part of his message and for his correspondents to read them because, although often pushed for space in a postcard, he was always careful to write around its pre-printed matter. However, the interaction of Lawrence’s message and the pre-printed text is not always so simple. Letter 2589a1, for example, contains one of Lawrence’s shortest postcard messages (unusual for a postcard to his nephew, which generally included a few lines of banter): “On the way across the desert of Arizona very hot love DHL”.¹⁸ The colour picture, however, is typical of those sent to him (the cards to his nephew seem to be chosen especially to excite the spirit of adventure, fun, and life in him, compared with other picture postcards sent at the same time): it shows two teamsters in conversation with two Indians in the left-foreground and the bony corpse of a horse in the right-foreground, behind which are three of their wagons descending a ridge in the right-middleground, and the desert and mountains in the background. The card’s pre-printed text is equally as exciting (especially when compared with the drier, more businesslike information pre-printed on letters 2590 and 2606).¹⁹

In the deserts of Arizona and California the mirage is often seen, and in some locations it is visible nearly every day of the year.

Broad lakes surrounded by fields of green, herds of cattle, houses, and tree-bordered streams frequently appear not far distant amid the sands and many a prospector or adventurer has been mislead by the apparent oases, only at last to find that the spreading trees and the sparkling water evade him, the valley that looked so green is as dry and barren as the trail he left, and that he has been in the pursuit of a mirage.

To a seven-year old boy, pictures of cowboys and Indians sent from an uncle in the Wild West must have been incredibly exciting. All the more so if he had been able to understand the subtle way in which Lawrence's message weaves into the printed one. One can imagine how Lawrence might have liked the idea of symbolically becoming one such "adventurer" for his nephew, as he made his own way "across the desert of Arizona". If this is perhaps too complex a reading for a seven-year old, the irony of the card's pre-printed text would not have been lost on his mother, Ada. Although addressed to his nephew, the card is as much a message to his sister acknowledging that his own journeying across the desert may also be in pursuit of a mirage, through a combination of his own message and that printed on the card.²⁰

His overnight journey direct from San Francisco on "The California Limited" would have taken him through a number of towns on his way to Lamy (including "Clarkdale" and "Holbrook", which may have caught his eye) and along a significant stretch of the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe (ATSF) Railway network, one closely associated with The Fred Harvey Company. In 1897, "Harvey took over the news stands for the ATSF Railroad and began distributing postcards".²¹ These, along with the hotels and restaurants that, by 1922, were numerous became a significant part of the Harvey marketing machine. As Marta Weigle writes: "Capitalizing on the technology of the train and later the automobile, the popular world's fair performance tradition, and contemporary notions of tourism, the Santa Fe/Harvey system presented the Southwest as no longer a savage desert but variously

salutary, educational, heroic, and finally a ludic region similar to Walt Disney World's Magic Kingdom and EPCOT Center".²² Nothing could be more different from the way in which Lawrence presented the desert in his letters and postcards.²³

His attitude to the company can be judged, in part, by his behaviour in the Harvey House at Albuquerque when he, Frieda, Tony and Mabel stopped there on the way to the Snake Dance in August 1924 (Luhan 234-5). In his time spent journeying to Taos and about the Santa Fe region he would have seen first-hand how the "closely-linked Santa Fe/Harvey Corporations appropriated, displayed, and marketed the cultures of the Native American and, to a lesser extent, the Spanish colonial and Anglo (primarily hunter/trapper/prospector) Southwest".²⁴ Brett's uncomplicated memory that they ran out "to the Harvey houses" (Brett 41) on their journey to Taos from New York in March 1924 and lack of mention of the company in Lawrence's correspondence suggests that his attitude to the company was slow to build. It is revealing, however, that none of the fifteen picture postcards Lawrence sent "from various trading posts" (Brett 143) between 14-20 August on the way to the Snake Dance were Fred Harvey Company cards (and unsurprisingly, being in Harvey country, there would have been a variety of their cards depicting the dance in plentiful supply). Of the fifteen, those dated 14 August 1924 are black and white "real photo" cards of Indian pueblos or rituals; those dated 15-20 August are colour printed cards published by Curt Teich in their American Art series.²⁵ Like the Fred Harvey "Phostint" cards, these were beautifully produced and included pre-printed information to supplement the caption and image. The card showing the "Hopi Snake Priest Entering Snake Kiva, Oraibi, Arizona" was one such card and the one most frequently sent on the excursion (sent to five of his thirteen correspondents during the trip, and to John Middleton Murry ten days later when sending him the 'Hopi Snake Dance' article). That Lawrence preferred to send this card to six correspondents rather than the one of 'The Hopi Snake Dance' itself (sent only to Adele Seltzer) is more than likely due to the

language of its pre-printed information. Whereas the pre-printed material on the “Hopi Snake Priest Entering Snake Kiva, Oraibi, Arizona” card primarily informs the reader about Hopi language, ritual and culture, that on ‘The Hopi Snake Dance’ card Lawrence may have found an exercise in cultural othering and marketing as questionable as that of The Fred Harvey Company’s marketing of the Indian.²⁶ Although no mention of his turn against Fred Harvey’s cards is made in the text of the correspondence itself, by examining the picture postcards themselves we can see him expressing his distaste for the company responsible for the mass commodification of Indian culture through the silent but telling choices of the brands and kinds of postcards he bought. It is not too strong to suggest, given his self-awareness that he was introducing his correspondents to and educating them about Indian culture through the picture postcards he sent, that here his choice of picture postcards from the Americas takes on ethical and political dimensions.

Lawrence’s preference for Curt Teich rather than Fred Harvey picture postcards can be seen as part of a broader change in the kinds of postcards that he sent from the Americas. Unlike the trip from San Francisco to Taos in September 1922, on which he bought and later sent a series of Fred Harvey cards, he sent no cards on his journey from New York to Taos in March 1924. Moreover, none of the picture postcards that he sent the following month, when he attended the dance at Taos on 10 April and went on an excursion to another on 23 April, or the pair of cards he sent on 30 July, are mass market picture postcards. More and more frequently during his time in the Americas, Lawrence used photographs and “real photo” postcards, the cards he posted instead on these occasions in April and July 1924 being good examples.

III. “Real Photo” Postcards

In contrast to the vast majority of commercial postcards, such as those of Harvey and Teich that were often reproductions of original photographs “printed in ink from lithographic stone, metal, or glass plates, or by letterpress halftone”, real photo cards were actual

photographs, “positive prints developed from glass plate or film negatives onto heavy sensitized photo stock, cut to postcard size ... As original photographs, some matte some glossy in finish, they differ from printed reproductions in their continuous tone and lack of dot or grain pattern”.²⁷ Cards such as that of his home in Taos sent to Mountsier (letter 2657)²⁸ or a view of Valdez sent to Ada (letter 2706) are examples of his use of real photo cards early in his time in America. They are typical of the real photo repertoire in that their subjects are an ordinary building and a local view, rather than “well known landmarks or public sites”. Whereas mechanically produced cards were “primarily directed to tourists”, the market for these cards was generally the “home market” and the term “real photo” was one used by their makers to emphasize their “authenticity and to distinguish their cards from the abundance of photomechanically reproduced and printed cards dominating the market”.²⁹ The local, small-scale production of these cards by amateur artists who knew the regions and subjects they photographed intimately would surely have endeared these cards to Lawrence.

That said, the majority of the real photo cards that Lawrence sent were taken by his friends. In 1902, Kodak “introduced photo stock specifically for postcards” and between 1903-41 “produced various models of 3A camera that used postcard size film” (3.25 x 5.5 inches).³⁰ Both Witter Bynner and Dorothy Brett owned and used Kodak cameras to record their journeys with Lawrence in the Americas, and Lawrence, in turn, used their photographs to send to correspondents in both America and Europe.³¹ Their photographs, which Lawrence used as postcards, have the characteristic AZO stamp on the back of them, identifying them as Kodak processed. The backs of these photographs are printed with the heading POST CARD beneath which appear the words CORRESPONDENCE and ADDRESS (although, unlike mass-produced printed cards, there is no line dividing the back) and the edges of the PLACE STAMP HERE box are formed from the word AZO, effectively transforming the photograph into a postcard. AZO by Kodak was one of the most

frequently used postcard paper stocks, was slightly less expensive than their other brand “Velox”, and of all the postcard paper stocks seems to have been “the most popular”.³² These real photo cards allowed Lawrence to give his correspondents a more intimate insight into his life in the Americas, although unlike mass-produced printed cards he tended not to send them openly through the post, preferring instead to place them in envelopes.

In *Journey With Genius*, Bynner remembered how Lawrence “beamed at the camera” when he took his photograph in one of the cloisters of an old monastery, San Agustin Acolman, on the way to Teotihuacan (Bynner 23). He also recalled how it felt touristy to photograph one another on the pyramids when they got there and that they “photographed one another on burros” at Atlixco (Bynner 24, 43). His comments suggest that Lawrence also took a number of photographs (that of Frieda, Willard Johnson, and Bynner posing outside Bynner’s house in Santa Fe among them). However none of these seem to have been used as postcards, and neither (sadly) has the photograph of them on the burros been located. What is more, according to Bynner, Lawrence also accompanied him “several times” to have photographs developed at the Kodak Shop in Guadalajara, and witnessed Bynner’s insistence that the prints be developed “with a dull finish” (Bynner 153). Although Lawrence would later react against the Kodak and “Kodak-vision” in his essay ‘Art and Morality’, in his first sojourn in Mexico at least he seems to have been active in and enjoyed the taking and production of the photographs he used as postcards.

As David Ellis says, it is a “tribute” to the frequently antagonistic relationship between Bynner and Lawrence that the former as photographer managed to “relax” his subject and make him “willing to present himself to the camera rather than hide from it”³³ (although, in Frieda’s opinion, Johnson was a better photographer than either Bynner or Lawrence [5L 132]). Almost all of Bynner’s photographs are posed but few are awkward: the one Lawrence sent of himself, Frieda, and Johnson with the two Mexican chauffeurs crouching in front of them being one of the

exceptions. This, among other photographs, was sent to various correspondents, although the most charming, spontaneous, and intimate of Bynner's photographs do not seem to have been used in this way (the one of them with the Purnells in Chapala [reproduced in 4L] or that of Frieda running out onto the lake [reproduced as fig. 12 in Ellis' biography] for instance). Lawrence's postcards of the lake (letters 2837 and 2840) and its shore (2839) also contrast sharply with the portraits taken of the four of them, and they do not include any of the identifying Kodak stamps mentioned above. According to Bynner, Lawrence disliked the postcard vendors at the lake, who "tried to penetrate anywhere with their packets of postcards" so these cards may have been bought instead from Pepe Sanchez who ran an open-air pavilion with tables for drinkers just across from the Hotel Arzapalo and who was "an expert photographer, whose prints of Chapala are a selective artistic record of its aspects in those years" (Bynner 129, 93).

In the essay 'Taos', written soon after his first arrival there, Lawrence documents an altercation between a young American girl with a Kodak and an Indian after she has taken a photo of him helping to erect a maypole because she "ain't allowed take no snaps here". The episode illustrates the difficulty of obtaining photographs of Indian subjects, a fact corroborated by Merrild's memoir: "'Big Chief says you cannot photograph in pueblo'" (Merrild 20-22). The real photo cards sent by Lawrence upon his return there in 1924 demonstrate he had no such problem, and consequently he could give his correspondents a unique and intimate insight into his life in Taos: "See these dancers?", he wrote to his mother-in-law on one sent as part of the sequence on 10 April, "We know all of them" (letter 3103). His continued association with Mabel and Tony seems to have allowed him to provide his correspondents with such rare snapshots into Indian life in a way he might not otherwise have been able to: Mabel, he told Edith Isaacs, could lend her pictures to accompany his article on the Snake Dance (letter 3223). In the end, these pictures of the Snake Dance were not used as postcards. However, after thanking Mabel

for some “photographs” on 29 July, he sent two real photo postcards of Taos Indians the following day (letters 3178-9), making her the likely source of these cards. Moreover, in spite of Brett’s memory that “huge notices” were hung up at the entrance to the Pueblo of Santo Domingo, where they attended the dances, to say that “No photographing” would be permitted (Brett 61), the cards sent to Carswell and Gertler on 23 April of the Deer Dance are also real photo cards of the event (5L 36).³⁴

Brett’s own photographs of their time in Oaxaca at the end of the year were frequently used as postcards. Compared with Bynner’s photographs, hers are far more spontaneous with far fewer posed shots (the Lawrences are sometimes caught off guard in them). Whereas Bynner’s photographs are exclusively portraits of various members of their party in Mexico, Brett’s document some of the street life they encountered there too: “I take many photographs”, she recalled, “the Indians are always willing to be taken” (Brett 175). Lawrence’s references to the photographs themselves in his messages on them sometimes take a disparaging tone about Brett’s “attempts” at photography (something he had not done with Bynner’s) but he sent a number of them nonetheless and they certainly allowed him to exchange photographs with his family – as he had begun to do at the end of the summer (letters 3219, 3349, 3449) – and thereby keep in touch more easily and intimately than he had sometimes felt they had. For him, postcards were an essential medium to achieve this: “even a postcard lets one know that all is well” (letter 3221). The real photo cards from Oaxaca allowed him to educate and entertain his nieces and were also the ideal medium for short comedic scenes based on their pictures (such as that on Corasmin and the parrots sent on the reverse of the picture of them in their garden [letter 3317]). Brett’s more informal photographs provided the platform for this in a way that Bynner’s did not. Lawrence’s enthusiasm for using Brett’s photographs as postcards may have been enhanced by his meeting with the photographer Edward Weston in Mexico City on 4 November. On 20 November, Lawrence wrote to Edward McDonald to say he

thought Weston's photographs of him were "good" and from the following day sent a steady stream of Brett's photographs as postcards. Weston himself had been an itinerant "real photo" photographer working in California in 1906, using a postcard camera and developing his prints on the spot for a small fee.³⁵

IV. Conclusion

Sean Matthews is astute in his observation that Lawrence's postcards are "like e-mails. Wherever he is he sends a postcard, a little record of what he's observed".³⁶ It is an especially good analogy in that, just as the present-day traveller checks in to an internet cafe to update his friends and family with e-mails and picture messages, Lawrence checked in to the various trading posts, newsstands, and Harvey establishments that he passed when on the go to pick up a postcard to send to them, or, when with Bynner, to develop the photographs he would later use as postcards. These real photo cards are the early twentieth-century equivalent of the mobile phone picture message.

As I have tried to show, however, Lawrence's selection and use of picture postcards was a little more complex than the image of the easy-going traveller set out above. The short letter from which this essay takes its title is one of a number written in late August and September 1923 in which Lawrence tells his correspondents that he "can't write letters" (letter 2890).³⁷ But, at the same time, these comments coincide with a stream of postcards, sent mainly to Frieda and his mother-in-law, after Frieda had sailed from New York without him. As we have seen, postcards provided an outlet for correspondence when travelling, or, as in the sequence from Orizaba on 21 April 1923, when his reaction against the spirit of a place seemed to inhibit his letter-writing, although this is by no means unique to his correspondence from the Americas: "Pardon the p.c." he wrote to Kot from Thirroul, "I can't bring myself to write letters here". His comments about letter-writing, on the one hand, and his postcard correspondence, on the other, both in September 1923, demonstrate the impact of mood on his

correspondence in general and show that postcards provided a rapid, less formal and more detached form of communication when he lacked either the time or the feeling necessary to write a letter. Mabel and Frieda both record, albeit jealously, that Lawrence kept up a correspondence with people he did not really like (specifically on postcards in Mabel's account) (Luhan 113-4; Bynner 62; Foster 150).

Despite being impatient to receive letters, two letters soon after his arrival in Taos underline the importance feeling played in his letter-writing. "When you feel moved to it, write again", he told E. M. Forster in September 1922 (4L 301). He said almost the same to Willard Johnson the following month: "Don't bother about apologies: one writes when the spirit moves" (4L 331). Similarly, although he told a number of his correspondents that he destroyed letters upon receiving them, he also wrote in his letters of the period that he was glad to take them with him in his mind (4L 499) and even that through their correspondence he and his mother-in-law could, in a sense, travel together, "travel, in spite of age" (4L 590).

It seems that he may have actually saved postcards that he particularly liked on his travels, too, and sent them when necessary. For example, on 16 March 1923, he sent one German and three Sardinian postcards to inform his sisters, mother-in-law, and Kot that he was leaving Del Monte for Mexico City. A study of the picture postcards is important for the reader to understand Lawrence as a correspondent in the Americas and can help to illuminate the biographical records of his time there. For example, the carving that Mabel records Lawrence and Brett making of a "Garden of Eden, an apple tree with red apples on it, a *huge* serpent, and a brown Adam and Eve on either side of the tree" describes almost exactly the picture of the card Lawrence sent to Brett on 29 January 1924 (4L 565; Luhan 161).

Through its "everyday subject matter, small scale, and especially its sender's written message, the photographic card achieves a persuasive relationship and intimacy"³⁸ with its recipients. This is true of Lawrence's use of real photo cards, both those taken by his

friends and those which he bought. Lawrence increasingly turned to these cards as an intimate and visual means of showing his correspondents (his) life in the Americas. The colour-printed, mass-produced cards and the colourful illustrated stationary on which he wrote his early letters from America also establish that, from his arrival there, he wanted to provide his correspondents with access to a world they might never otherwise see through the pictures of the cards he sent them. Whereas his earlier letters have been celebrated for their descriptions of place and landscape, in these years Lawrence was less inclined to write these into his correspondence (“I thought of stopping off at Yosemite Valley but feel – oh damn scenery” [4L 288]). The picture postcards, then, conveniently substitute in for this aspect of his correspondence and, in his increasing preference for real photo rather than mass-produced printed cards, are the pictorial equivalents of his intimate, detailed descriptions of scenery in his earlier letters.

To receive a letter from Lawrence was both memorable and important. Frieda wrote (jokingly) to her mother that Thomas Seltzer would only let Adele read the letters they received from Lawrence if she had “clean hands” (4L 396) and Merrild “treasured” certain letters from Lawrence and remembered that, when he and Götzsche parted ways in the Autumn of 1923, they divided among themselves the letters that Lawrence had written to them jointly (Merrild 307, 329). Although the prevailing critical trend has been to regard Lawrence’s postcards as anomalous, repetitive, and utilitarian features of his correspondence (in comparison with his “letter-writing proper”), that so many of these postcards have been preserved underlines how, for their recipients, they were the personalised, intimate snapshots of life that Lawrence intended them to be. That so many of these picture postcards now grace the scholarly volumes of Lawrence’s letters is a testament to the important role they played in his correspondence, the extent to which these little windows into their writer’s world were cherished by their recipients, and is evidence that they should continue to be cherished, studied, and taken seriously by his critics.

¹ Aldous Huxley, *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*, ed. and introd. Aldous Huxley (London: Heinemann, 1932), xxxiii-xxxiv.

² Cf. Philip Hobsbaum, rev. of 4L in *The Yearbook of English Studies: Literature in the Modern Media: Radio, Film, and Television Special Number*, vol. 20 (1990), 335; Karen McLeod Hewitt, rev. of 5L in *The Review of English Studies: New Series*, vol. 42, no. 165 (February, 1991), 137; Philip Hobsbaum, rev. of 5L in *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 86, no. 3 (July 1991), 686.

³ Cf. Hobsbaum, rev. of 4L, 335; Karen McLeod Hewitt, rev. of 4L in *The Review of English Studies: New Series*, vol. 40, no. 158 (May 1989), 293; Lyndall Gordon, rev. of 4L in *Times Literary Supplement* (16 October 1987), 1142.

⁴ R. P. Draper, rev. of 4L in *Durham University Journal* (June 1988), 359.

⁵ David Bradshaw, rev. of 5L in *Times Literary Supplement* (17 November 1989), 1260.

⁶ Paul Delany, “‘Giving Your Self Away’: Lawrence’s Letters in Context’, in *Editing D. H. Lawrence: New Versions of a Modern Author*, ed. Dennis Jackson and Charles L. Ross (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1995), 176.

⁷ My account in the first three paragraphs of part I relies on Frank Staff’s *The Picture Postcard and its Origins* (London: Lutterworth, 1966), 46-76.

⁸ Qtd. in Staff, 78-9.

⁹ Richard Storey, ‘Letters of D. H. Lawrence’, *Notes and Queries* 27.6 (December 1980), 531.

¹⁰ In this and subsequent sections I refer to the following memoirs by using the surname of the author: Dorothy Brett, *Lawrence and Brett: A Friendship* (London: Secker, 1933); Mabel Dodge Luhan, *Lorenzo in Taos* (London: Secker, 1933); Knud Merrild, *A Poet and Two Painters: A Memoir of D. H. Lawrence* (London: Routledge, 1938); Witter Bynner, *Journey With Genius: Recollections and Reflections Concerning the D. H. Lawrences* (London: Nevill, 1953); Joseph Foster, *D. H. Lawrence in Taos* (n.p.: U of New Mexico P, 1972).

¹¹ Jessie Chambers, *D. H. Lawrence: A Personal Record* by E. T. (1935; Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980), 28.

¹² Angela Easterbrook was Curtis Brown’s secretary (cf. 4L 153 n.1).

¹³ Staff, 47.

¹⁴ Ibid., 46.

¹⁵ Although Lawrence had asked the Brewsters to “pardon” his note on a “p.c.” because he had no envelope when arriving in Baden-Baden in late spring 1921 (3L 711), that he didn’t feel the need to apologise in Mexico for corresponding with them on real photo cards (4L 421, 444) but did apologise for his “rag of a note” (4L 466) suggests that they were less snobbish about receiving and sending postcards than Purnell and Freeman and that Lawrence’s pledge to them “I will write a letter from the country” (4L 471) on a postcard from New York is a reflection of his being conscious of not having corresponded with them as frequently, amusingly, or extensively as he had throughout 1921-2, rather than an indication of the Brewsters feelings about postcards per se. Interestingly, however, one reason Lawrence gave for this was their not having replied to the “card” with which he answered Achsah’s letter (4L 444). The place of postcards as constituting a full reply in a sequence of correspondence by letter seems to have been in doubt.

¹⁶ I refer here to letter 2589a sent to John Clarke, which appears on page 23 of *JDHLS*, 1.1 (2006), not the letter of the same number (2589a) sent to Frieda’s mother, which appears on p. 55 of 8L. To avoid confusion in this and further discussion, I number that sent to Lawrence’s nephew 2589a1 and that sent to his mother-in-law 2589a2. 2589a1 precedes 2589a2 because in the former Lawrence writes that he is “On the way across the desert of Arizona” whereas in the latter he has travelled further east to Albuquerque, the “first station in New Mexico”.

¹⁷ Images of these cards can be viewed in the New York Public Library’s Digital Gallery at these permalinks: ‘A Mirage on the Arizona Desert’ (letters 2589a1 and 2592):

<http://digita gallery.nypl.org/nypldigital/id?70471>

‘The Church, Pueblo of Laguna’ (letters 2590 and 2606):

<http://digita gallery.nypl.org/nypldigital/id?75825> .

Letters 2589a2, 2604, and 2606a that were bought on Lawrence’s journeys to Taos and the Apache Dance obviously bear on the discussion above. However, being in private collections, I have not been able to establish whether they were, in fact, Fred Harvey Company picture postcards. The generic captions of letters 2589a2 and 2606a make it difficult to suggest a probable image. The distinctive caption of letter 2604 makes it likely that it was this Fred Harvey card:

<http://digita gallery.nypl.org/nypldigital/id?68979> .

¹⁸ *JDHLS*, 1.1 (2006), 23.

¹⁹ The pre-printed text of letters 2590 and 2606 reads: "This Pueblo is 66 miles west of Albuquerque and lies at an altitude of 5786 feet. The population is about 1200. It is the youngest of the New Mexican Pueblos, its population being originally recruited from Acoma, Zuni and Cochite in 1699. It is usually the point of departure for the pueblo of Acoma which lies fourteen miles distant on the South. All Santa Fe trains run directly past it."

²⁰ Lawrence was already familiar with postcards giving pre-printed information about their image and had used them to similar effect before arriving in America. As early as November 1908, he sent a postcard of "Picturesque Devon, Bickleigh Vale, Nr Plymouth" to Mabel Limb which included pre-printed text rhapsodising on the "delicate foliage" and carpets of "bluebells and anemones" there in the spring. It is interesting that Lawrence's expression of nostalgia and homesickness for Eastwood at Christmastime should be sent from London and sparked by and written on a card that depicts spring in Devon and mentions two flowers which throughout his life he loved and associated with his home town in both letters and fiction ("Dearest Mab, Doesn't this picture remind you of the old days!"). Here, image, pre-printed text and written message interact in a number of complex ways to underscore his distance from Eastwood and his early life there.

²¹ The Metropolitan Postcard Club of New York City, "Fred Harvey Trading Co. 1897-1968, Kansas City, MO":

<http://www.metropostcard.com/publishersh1.html> .

²² Marta Weigle, "From Desert to Disney World: The Santa Fe Railway and the Fred Harvey Company Display the Indian Southwest", *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 41.1 (Spring, 1989), 115.

²³ In the letters written on first arriving in Taos, Lawrence made several attempts to capture the colourful natural life of the "so-called desert" (4L 313). The sequence of picture postcards sent from Palm Springs on 25-6 September 1923, show just how differently Lawrence and the Harvey Company saw the desert and sum up well Lawrence's feeling that the desert had kept its "untouched fierceness" (Brett 160). These cards are all black and white "real photo" cards of desert and cactus; fitting images to the descriptions given by him of its "pale whitish desert – a bit deathly", in sharp contrast to the "silliness" of Los Angeles and the postcards he had sent of its parks a fortnight earlier. The language in which Lawrence wrote

about America drying up the “springs of one’s soul” (letters 2921-2) reflects his experience of its west coast. Their tone is nothing like the “cheery look-into-the-future with-bright-eyes touch” he found in Idella Purnell’s Californian letters (5L 273).

²⁴ Weigle, 115.

²⁵ I have not been able to establish whether this is unequivocally true of letter 3207 because it is in a private collection. However, it does fall in the middle of the sequence of Curt Teich cards sent by Lawrence between 15-20 August, so it is almost certainly one such card.

²⁶ The pre-printed matter of the card captioned “Hopi Snake Dance, Arizona” (letter 3203) reads: “That the Hopi Indians are the most primitive people and their almost inaccessible homes the most primitive to be found in the United States is conceded by all travellers. The snake dance, which takes place in August, is a pagan ceremony giving thanks for rain and bounteous harvests. The venomous snakes, like rattlers, are in no way treated to make them harmless. The Indians have an antidote for snake poison which no white man may know. The dancers are often bitten by rattle-snakes without fatal results”. The pre-printed matter of the cards captioned ‘Hopi Snake Priest Entering Snake Kiva, Oraibi, Arizona’ (letters 3202, 3204, 3208, 3209, 3210, 3217) reads: “The Snake Kiva (or sacred dwelling) is the depository for the snakes collected during eight days prior to the ceremony, where they are stored in Jars. The Priests enter naked except a loin cloth bearing a bundle of food, a snake whip and a bag of meal, and handles the reptiles with the utmost unconcern”.

²⁷ Rosamond Vaule, *As We Were: American Photographic Postcards, 1905-1930* (Boston: Godine, 2004), 21-2.

²⁸ Although this is the only real photo postcard of his home “festooned with red chilis”, Lawrence was obviously fond of the image and sent the Curt Teich picture postcard of ‘Chili (Red Pepper) Drying in Front of Adobe Home’ on numerous occasions (letters 3206, 3268, 3429). The interaction between printed and “real photo” cards is interesting in other sequences too. For example, the printed cards of sunny scenes when crossing into and out of Mexico sent to Bynner (letters 2758, 2859) allude to umbrellas and the incident of Frieda’s forgetting them on the journey to Mexico (Bynner 18). That Frieda is pictured in many of Bynner’s photographs “wielding” her umbrella is perhaps more evidence of it being a continued joke between them.

²⁹ Vaule, 23.

³⁰ Ibid., 53.

³¹ During the trip to Mexico with Bynner, between April-June 1923, Lawrence sent almost twice as many real photo cards to correspondents in Europe than in America; in a similar three month period, during the trip with Brett, between October-December 1924, he sent only marginally more real photo cards to Europe than to America.

³² Vaule, 55.

³³ David Ellis, *D. H. Lawrence: Dying Game 1922-1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998), 103.

³⁴ Again, since letter 3117, also sent on 23 April, is in a private collection, I have not been able to establish whether it, too, is in fact a real photo card, although it is highly likely.

³⁵ Vaule, 105-6.

³⁶ 'Cards From a Man of Letters: A New View of D. H. Lawrence', *The Times* (17 August 2007), 23.

³⁷ Cf. Letters 2865, 2912, 2914, 2927.

³⁸ Vaule, 35.

OUT OF PLACE: COLONIAL AUSTRALIANS IN *ST. MAWR*

DAVID GAME

St. Mawr is not usually read for its engagement with Australia, and criticism has overlooked the significance of its Australian characters, Rico and the Manby sisters. It concludes what I have termed elsewhere Lawrence's "Australian period",¹ which is delineated by the four novels and a novella published between 1920 and 1925, all of which contain Australian characters. The period begins with his first Australian character, Dr Alexander Graham in *The Lost Girl* (1920), continues with Francis Dekker in *Aaron's Rod* (1922), through the numerous Australian characters in the fully Australian novels *Kangaroo* (1923) and *The Boy in the Bush* (1924), and ends with Rico and the Manbys in the novella *St. Mawr*, published in 1925. The Australian period also includes the poem 'Kangaroo'. If we include the posthumously published *Mr Noon*, with its passing reference to Australia, we may say that all the long fiction Lawrence wrote in this period, to varying extents, engages with Australia. In this essay, I will argue that in *St. Mawr* Lawrence expands on the largely negative characteristics he attributes to Australians in their homeland in *Kangaroo* and *The Boy in the Bush*. In *St. Mawr* he registers a fear that expatriate Australians, with their obsessive attachment to the material trappings of modernity and their desire to pursue a 'fast' and superficially 'English' existence in the English countryside, are a blight on the social fabric of a society which is itself already threatened by similar forces from within. The novella associates Australianness with modern and degenerative social attitudes. In *St. Mawr* Lawrence continues the critique of Australian society expressed in *Kangaroo* and *The Boy in the Bush*, which stemmed from his experience of Australia. The largely negative portrayal of

Australian characters in these works is a stark reversal of the optimism with which he presented Australians in *The Lost Girl* and *Aaron's Rod*, written prior to his visit in 1922.

It is useful to first consider *St. Mawr* in the context of Lawrence's total fictional engagement with Australia, which extends either side of his Australian period, spanning virtually his entire writing life. In 'The Vicar's Garden', written in 1907, one of the vicar's sons "died of thirst in Australia" (*VicG* 8). Annable the gamekeeper in *The White Peacock* (1911) recounts ironically that he "was proved to have died" in Australia (*WP* 151), only to disconcertingly reappear like Dickens's Magwitch. In *The Daughter-in-Law*, written in early 1913, the brothers Joe and Luther consider emigrating from England to Australia to resolve their respective economic and personal predicaments (*Plays* 305, 338). In 'The Primrose Path', written in 1913 and later revised, the morally corrupt Daniel Sutton, modelled on Lawrence's uncle (*EME* 246), is rendered more contemptible because of his boasting of the "money" to be had in Sydney (*EME* 124). With Dr Alexander Graham in *The Lost Girl*, "an Australian who had been in Edinburgh taking his medical degree" (*LG* 22) and whom the insular English midlands folks (apparently alluding to his aboriginal roots) call "the darkie" (*LG* 23), Lawrence explores the possibility of Alvina Houghton's entering into a regenerative, impliedly inter-racial marriage. In *Aaron's Rod*, the Australian Francis Dekker is "tall and handsome and well coloured" in contrast to his "thin" English companion "shattered by the war" (*AR* 186). An Edenic, alpine region of Europe is associated with "the wilds of Australia" in *Mr Noon* (*MN* 255), most of which Lawrence wrote between November 1920 and February 1921.² Following *Kangaroo*, *The Boy in the Bush* and *St. Mawr*, in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, published in 1928, Constance wonders whether she and Mellors might live in "Australia" (*LCL* 215), but he remarks bitterly that "the colonies aren't far enough" (*LCL* 220). Later that year Lawrence provided comments and some new text for M. L. Skinner's unpublished Australian novel 'Eve in the Land of Nod'.

It is also important to note that Lawrence, throughout his life, referenced Australia in his letters, first to his sister Ada, in 1911, where he mentions an Australian acquaintance returning home (*IL* 324), and finally in three letters written on 12 February 1930, two weeks before his death, including to Maria Huxley, to whom he described the mimosa at Bandol as blooming “in clouds – like Australia” (*7L* 646), and to Mrs Morland, where he considered that she “would like Australia, where Spring is in August”.³ The Australians in *St. Mawr*, therefore, are not isolated, casual creations but must be viewed as part of an important continuum, and reflective of Lawrence’s repeated attempts to come to terms with a country whose landscape he believed displayed great natural beauty and regenerative possibilities, but whose society he found derivative, degenerate and exemplifying a host of negative attributes he associated with industrial modernity.

Lawrence wrote *St. Mawr* in America in the summer of 1924. Only a few months earlier, on 3 March 1924, he had informed Mollie Skinner that their Australian novel *The Boy in the Bush* “is in the printer’s hands” (*4L* 596). It is generally assumed that *The Boy* represents Lawrence’s fictional closure with Australia. It is *St. Mawr*, however, with its Australian characters Rico and the Manby sisters, which concludes Lawrence’s major fictional engagement with Australia. While *St. Mawr* is not set in Australia it is, nevertheless, in important respects about Australia, just as it is also concerned with both England and America. In *St. Mawr* we do not find an Australia richly and imaginatively evoked, as we do in *Kangaroo* and *The Boy*, but the novella must be bracketed with these novels as partly Australian and thereby completing if not an Australian trilogy, then an Australian trifecta. As with his two previous novels, in *St. Mawr* Lawrence continues to expose what he sees as the limitations of the modern industrial civilisation which he experienced in Australia. Like *The Boy*, *St. Mawr* concludes with the protagonist seeking regeneration in a pre-industrial, new world environment, although the new locus for this vision is North America, rather than Western Australia. The remote New Mexico

locale of the latter part of *St. Mawr* is, however, in many respects, also a re-statement of the more abstracted landscape of the north-west of Western Australia which Lawrence evokes in *The Boy*. While *St. Mawr* most obviously exemplifies important elements of Lawrence's general concerns at the trajectories of the English and American civilisations, the Australian characters remind us that Australia is a third Anglophone domain – provincially English on the one hand, as we find in *Kangaroo*, yet like America, also a new world society. If, as John Worthen notes, *St. Mawr* is "Lawrence's first novel of North America",⁴ it is also Lawrence's last novel about Australia. While we must agree with David Ellis that *St. Mawr* is, like Forster's *A Passage to India*, "a satire of English civilisation",⁵ we must also acknowledge the Australian strand of that civilisation, which Lawrence found to be so disappointing.⁶ *St. Mawr*, therefore, offers a striking critique of three Anglophone societies, and is the product of Lawrence's sequential experiences of Australia, America and England over a relatively short period of time.

Contexts and Continuities

Lawrence's itinerary in late 1923 and early 1924 provides an important context for his writing of *St. Mawr*. On 14 December 1923 he returned to England after his first sojourn in America, having written most of *The Boy in the Bush*, and immediately felt "like a wild animal in a trap" (4L 542). His relationship with Frieda was also severely strained – she had gone ahead of him to England. Once in England himself Lawrence was anxious to continue to work on *The Boy* (4L 544), and informed Mollie Skinner that "it's awfully good" (4L 557). His recollections of Australia must have occupied a great part of his thoughts at this time. So too America, to which he wanted to return "in the Spring" (4L 543). Lawrence left England for America on 5 March 1924 (4L 599), and *St. Mawr*, which he was writing by June 1924 (SM xxiv), is very much an amalgam of this period of flux, between the end of 1923 and early

1924, when he was uniquely preoccupied with England, Australia and America.

Paul Eggert observes that Lawrence penned a new final chapter of *The Boy* in London, whereas the bulk of the novel was written earlier in America; Eggert sees this as a “fresh start: it is another attempt to unlock the dilemma – to show that extremes are liveable by Jack’s establishing a colony in the Northwest [of Australia].”⁷ Lawrence, however, although still writing of Australia at the end of 1923, had by then been away from the country for over sixteen months. He had, meanwhile, experienced New Mexico, Mexico and California and been stimulated to introduce new characters into *The Boy*. In London, Dorothy Brett agreed to accompany Lawrence and Frieda back to America (4L 596), and he back-filled her into the novel in the figure of Hilda Blessington (BB 432). It is apparent also that while Lawrence was finishing *The Boy* there was an element of convergence in his regenerative visions of Australia and America, with the eventual shift towards the latter in *St. Mawr*. Lawrence’s trek through the dry landscape of southern California and western Mexico may well have stimulated his recall of the Australian bush.⁸ The convergence also caused Lawrence minor confusion. In *The Boy*, Gran Ellis keeps English “half-sovereigns” and “half-crowns” hidden away (BB 267), while Tom, visiting Perth, impossibly has only a “couple o’ dollars” (BB 236), a leakage of American currency into the text. Lawrence’s “fresh start” at Australia in *The Boy*, may also be seen as the beginning of a fresh look at America as well – he had written the first draft of ‘Quetzalcoatl’ in mid-1923. *The Boy*’s last chapter on Australia, where Jack again encounters Hilda, anticipates the later wilderness horse rides in ‘The Woman Who Rode Away’ and ‘The Princess’, set in America, as well as the centrality of the horse St. Mawr in the later novella. Eggert does not identify linkages between *The Boy* and *St. Mawr*, but his overarching discussion of Lawrence’s provisionality and “re-vision” at the end of *The Boy* provides a valuable lens for looking at the way *St. Mawr* and *The Boy* may be connected:

Such revision is indeed re-vision, and there is no intrinsic reason why it should stop there, except that Lawrence lived by his pen, and looked to publication (in this case, to make money for himself and Mollie Skinner). Nevertheless the point stands: only the constraints of publishing schedules give an appearance of fixity to a process that was essentially ongoing.⁹

Seen in this light, Lawrence's vision of Australia portrayed in *The Boy* is "ongoing" in *St. Mawr*. Eggert also notes that by the final chapter of *The Boy* Lawrence "was surer where he stood in relation to Jack's rejection of civilised society".¹⁰ This takes him to the remote north-west of Australia. The trajectory of Jack's rejection of "civilised society" in Australia is continued in *St. Mawr* in Lou Witt's rejection of her husband, the over-civilised Rico, and her flight from England to the mountains of New Mexico, where Jack Grant in *The Boy* would have, as it were, been equally at home as in the Australian bush.

Identifying the Australian Presence

There is no record of Lawrence making reference to the Australian presence in his novella, and this has served more to throw readers off the scent than reveal a "truth" about *St. Mawr*. Unlike Jack Callcott in *Kangaroo*, Lawrence's most developed Australian character, Rico, is not presented as overtly Australian either in speech or outlook. He is apparently indistinguishable from the English-born members of his class. It is easy to forget that he is Australian, which, of course, Rico is busily doing himself. And this is the point. Rico's desire and capacity to blend with English society is a major anxiety in the novella. Along with the Australian Manby sisters, Rico embodies Lawrence's own troubled impressions of Australian society – its curious blend of Englishness and colonial Australianness. He records the duality surrounding the identity of Australians in *Kangaroo*. Richard Somers deplores "these British Australians with their aggressive familiarity. He surveyed them from an immense distance, with a kind of horror" (*K*

21). This conflation of the two nationalities reflected prevailing attitudes in Australia and England. In the 1920s most Australians still saw themselves as also British, as “‘independent Australian Britons’”,¹¹ as the Australian historian W. K. Hancock observed, writing in 1930. Nevertheless, it is the Australian element in the mix which concerns Lawrence in *St. Mawr*.

On the first page of *St. Mawr* we learn that Rico is “an Australian, son of a government official in Melbourne, who had been made a baronet” (*SM* 21). There is no obvious foundation for Rico amongst Lawrence’s acquaintances, but we might speculate about his origins. On 13 January 1924 Lawrence wrote from London to Mollie Skinner, advising her that he had received “Lord Strathspey’s fume against *Kangaroo*”, which he found “amusing” (*4L* 557). Lord Strathspey, born in New Zealand, was the 4th Baron Strathspey, and claimed that *Kangaroo* was in “‘bad taste’” and was “‘a book which no one should read’” (*4L* 557 n.1). It is possible, therefore, that in Rico, son of a baronet, born in Australia, and created only five months later, Lawrence vented his own “fume” against this narrow-minded, similarly antipodean aristocrat. Critics have regarded Lawrence’s satire in *St. Mawr* as directed largely at English and to a lesser extent American society. Eugene Goodheart sees strong Swiftian “misanthropic” resonances in *St. Mawr*,¹² and later critics have described the novella as a “Gulliver-like renunciation of English civilisation”.¹³ In a broad sense, “English civilisation” may be taken to include the transplanted varieties which have taken root in America and Australia. This may be how most readers have approached *St. Mawr*. The fact remains, however, that Australia is absent from virtually all commentary on the novella. At the risk of overstating my case, it is useful to cite examples. On the dust-jacket of the first American edition, which quotes liberally from contemporary reviews, one reviewer lauded Lawrence’s ability to reveal “the psychology of the classes” he portrayed, without differentiating their nationality.¹⁴ Subsequently, F. R. Leavis, the great critic and admirer of Lawrence and his work, in *D. H. Lawrence: Novelist*, offers no comment on the Australian

nationality of either Rico or the Manbys in his study of *St. Mawr*.¹⁵ Richard Aldington, who knew Lawrence, and who subsequently wrote introductions to Penguin editions of *Kangaroo* and *St. Mawr*, and who was, therefore, well-placed to grasp and compare Lawrence's attitudes to Australia, England and America, sees *St. Mawr* largely as a "repudiation of England", noting also the novella's condemnation of the "impudence" of the American Mrs Witt.¹⁶ More recently, the 'Introduction' to the Cambridge edition of *St. Mawr* does not discuss the nationality of the Australian characters, nor are Australian places referenced in the 'Explanatory Notes'. The Penguin edition of 1997 reproduces the same text and notes as the Cambridge Edition, and the new 'Introduction' by Charles Rossman narrowly asserts that *St. Mawr* is the product of Lawrence's "so-called 'American phase'", and does not include Australia among the "many places" in which "St. Mawr roots itself".¹⁷ Paul Poplawski, while using quotations showing that Rico and the Manbys are Australians, concludes: "There are five main butts of satire here: Mrs Witt, Rico, upper-class English society, Dean Vyner and English village life".¹⁸ Drew Milne, while persuasively pointing out that *St. Mawr*'s "sympathies with Lou and her mother" reflect Lawrence's "bitter rejection of the inadequacies of men after the catastrophe of the First World War", and are a "critique of male degeneration through war and industrialism",¹⁹ also overlooks the Australian strand in the novella. And in the latest Penguin edition, the 'Introduction' is silent about Rico's Australian origins, while the 'Explanatory Notes' incorrectly state that "Australia was a British colony until 1901".²⁰ These omissions and errors, slight as they may appear, in aggregate exemplify a fundamental and sustained misunderstanding of a major theme of *St. Mawr*. If, therefore, as Milne asserts, "the social conditions of the novel's sexual narratives are also historical",²¹ we must also recognise, as Lawrence does, the "historical" origins of Rico's "social conditions" in Australia, if we are to grasp the full meaning of *St. Mawr*. The late Mark Kinkead-Weekes comes closest to engaging the Australian element in the novella. He identifies Rico,

the “Australian artist”, in general terms, as “a colonial type still very much with us”.²² Perhaps, for Kinkead-Weekes, Rico foreshadows subsequent expatriate Australian artists resident in England, such as Rolf Harris, Clive James or Barry Humphries, who may be seen by some as having “invaded” England in more recent times. More importantly, Kinkead-Weekes alerts us to the postcolonial elements in Lawrence’s writing of this period, seeing “the imaginative development and underlying structure” of *St. Mawr* (and ‘The Princess’) as stemming from “Lawrence’s growing understanding of colonialism and of what it means, to those who profit by it, and to its victims”.²³ Critically, he also observes that the “Colonial mentality feels its cultural home to be not in the colonial country, but in metropolitan Europe”.²⁴ It is Rico’s and the Manbys’ pursuit of a cultural home in England which is the core of the novella’s anxiety and satire.

Kinkead-Weekes also observes that Lawrence in the 1920s was able to “decolonise his vision”, and free himself from received “prejudices” because of his exposure to Native American culture.²⁵ This new vision, I suggest, had its origins before Lawrence went to America in his first-hand experience of the British Empire in Ceylon, where he witnessed the spectacular perahera involving a hapless Prince of Wales, and later in Australia. In *The Boy in the Bush*, Lawrence satirises Western Australian upper-class colonial society in the 1880s in the chapter ‘The Governor’s Dance’. Jack arrives in a suit purchased from a “pawn-shop” (BB 245), and he rejects the purely “social world” of the occasion (BB 250). In *St. Mawr* Lawrence directs this attack at an expatriate Australian petty aristocracy. Lawrence, as we know, is not interested in an aristocracy of birth, such as Rico’s, but in “natural aristocracy” or “‘the aristocrats of the bone’” (BB 308), as Jack Grant affirms in *The Boy*. More closely aligned with Kinkead-Weekes’s observation is Lawrence’s attempt to come to grips with sexual relations between the different races, which Lawrence explored tentatively in *The Lost Girl*, and more explicitly in *The Boy*. Jack “did not mind” [the Australian-born] Easu’s running with a black girl”, but at the

thought of “actual physical contact … his blood recoiled with old haughtiness and pride of race” (*BB* 132). Importantly, however, Jack feels a sense of “free-masonry” with the blacks (*BB* 194), and *The Boy* elevates Jack’s connection with Aborigines above his putative links with the British authority at Government House. There are limits, however, to Lawrence’s decolonised vision. He does not give us a distinctly Australian colonial point of view in *The Boy* – Jack is, after all, English. Nor is there an indigenous perspective, unlike the fuller and sustained Native American presence in the later ‘The Woman Who Rode Away’, where the challenge to see a Native American point of view is, in many respects, the essence of the tale. Similarly, in *St. Mawr*, Lawrence’s attitude to Australia is only partially decolonised. There is no voice of the Australian settler or Aborigine.

Invasion Fears

Lawrence’s love of the English landscape and his horror at its degradation is a major theme in his works. In *Kangaroo*, Somers recalls that he had liked “to wander through the hazel copses, away to the real English hamlets, that are still like Shakespere [*sic*]—and like Hardy’s *Woodlanders*” (*K* 257). It is this precious landscape which Rico and the Manbys have “invaded”. In *Kangaroo* Somers finds Sydney “a London of the southern hemisphere”, and “a substitute for the real thing” (*K* 20). As representatives of an imitative society, Rico and the Manbys lack vitality, are parasitic. They, and the English people with whom they associate, are a “substitute” for Lawrence’s “real English” folk. Rico, rather than representing a vigorous and regenerative Australia, like the “well-coloured”, “so well-formed”, similarly aristocratic and “so modern” Francis Dekker in *Aaron’s Rod* (*AR* 186, 198), displays a “sterilising cruelty” (*SM* 96).

By the time Lawrence had written *St. Mawr* there was a well established body of English literature which expressed invasion fears, and Lawrence was familiar with novels such as Stoker’s *Dracula*, Haggard’s *She*, and Wells’s *The War of the Worlds*. Tony

Pinkney points to invasion fear in ‘The Nightmare’ chapter in *Kangaroo*, notably seeing its depiction of the collapse of London as “in a sense the ‘Australianisation’ of London”.²⁶ We may also point to invasion fear in Daniel Sutton’s return from Australia in ‘The Primrose Path’, written in 1913, long before Lawrence went to Australia. Sutton, having emigrated from England to Australia, returns suddenly and ominously to England with enough money to buy a cab. He displays a callous indifference to the suffering of his English wife, whom he had deserted, and trumpets the material opportunities to be found in Sydney: “‘You want to come out to Sydney with me, lad. That’s the place for you—beautiful place, oh, you could wish for nothing better. And money in it too’” (EME 123-4).

The significance of Rico’s intrusion into England is reinforced by his place of origin. Rico comes from Melbourne, the capital of the state of Victoria. At the time of Lawrence’s visit in 1922, and until 1927, while Canberra was the official capital of Australia, the Federal Parliament met in Melbourne, rendering it the de facto capital and, through the residency of the Governor-General, the seat of the British imperial presence in Australia. Lawrence demonstrates a sound knowledge of the workings of Australian politics in *Kangaroo*, including its federal basis, and he would have known the status of both Melbourne and the fledgling Canberra from his wide reading of the Sydney press. Bruce Steele notes that there was “much public discussion” about Canberra in 1922 (K 485), and Lawrence invents “Canberra Hall” as the place where “Labour” holds its political meetings (K 304). Lawrence spent a day in Melbourne visiting the art gallery (4L 273), and Rico, the artist and aristocrat, in coming from Melbourne, may be seen as representing the flower of Australia’s cultural and political establishment of the mid-1920s. In light of the above, Lawrence’s choice of Melbourne as the city of Rico’s birth appears to be deliberately symbolic.

Rico’s aspiring to a place in London society is exemplified by his fascination with the aristocratic parade in Hyde Park. While in *The Boy*, Jack Grant’s “Hyde Park costume” (BB 66), which he

wears to ride Stampede, is a symbol of the constrained English trappings he must shed in colonial Western Australia, Rico revels in the spectacle of Hyde Park, which he desperately wants to be a part of. But his efforts are lampooned by royalty's "mistaking him ... for somebody else" (*SM* 38). Moreover, the novella mocks the possibility that there could be any meaningful lineage in Australia. Early in *St. Mawr* we learn that Rico is set to marry an Australian girl, "only daughter of one of the oldest families in Victoria" (*SM* 22), but the narrator concludes tartly: "Not saying much" (*SM* 22). Lawrence's early optimistic belief in 1912, that Australia "is not a split from England" (*IL* 425), was completely destroyed by the time he wrote *St. Mawr*.

Lawrence was not alone in incorporating problematic expatriate Australian characters into his fiction. Another modernist and contemporary of Lawrence's, Virginia Woolf, later depicted in *The Waves* (1931) an Australian character, Louis, who like Rico, is similarly alien and unwelcome in British society. Both authors, in their different ways, held cherished visions of Englishness. For both, World War I had forever torn the fabric of British society. And Woolf, like Lawrence, contests Britain's colonial project. In *Mrs Dalloway*, Peter Walsh, returning from half a lifetime in India and sitting uncomfortably in Clarissa's room, with its "English tinted prints", is "a failure" in "the Dalloways' sense".²⁷ It is significant that both Woolf and Lawrence also identify a specifically Australian negative colonial type. Early in *The Waves* Louis struggles to establish himself in England, but it is clear that he is as much a threat as is Rico. Louis's presence in English society is anomalous and he feels tortured by his difference:

My roots are threaded, like fibres in a flower pot, round and round about the world. I do not wish to come to the top and live in the light of this great clock, yellow-faced, which ticks and ticks. Jinny and Susan, Bernard and Neville bind themselves into a thong with which to lash me. They laugh at my neatness,

at my Australian accent. I will now try to imitate Bernard softly lisping Latin.²⁸

The image of Louis enveloping the world “round and round” suggests that he is insidiously strangling those about him. The menacing image of his threading roots converges later with the lashing “thong” of the other characters. Importantly, Louis is differentiated and shamed by his Australian accent: “‘I will not conjugate the verb’, said Louis, ‘until Bernard has said it. My father is a banker in Brisbane and I speak with an Australian accent. I will wait and copy Bernard. He is English. They are all English’”.²⁹ Louis’s reference to his father being “a banker in Brisbane” becomes, through constant repetition, a kind of mantra in the novel, continually drawing attention to his colonial otherness. The alliteration produces a hypnotic and, ultimately, comic absurdity.

Australian Moderns

Tony Pinkney observes that “the Australia of *Kangaroo* is at the very heart of Lawrence’s – and modernism’s – cultural fears and hopes”.³⁰ And Rico’s and the Manbys’ presence in England may be characterised as a further and more literal “Australianisation” of England than that pointed to by Pinkney in his appraisal of *Kangaroo* referred to earlier. Lawrence’s anxieties at Australia’s modern tendencies expressed in *Kangaroo* are even more explicit in *St. Mawr*. Richard Aldington aptly describes Rico and his set as representing “industrialism’s genteel parasites”.³¹ Rico’s origins in a democratic, industrial and colonial Australia are a further aspect of the novella’s condemnation of him. Rico understands that despite his pretensions, he must survive by his wits, rather than through status and birthright. Beneath his brash exterior and artistic pretensions he has a sense of insecurity and inferiority, which is apparent to the indigenous “aboriginal” Welsh groom:

He really was aware that he would have to hold his own all alone, thrown alone on his own defences in the universe. The extreme democracy of the Colonies had taught him this.

And this, the little aboriginal Lewis recognised in him. He recognised also Rico's curious hollow misgiving, fear of some deficiency in himself, beneath all his handsome, young-hero appearance. (SM 34)

The anachronistic reference to Australia as “Colonies” suggests inferiority and their being “democratic” points to Australia's advanced state of degeneration, *vis-à-vis* Britain. Here the narrator appears to be invoking a peculiar contemporary social theory which the narrator in *Kangaroo* ascribes to Somers: “He was always recalling what Flinders Petrie says somewhere: ‘A colony is no younger than the parent country’. Perhaps it is even older, one step further gone” (K 49). Paradoxically, therefore, Rico, the product of a young “country”, is the herald of a terrible, senile future – too advanced and modern, too far “gone”.

Australians are not the only moderns infiltrating English society. There are Rico's wife Lou and her mother Mrs Witt, both Americans. Significantly, two modern New World societies are united in the marriage of the Australian Rico and the American Lou. It is a dual threat when they attempt to “settle in a certain layer of English society”. The novella makes it clear that they are unwelcome. As outsiders they “would never quite go down in any society” (SM 23). Through the eyes of the English Dean, Mrs Witt, Lou and Rico are all seen as interlopers: “He was a gentleman, and a man of learning in his own line. But he let Mrs Witt know that he looked down on her just a trifle—as a parvenu American … and at the same time he had a sincere respect for her, as a rich woman”:

Lou knew that every Englishman, especially of the upper classes, has a wholesome respect for riches. But then, who hasn't?

The Dean was more impressed by Mrs Witt than little Lou. But to Lady Carrington he was charming: she was almost ‘one of us’, you know. And he was very gracious to Rico: ‘your father’s splendid colonial service.’ (SM 43)

The Dean is deeply ironic about Rico’s father’s “splendid colonial service”. It is far less impressive than Mrs Witt’s money. And Lou, who, as Rico’s wife, is Lady Carrington, is only “almost” one of the Dean’s class. Mrs Witt, however, has no desire for acceptance amongst the society craved by Rico – it is all simply “a new pantomime to amuse her” (SM 43). She is impervious to the Dean’s snobberies. Mrs Witt’s and Lou’s desire to reject English society distinguishes the Americans from the Australians in the novella, and focuses the novella’s satire on the latter.

Although Rico is not himself an “industrial magnate”, like the doomed Gerald Crich in *Women in Love* (WL 211), the text aligns him with a similarly negative industrial modernity. Rico lives life “like an amiable machine from day to day” (SM 94). Early in the novella Lou decides that Rico should join her riding in Hyde Park. He responds with a “squirming” manner “caught at Oxford” and she learns that “he couldn’t ride, and that he didn’t care for riding” (SM 26). Lou enquires sarcastically: “‘I thought you used to ride so much, in Australia, when you were young?’” (SM 27). When Lou tells him she will purchase St. Mawr as a gift for him, Rico protests: “‘Lou dearest, don’t spend a fortune on a horse for me, which I don’t want. Honestly, I prefer a car’”. He “would”, however, “like to cut a handsome figure in the park” (SM 32), because this is what society people do. He therefore accepts the gift. Later the narrator reports ironically on a trend of modern life: “Man wisely invents motor-cars and other machines, automobile and locomotive. The horse is superannuated, for man” (SM 84). Another damning modern trait of Rico’s is that he pursues a mentalised life, in stark contrast to the sensuous “barbaric exultance ... devoid of emotion”, attributed to Mrs Witt’s Navajo-Mexican groom Phoenix (SM 39). The two characters are, unsurprisingly,

deeply antagonistic towards each other (*SM* 48). In *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, Lawrence ridicules modern Freudian psychoanalysis and the emergence of “a theory of pure psychology” (*PFU* 7). In *St. Mawr*, “Rico, in his way, was a psychologist” (*SM* 45), the narrator informs us ironically. The modern marriage between Rico and Lou collapses because their attraction to each other is an “attachment of the will and the nerves” which is “destructive”. “It was a marriage, but without sex”, which was “shattering and exhausting” (*SM* 24). This is the environment in which Lou purchases *St. Mawr* and the stallion functions as a surrogate lover for her. “‘I might take him to America’” (*SM* 30), she speculates; before the purchase, “she was prepared to sacrifice Rico” (*SM* 35). In *Fantasia of the Unconscious* Lawrence remarks that “almost invariably, a married woman, as she passes the age of thirty, conceives a contempt or a dislike for her husband ... Particularly if he be a good husband, a true modern” (*PFU* 160). Such is Rico, and Lou ultimately moves back to America “to escape from the friction which is the whole stimulus in modern social life” (*SM* 137). Rico thrives on this friction and lives as he rides, “self-consciously” (*SM* 38), craving the distractions of a fast social life. Even his head is “perfectly designed for social purposes” – he has “one of the famous ‘talking heads’ of modern youth” (*SM* 33-4). Rico adores superficiality and egotistical banter:

‘Do you know,’ said Rico as they sat at lunch, he and Lou and Mrs Witt, in Mrs Witt’s sitting-room in the dark, quiet hotel in Mayfair; ‘I really like riding *St. Mawr* so much. He really is a noble animal.—If ever I am made a Lord—which heaven forbid!—I shall be Lord *St. Mawr*.’

‘You mean,’ said Mrs Witt, ‘his real lordship would be the horse?’

‘Very possible, I admit,’ said Rico, with a curl of his long upper lip. (*SM* 38)

This passage mocks Rico's alliance of his sexual prowess with that of the stallion. It is St. Mawr, the novella asserts, who is nobler than Rico. Furthermore, Rico is also feminised – another aspect of modern, masculine degeneracy. Mrs Witt laments the passing of her vision of the “old Englishmen” who are “so robust”. The “young Englishmen” she finds “perfect ladies”. Rico replies pompously: “‘Somebody has to keep up the tradition of the perfect lady’” (*SM* 45). Rico’s interest in “tradition” points to yet another negative modern attribute. In *Fantasia*, Lawrence writes: “You’ve got to take a new resolution into your soul, and break off from the old way” (*PFU* 198). There is no new “resolution” in Rico’s “soul”: “Ah, Rico! He was one of mankind’s myriad conspirators, who conspire to live in absolute physical safety, whilst willing the minor disintegration of all positive living” (*SM* 82), the narrator laments.

As the novella develops, Rico drifts inexorably to the company of his fellow Australians, the Manby sisters. They share a similar social background and the sisters are similarly modern in outlook:

Rico consented to spend the month in Shropshire, because for near neighbours Mrs Witt had the Manbys, at Corrabach Hall. The Manbys were rich Australians returned to the old country and set up as Squires, all in full blow. Rico had known them in Victoria: they were of good family: and the girls made a great fuss of him. (*SM* 42)

Again we find the invasion theme, attached to the Manbys. The Manbys, having “returned to the old country” and “set up as Squires”, are also heavily satirised for their modern aspirations. Flora Manby asserts the rights of the modern woman. “‘I consider these days are the best ever, especially for girls’” (*SM* 74), she reports, and having read “‘H. G. Wells’ history’”, is relieved that she does not have to “‘cringe before mouldy domineering men’” (*SM* 74). In *Kangaroo* Lawrence had already implicated Australia in what he saw as the modern woman’s disintegrating bid for freedom, accusing Harriett of being part of a cohort of “white

females, raging for further freedom (*K* 351). The Manby sisters, with their independence and pursuit of pleasure, assert such “freedom”, and mesh perfectly with Rico:

Rico immediately started the social round: first the Manbys: then motor twenty miles to luncheon at Lady Tewkesbury’s: then young Mr Burns came flying down in his aeroplane from Chester: then they must motor to the sea, to Sir Edward Edwards’ place, where there was a moonlight bathing party. (*SM* 45)

Kingsley Widmer sums up the tendencies of the modern man as seen by Lawrence in Rico: “Sexual introvert and social poseur appear repeatedly to be matching symptoms of modernity for Lawrence”, he writes.³² Lou, by contrast, finds the social round “so innerly wearisome” and with a sharp assertion of Lawrence’s countervailing primal values, the narrator continues: “Back of it all was St. Mawr, looming like a bonfire in the dark” (*SM* 45).

St. Mawr’s ‘Kick’ at Modern Australia

The dichotomy between the elemental, primitive forces represented by St. Mawr and the Welsh and Native American grooms, and the forces of modernity represented by Rico and the fast Australian Manby set is sharpened in the lead up to the climactic excursion in which St. Mawr crashes with Rico. With Rico temporarily absent at Corrabach, Lou realises that he “seemed to her the symbol of the futility” of her life (*SM* 51). She cannot abide their superficiality and triviality. While Rico is drawn to Flora, her sister Elsie is married to the rather simpering Frederick, a “blond Englishman” with “strong blue eyes always attempting the sentimental” (*SM* 63). When Rico returns from Corrabach he displays an “empressé anxiety” towards Lou, “which spoke too many volumes” (*SM* 62), and there is a ghastly exchange of diplomatic greetings and false delight as the Manby party settle in to stay over at Mrs Witt’s: “It had begun again, the whole clock-work of ‘lots of fun!’” (*SM* 63).

The commencement of the climactic horse ride to neighbouring scenic sites demarcates the lines of fracture in the novella, which are split open with the catastrophic rearing of St. Mawr. Lou rises eagerly at dawn. Rico, however, malingers in his “yellow silk pyjamas”, annoyed with the prospect of “horses and paraphernalia” (*SM* 67). He is aggressive towards his mount, St. Mawr, and the horse resists. Lou’s mother quips: “‘Probably he doesn’t like that apricot shirt’” (*SM* 68), reminding us that Rico, although not keen on the outing, is still keen to look good. During the ride through the countryside Rico’s alignment with the Manbys is clear. The sisters have their own pet-name for him, “‘Harry’” (*SM* 63). Rico is “slightly piqued” that his wife does not enjoy the expedition as much as the Manby sisters who “were enjoying themselves so much” (*SM* 75). St. Mawr’s desperate rearing up beneath Rico, which results in his foot injury, and the horse’s “kick in the face” to Elsie’s husband Edwards (*SM* 76), confirms the novel’s attitude to the “Manby group” (*SM* 75). They are intruders in the remote region “where the spirit of aboriginal England still lingers” (*SM* 73). For Lou, while the “millions of ancestors have used all the life up” and the excursion party is “not really alive, in the sense that they were alive”, the novella asserts, with their impending flight to America, that Lou and her mother recognise the dead hand of modern civilisation which has all but obliterated the ancient spirit. Flora, by contrast, is pleased to “‘live in nineteen-twenty odd’” (*SM* 74).

After the catastrophe, the break between Rico and the Manbys, and Lou and her mother is complete, and is apparent in the polarised reactions to St. Mawr. “‘I want St. Mawr shot!’ was almost his [Rico’s] first word, when he was in bed at the farm and Lou was sitting beside him” (*SM* 81). Lou quizzes him coolly: “‘Do you want to shoot him yourself?’” His reply: “‘No. But I want to have him shot’”, exposes his innate cruelty and lack of courage (*SM* 81). And Flora Manby, although the horse is quite advanced in years, “would geld St. Mawr” (*SM* 95). By contrast, Mrs Witt’s “sympathies are with the stallion” (*SM* 91), and she announces

boldly: "I am an American woman, and I always have to stand up for the accused" (*SM* 91). In Lou's eyes, Rico is essentially a coward:

'And in men like Rico, the animal has gone queer and wrong. And in those nice clean boys you liked so much in the war, there is no wild animal left in them. They're all tame dogs, even when they're brave and well-bred. They're all tame dogs, mother, with human masters. There's no mystery in them.' (*SM* 61)

In *The Boy in the Bush*, Lawrence, with Easu, had already associated this kind of cowardly aggression with Australians, in startlingly similar language:

In Australia, a new sort of fight. A fight with tame dogs that were playing wild. Easu was a tame dog, playing the wolf in a mongrel, back-biting way. Tame dogs escaped and become licentious. That was Australia. He knew that. (*BB* 307)

For Lou, Rico's accident is a defining moment – her marriage crashes with the fall of the horse. St. Mawr's mating call in a nearby field she hears as a call to her to reject the sickness of her marriage, and the society she inhabits:

He was neighing to Poppy. Clear on the wet wind came the sound of his bell-like, stallion's calling, that Mrs Vyner called cruel. It was a strange noise, with a splendour that belonged to another world-age. The mean cruelty of Mrs Vyner's humanitarianism, the barren cruelty of Flora Manby, the eunuch cruelty of Rico. Our whole eunuch civilisation, nasty-minded as eunuchs are, with their kind of sneaking, sterilising cruelty. (*SM* 96)

While Rico convalesces at the Manbys, Lou considers her future. Her mother sums up the situation for her daughter, and in suggesting the following response to Flora Manby's love-interest in Rico, she delightfully parodies Flora's proposed gelding of St. Mawr:

'I should say: Miss Manby, you may have my husband, but not my horse. My husband won't need emasculating, and my horse I won't have you meddle with. I'll preserve one last male thing in the museum of this world, if I can.' (*SM* 97)

The marriage is finished at this point and Lou and her mother decide to quit England and return to America, taking St. Mawr with them. Lou negotiates the end of the relationship with skilful and comic intensity. She writes to her mother, who has by this time departed:

'And I don't think I should ever have made any final announcement to Rico, if he hadn't been such a beautiful pig in clover, here at Corrabach Hall. He has known the Manbys all his life, they and he are sections of one engine. He would be far happier with Flora: or I won't say happier, because there is something in him which rebels: but he would on the whole fit much better. I myself am at the end of my limit, and beyond it. I can't "mix" any more, and I refuse to.' (*SM* 118)

Rico and Flora "fit" because they are Australian and parts of "one engine", and the image symbolises the link between their mechanical way of life and industrial modernity.

The Australian characters, who bear so much of the satire of the first part of the novella, disappear entirely with Lou's departure for America. The subsequent "long American coda" (*SM* xxvi) reflects Lawrence's hopes for regeneration in non-industrial America. There remains, however, in *St. Mawr* an important reminder of the regenerative promise Lawrence also saw in the Australia which

existed outside modernity. Early in the novella, Mr Saintsbury, who sells St. Mawr to Lou, remarks: “They say it’s been the making of some horses, to take them over the water, to Australia or such places. It might repay you—you never know” (*SM* 30). The novella does, therefore, leave open the possibility that Australia, with its bush and vast unsettled areas, such as the north-west of *The Boy in the Bush*, might yet offer the promise of renewal to people with St. Mawr’s “alert intensity” (*SM* 30). Lou has this faculty, sharing an “ancient understanding” with the animal (*SM* 12-13). Being American, however, and at odds with her Australian husband, she naturally turns to America, where Lawrence himself was living when he wrote *St. Mawr* and where he had re-located his regenerative quest.

¹ See David Game, ‘Grant Watson’s *Where Bonds Are Loosed*: A Stimulus for Lawrence’s ‘Australian Period’ with Particular Resonances in *The Boy in the Bush*’, *Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (2008), 99. This essay also sketches in Lawrence’s engagement with Australian literature and anthropology, which point to the depth of his interest in Australia.

² See Peter Preston, ‘Introduction’, *Mr Noon*, ed., Lindeth Vasey (London: Penguin Books, 1996), xv-xvi.

³ James T. Boulton, ‘Further Letters of D. H. Lawrence’, *Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (2006), 31.

⁴ See John Worthen, *D. H. Lawrence: The Life of an Outsider* (London: Allen Lane, 2005), 310. Worthen excludes the first draft of ‘Quetzalcoatl’, completed in mid-1923, arguably Lawrence’s first novel of North America, written before both *St. Mawr* and *The Boy in the Bush*. Lawrence later revised ‘Quetzalcoatl’ as *The Plumed Serpent*, published in 1926. *Quetzalcoatl* was subsequently first published posthumously as a novel in its own right by Black Swan Books in 1995, and in 2011 it was published by Cambridge University Press as part of *The Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D. H. Lawrence*.

⁵ David Ellis, *D. H. Lawrence: Dying Game, 1922-1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998), 190.

⁶ See David Game, 'Aspects of Degenerationism in D. H. Lawrence's *Kangaroo*', *D. H. Lawrence Review*, Vols. 32-33 (2003-2004), 87-101.

⁷ Paul Eggert, 'Comedy and Provisionality', in *Lawrence and Comedy*, eds. Paul Eggert and John Worthen (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996), 152-3.

⁸ See David Ellis, *Dying Game*, 131.

⁹ Eggert, 'Comedy and Provisionality', 146.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ W. K. Hancock, *Australia* (Brisbane: The Jacaranda Press, 1961), 50.

¹² Eugene Goodheart, *The Utopian Vision of D. H. Lawrence* (Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 1971), 59.

¹³ Con Coroneos and Trudi Tate, 'Lawrence's Tales', in *The Cambridge Companion to D. H. Lawrence*, ed. Anne Farnihough (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001), 116.

¹⁴ B. P. H., quoted on the dust jacket of the first American edition of *St. Mawr* (New York: Thomas Seltzer, 1925).

¹⁵ F. R. Leavis, *D. H. Lawrence: Novelist* (London: Penguin Books, 1994), 271-96.

¹⁶ Richard Aldington, 'Introduction', *St. Mawr and The Virgin and The Gypsy*, by D. H. Lawrence (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1981), 7.

¹⁷ Charles Rossman, 'Introduction', *St. Mawr and Other Stories*, by D. H. Lawrence, ed. Brian Finney (London: Penguin Books, 1997), xiii, xviii.

¹⁸ Paul Poplawski, 'Lawrence's Satiric Style: Language and Voice in *St. Mawr*', in *Lawrence and Comedy*, 162.

¹⁹ Drew Milne, 'Lawrence and the Politics of Sexual Politics', in *The Cambridge Companion to D. H. Lawrence*, 208-209.

²⁰ James Lasdun, 'Introduction', Paul Poplawski, 'Explanatory Notes', *The Woman Who Rode Away St. Mawr The Princess*, by D. H. Lawrence, eds. Brian Finney, Christa Jansohn and Dieter Mehl (London: Penguin Books, 2006), xi-xx, 218. There has never been a colony of Australia. Prior to 1901, Australia was a geographic term, not a political entity. In 1901 six separate colonies, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania, each with its own parliament and governor, federated to form a single country, Australia. Nineteenth-century authors, therefore, often referred to 'the colonies' or specified a particular colony. Rolf Boldrewood writes: "no cattle-duffer in the colonies could have had a better pair of mates". See Rolf Boldrewood, *Robbery Under Arms* (1888) (Sydney: Angus and Robertson Publishers,

1980), 59. And Magwitch was a convict who had been resident specifically in “New South Wales”. See Charles Dickens, *Great Expectations* (1860-61) (London: Penguin Books, 1985), 351. Lawrence refers to Australia anachronistically and pejoratively as “the Colonies” in *St. Mawr* (SM 34).

²¹ Milne, ‘Lawrence and the Politics of Sexual Politics’, 209.

²² Mark Kinkead-Weekes, ‘Decolonising Imagination: Lawrence in the 1920s’, in *The Cambridge Companion to D. H. Lawrence*, 77.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 67.

²⁶ Tony Pinkney, *D. H. Lawrence* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1990), 116.

²⁷ Virginia Woolf, *Mrs Dalloway* (London: Penguin Books, 1992), 47.

²⁸ Virginia Woolf, *The Waves* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1974), 16.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ Pinkney, *D. H. Lawrence*, 113.

³¹ Richard Aldington, ‘Introduction’, *St Mawr and The Virgin and the Gipsy*, 7.

³² Kingsley Widmer, *The Art of Perversity: D. H. Lawrence’s Shorter Fictions* (Seattle: U of Washington P, 1962), 71.

“UNHEARD-OF BECOMINGS” IN D. H. LAWRENCE’S *ST. MAWR*: A DELEUZEAN READING

GERALD DOHERTY

By way of approach to the “becoming animal” motif in *St. Mawr*, I shall sketch out two of Lawrence’s most vivid encounters with trees, which, as with animals, held an uncanny fascination for him. In the first, he sits under the huge fir and pine trees of the Black Forest, writing *Fantasia of the Unconscious* (1922) – his “tree book”, as he calls it. There he contemplates the inner being of the tree, as a dynamic presence that is essentially separate from him, its “self-sufficient … indomitable energy” (PFU 87) distinct from his own human being. There is no contact or flow or exchange between them beyond his cursory wish “to be a tree for a while” (PFU 86), and the reassurance he feels from their “shelter and strength” (PFU 87). The second, by contrast, stages a much stranger, more ineffable event. In his short essay, ‘Pan in America’, written in the same year as he wrote *St. Mawr* (1924), Lawrence offers one of the simplest, most explicit and personalized descriptions of becoming-the-other, an event Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari were to theorize and transform more than fifty years later in *A Thousand Plateaus* into a now celebrated metaontology of becoming-animal.¹ In the Pan essay, becoming-tree is just one of a multiplicity of possible Lawrentian becomings, in this instance sparked off by the presence of a huge pine-tree, outside his cabin in the Rocky Mountains. Virtually all the elements of more sophisticated theorizing are present *in nuce* in those two-way, high-intensity energy surges between human and arboreal life: “Our two lives meet and cross one another, unknowingly: the tree’s life penetrates my life, and my life, the tree’s … I become a degree more like unto the tree, more bristling and turpentiney, in Pan. And the tree gets a certain shade and alertness of my life, within itself” (MM 158-9). Intense

vibrations across genera boundaries, flows of molecular particles at levels below self-identity, transmit that “vivid relatedness” (*MM* 160) between the man and the tree. Lawrence’s assurance of the tree-human alliance is replicated in Deleuze and Guattari’s faith in the becoming-animal one: “We believe in the existence of very special becomings-animal traversing human beings and sweeping them away, affecting the animal no less than the human” (*Thousand* 261). (Being “swept away” is a far more appropriate idiom, as we shall see, for Lou’s initial crossings with St. Mawr than for Lawrence’s own more cautiously reserved crossing with the pine tree).

Though Deleuze and Guattari make no reference to *St. Mawr* (they confine themselves mainly to the essays, poems and letters, though they do refer to *Aaron’s Rod*), it is Lawrence’s great “becoming” novella. No fewer than four remarkable crossings play complex variations on the subtle flows and counter-flows between Lawrence and the tree. While all four involve strange and uncanny becomings-the-other, the first two stage Lawrentian versions of the Deleuzean becoming-animal.² At this point, brief summaries may be helpful.

In the first, Lou Witt’s early encounters with the stallion St. Mawr unleash vibrant molecular shock-effects that shatter her social defences, negate her “commonplace self” (*SM* 31), and transform her life-vision and aspirations. Replicating the two-way transversals of the becoming-tree, currents of invisible libidinal power flow between Lou and the horse. While she “feel[s] the vivid heat of his life come through to her” (*SM* 30), his “great, glowing, fearsome eyes” pose the threatening non-human question that haunts her for the rest of the novella: What does being a horse signify in relation to humans, who master and subjugate it? What has gone wrong between human and animal to create such menacing tension between them? Because it involves a crossing already accomplished, the second turns on a human/non-human alliance that occurred in the past. The groom, Lewis, to whom Mrs. Witt proposes marriage, has already crossed the species divide to

become the “human-animal” whom she perceives as a “dangerous commodity” (*SM* 62). Two distinct natures co-exist in uneasy tension within Lewis, each with its own distinctive view of the world. While the human-Lewis, as his discourse reveals, is gruffly pragmatic and working-class – hostile to collectives, preferring solitude, he resents being a servant to women – the animal-Lewis inhabits an esoteric magical universe where strange becomings and crossings are the virtual norm. From Mrs. Witt’s perspective, this near-psychotic Lewis at once fascinates and repels her, and puts an end to her prospects of marriage. The third (the most unheard-of becoming of all) involves, not an individual animal, but swarms or collectives – “multiplicities” or “pack modes”, as Deleuze and Guittari term them (*Thousand* 264): in *St. Mawr*, these are mainly pack-rats. As special agents of epidemics, they spread molecular infection – that “unnatural participation” across species bounds that Deleuze and Guittari call “contagion” (*Thousand* 264-8). In the novella, “malevolent breath[s]” (*SM* 143) from the Rocky Mountains penetrate the New England housewife’s defences, undermining her human identity, taking her language away. A frenzied rodent-like sexuality destroys her intelligence (she loses her mind and her speech), forcing her retreat from the ranch to a more “human home” (*SM* 150) in the valley. Because Lou’s final becoming (our fourth) involves, not an animal, but the “wild spirit” of the Rockies, it is the most problematic of all. Yet, like other becomings, it shatters not only Lou’s specific human identity, but also the traditional sharp caesura that divides human from natural being. A two-way libidinal flow, as yet prospective, ensures that she desires the “wild spirit” with the same urgent intensity as it “needs” and “craves” her (*SM* 155). Because this “wild spirit”, as its name suggests, is her untamed and untameable double, she becomes it so that it in its turn becomes her.

Before exploring each becoming in close-up, I need to establish the conceptual frameworks of such becomings, as Deleuze and Guittari theorize them in *A Thousand Plateaus*, as well as the more specialized vocabulary they use to denote them. Because of the

complexity of their ramifications, such theorizings, as Tom Conley notes, are not easily extrapolated from their source-text (*A Thousand Plateaus*) and applied “to any efficacious degree” to fictional texts, such as *St. Mawr*.³ However, Deleuze and Guattari’s analyses of three novellas by Henry James, F. Scott Fitzgerald and Pierette Fleutiaux (Chapter 8 of *A Thousand Plateaus*) employ a more personalized discourse, far more hospitable to literary analysis than the biological, geological, linguistic and geometric discourses that dominate the rest of the book. The three stages or life-trajectories they explore in Chapter 8 approximate uncannily to the “savage pilgrimage” Lou undertakes from a sophisticated, if enervated London society to a primeval New Mexican wilderness that opens up inhuman spaces beyond anything the term “human” evokes.

The first specialized term – molar – connotes those large institutional segmentations or blocks – political, cultural, social – which, rigorously sectioned and categorized, make everything “calculable and foreseen” (*Thousand* 215). Caught within these giant and static collectives to whose structures they are not entirely adjusted, the characters (especially in the James and Fitzgerald novellas) first negotiate and then establish their personal identities. As molar entities with “well-determined, well-planned territories” and with fixed subjectivities, they have a “future but no becoming” (*Thousand* 216). Highly resistant to crossings between human and non-human realms, they are also resistant to those libidinal surges or amplitudes that might sweep them away. This is especially true of Lou and her husband Rico’s existence in London in the opening scenes of *St. Mawr*: there, life is meticulously segregated (social, artistic, personal), their marriage is sexless, their territory (a “little old house in Westminster” [SM 23]) secured. Yet for all its apparent solidity, Lou does not fit in, or quite “belong” (SM 21). The stage is set for the irruption of molecular energies, an influx of intensities that shatters her *Weltanschauung* and opens her up to the animal other.

The second term – molecular – turns on a “deterritorialization” (another favorite Deleuzean term) – a traumatic rupture of those molar segmentations, erected precisely to contest and resist such a rupture. Through the molecular exchange of high-energy particles – their charged interactions or flows – one becomes-other than one had previously been. To undergo such a desire-flow as overwhelms Lou (at first sight, “she was already half in love with St. Mawr” [SM 28]) is to be drawn back into a primordial ontological realm, “a reality more fundamental than species and genera, organic classification, and evolution through filiation and descent”.⁴ In this new subliminal space of relations, and through its two-way transfers, becoming-the-other includes the other in its radical metamorphoses. In place of a rigorously articulated molar self, multiplicities of undetermined needs and desires circulate between magnetized bodies without barriers or identity blocks to inhibit them.

At this point, it is worth noting that in a sequence of essays written in 1925, Lawrence himself employs a term – the fourth dimension – popularized by the esoteric philosopher P. D. Ouspensky in his book *Tertium Organum*, whose materialist ontology of becoming without transcendence resembles at a more elementary level the Deleuzean molecular plane of existence. No longer assimilable to metaphysical categories (“it is not to be reckoned in terms of space and time” [RDP 358]), and with its base in a material reality, the fourth dimension turns on two-way flows and intensities, beneath pre-set boundaries or identity levels. At the moment “matter suddenly enters the fourth dimension”, as Lawrence puts it, “the transfer … take[s] place in a living flow, enhancing the lives of both beings” [RDP 359]).⁵ In this semblance of the Deleuzean “plunge into becomings-molecular” (*Thousand 300*), new dynamic circuits of energies dissolve the formal rigidities of molar existence. In melting down “the walls of her own world” (SM 30), for example, Lou’s traumatic early encounters with St. Mawr unleash magnetic radiations, intensive desire-flows that fuel her becoming the animal other. In Deleuze and Guattari’s

interpretation of Henry James' novella *In the Cage*, the young post-office telegraphist's encounter with an unknown man replicates Lou's with St. Mawr: "a strange passionnal complicity, a whole molecular life" does not "even enter into rivalry with the life she leads with her fiancé" (*Thousand* 216). In place of those social relations that were always external to themselves, these new flows and particles elude those classes, sexes, and persons that previously constituted the staples of her existence. In Lou's case, such radical dismantling of externalities fuels her ultimate need "to be alone and meet the true double at the other end of the line" (*Thousand* 218). This "true double", of course, will not be St. Mawr, who follows "slavishly" at the heels of a Texan mare (*SM* 132), but the untamed "spirit" of the Rockies which points to the "line of flight" she must take.

The third term – "line of flight" – is the most problematic (its metaphoric subtext is geometric), since it in no way implies a conventional retreat or regression. As Deleuze and Guattari insist, it is neither a "running away from the world", nor a "tak[ing] refuge in the desert" (*Thousand* 225), both of which molar designations might, at first sight, seem to characterize Lou's backtracking quite well. The Deleuzean "clean break" (*Thousand* 220), by contrast, involves an absolute breach with the past that makes retrogression impossible since the original molar subject has ceased to exist. Quoting from Lawrence's essay on Melville's *Typee* and *Omoo* in *Studies in Classic American Literature*, Deleuze and Guattari speak of Lawrence's "one grudge" against Melville: "He ever pined for Home and Mother ... [he] came home to face out the rest of his life" (*Thousand* 209) – exactly the oedipal need for security his seafaring exploits dissolved.⁶ Neither abstract nor personal, as Deleuze and Guattari conceive it, the "line of flight" points to "a love I shall choose, and that shall choose me blindly, my double, just as selfless as I" (*Thousand* 220). While the term "blindly" suggests the pure immanence of the engagement without conscious purpose or pre-calculation, "selfless" (devoid of a self) is the index that the molar self no longer determines the choice. Thus, making her own "clean

break”, Lou consigns Rico, Phoenix and her own previous existence to “the world’s back-yard”. Because, as Lou declares, “I am where I want to be”, she needs to “keep to [her]self”, maintaining a state of imperceptibility since she has no recognizable self for others to see (*SM* 155). Indeed Deleuze and Guattari’s summing up of a radical progress – one has “entered becomings-animal, becomings-molecular and finally becomings-imperceptible” (*Thousand* 221) – might well apply to Lou’s own progress in the novella, which we shall now proceed to trace.

I.

One of the major blocks to perceiving *St. Mawr* qua animal was the symbolic compulsion that dominated 1960s and 70s literary criticism – the projection of anthropomorphic traits, mainly sexual virility, for which the stallion seemed an exemplary figure. (For L. D. Clark, to take one among many examples, *St. Mawr* is “a symbol of supreme maleness”).⁷ In her book *Beasts of the Modern Imagination* (1985), Margot Norris initiates the arduous process of stripping the animal of his symbolic accoutrements – his “tropological enslavement to the human”, as Norris terms it⁸ – which culminates in those Deleuzean “becomings-animal” that undermine Western metaphysics’ entrenched anthropocentrism, and which inscribes *homo sapiens* as merely one product of nature, and not its perfected end-product. Confirming this trend, Carrie Rohman’s recent critique of John Haegert’s symbolic reading of *St. Mawr* insists on the “radical alterity” of the stallion as his meaning for Lou: no longer a crisis of the symbol, *St. Mawr* enacts “a crisis of the *real*”, an eruption of precisely those energies that resist symbolic assimilation.⁹ Lou’s initiation into becoming-animal represents that highly-charged libidinal shock – the traumatic break with the molar – that sets the rest of the novella in motion.

It also marks Lou’s break with London society, where molar segregations undergird those “fine-drawn discriminations” (*SM* 24) that regulate social behaviour. In one such exemplary instance, the sexless marriage between Lou and Rico mirrors the clear-cut

Cartesian segregation of body and mind (Rico's is "one of the famous "talking heads" of modern youth" [SM 34]), as well as the repressive oedipal block that ensures they love one another as brother and sister. Powerful, long-established molarities dictate the ritualized comings-together of London socialites, and well as those inveterate class-discriminations that keep them apart.

Into this world of neutered and fragmented desires, a wholly new dynamic of relationship to the other – an explosive shattering of molar rigidities – erupts. Yet Lou's first tentative approach to St. Mawr still harks back to anthropocentric modes of perception to which her quotidian lifestyle habituates her. Though "a dark, invisible fire seem[s] to come out of [St. Mawr]", presaging a new dynamics of contact, nevertheless she reads the stallion's unhappiness in terms of a psychoanalytical understanding – his "hostility" and "half-revealed resentment" (SM 28) linked to a traumatic event in his earlier life. Lewis's story of the beatings St. Mawr had received, and had not forgotten (SM 35), as well as "two accidents" with the stallion in which two humans were fatally injured (SM 29), performs precisely the kind of reductive "oedipal" analysis for which Lawrence attacks Freud and which the narrative itself will shortly revise, reconstruct.¹⁰ Lou's first tactile apprehension, by contrast – she strokes St. Mawr's head and shoulders – triggers the shift from a purely visual registration, which Lawrence habitually links to destructive female desire, to molecular transfers and crossings that deterritorialize both the human and animal, and make pre-set identities founder.¹¹ Unleashing hitherto repressed energy-flows, molecular discharges of heat, light and power "come through to her, through the lacquer of red-gold gloss" (SM 30). In the Deleuzean manner, molecular tropes – vibrations, quiverings, micro-pulsations – unsettle the limits of anthropocentric representation as well as the substitutive logic that undergirds metaphor.¹² Precisely because it is not based on imitation or resemblance or identification between human and animal, at stake in all Lou's early encounters with St. Mawr is a metamorphosis, which, as Deleuze and Guattari insist, is "the contrary of metaphor"

(*Kafka* 22). As is Lawrence’s practice in *St. Mawr*, “sequences vibrate”, opening the “word onto unexpected internal intensities” (*Kafka* 22). Already hints of a catachrestic rhetoric (“invisible fire”, “sun-arched neck”) that dislocates language points to states of becoming for which no stabilized signifiers exist (*SM* 28, 30).

The becoming-animal of the human is first vividly actualized in a Deleuzean “unnatural participation” that throws Lou’s self “into upheaval”, and that “uproots [her] from humanity” (*Thousand* 265). Her first radical deterritorialization has the affective charge of a molar identity in the process of its own annihilation: “It was as if she had had a vision, as if the walls of her own world had suddenly melted away, leaving her in a great darkness” (*SM* 30). The simultaneous evocation of a rigid enclosure (“walls”) and its dissolution (“melted”) connotes the release from psychic imprisonment without the reterritorialization that conventional narrative imposes. From out of this darkness, the “large, brilliant eyes” of St. Mawr return the menacing question that Lou has already begun to formulate: “what was his non-human question, and his uncanny threat?” (Clearly, the original psychoanalytical answer is already swept aside as irrelevant). The “ban” Lou feels St. Mawr puts on her is on a reterritorialization – the return to the “commonplace self” before the “vision” derailed her. In this context of a no-return, Lou projects St. Mawr as a “Master of doom” (*SM* 31), the harbinger of an apocalyptic upheaval, the compulsion to transform her life without the knowledge of exactly how to do so. This same context also radically redefines the meaning of the term “attitude”. Unlike the human “attitude” which is a function of molar perception that fixes views, limits perspectives, and reduces vision to a calculation of future advantage, the “black, fiery flow” in St. Mawr’s eyes carries a molecular charge from a primordial ontological domain that, unmediated by language, seems to Lou like the “real … thing” (*SM* 32).

As a prelude to Lou’s second vision (*SM* 35), a new kind of subjectivity abolishes the traditional reductive categorization that locks each singular animal into the space of the “beast” or the

“brute” on the assumption of a common essence shared by all animals. In place of a homogeneous identity, St. Mawr possesses what Derrida calls “a heterogeneous multiplicity of the living ... of organizations of relations between living and dead”.¹³ As Lou strokes the “slippery, life-smooth shoulder of the horse”, he slides along a sequence of “slippery” differences. He is at once a horse (with “a strange equine head”), a serpent (his head reaches “snake-like forward”), and a cat (“crouching to spring”) (*SM* 34). Multiple simultaneous states of becoming share an interior space that has nothing to do with established identity. Deleuze and Guattari’s favourite term for this difference is “a multiplicity”, which, they suggest, has a fascination for humans because of “a multiplicity dwelling within us” (*Thousand* 264). Associated primarily with pack-animals, it precipitates “unnatural participations” at pre-subjective levels of metamorphosis. To distinguish them from tamed, oedipalized family “pets”, and symbolic “State animals”, Deleuze and Guattari employ exactly the same term as Lawrence does in *St. Mawr* – “demonic animals” (*Thousand* 265) whose “hybrid modes of existence” displace “dominant modes of human subjectivity”.¹⁴ Theirs is precisely the multiplicities of powers and of presences Lou’s second vision evokes.

At one level, her vision may be read as a riposte or reproof to the earlier Freudian location of St. Mawr’s “dangerous ... resentment” (*SM* 28) in a personal past history of mistreatment by humans (the beatings). By contrast, the vision opens up prehistoric perspectives – a “battle between two worlds” (*SM* 35) – in which ultimately humans subjugate the horses. Glimpsed at their moment of pure supremacy, the half-invisible outlines of horses emerge in the process of their active becoming. “Jutting out of the matrix” that seems to contain them, they move with molecular velocities – “swift and fierce and supreme, undominated and unsurpassed” (*SM* 35) – before their subjugation by humans coerced and contained them. As archetypal pack-animals, they exist at the level at which humans encounter the animal, not as assemblages of established individual traits, but as uncanny potencies that trigger fresh human

becomings. As in Lou's encounters with St. Mawr, the pack (the stallion's "multiplicities") is "simultaneously an animal reality, and the reality of the becoming-animal of the human being" (*Thousand* 267). The "meet[ing]" with St. Mawr "half-way" that Lewis proposes to Lou is thus a daring ontological trespass, pointing at once backward to the all-too-human Rico whom she must "sacrifice" in the process and forward to an inhuman encounter with the "wild spirit" of the Rockies – her "true double at the other end of the line" (*Thousand* 218).¹⁵

Unlike Lewis, however, Lou never becomes the animal-other in the manner that Lewis's meeting "half-way" implies (the co-habitation of human and animal being within the same human body that I shall shortly explore). Though they profoundly remap her interior constitution, Lou's species crossings are, as yet, threshold affairs, a testing of borders and limits. For those great literary becomings-animal, such as Melville's Ahab and Moby Dick, or Kafka's 'The Metamorphosis', Deleuze and Guittari propose the term "monstrous alliance[s] ... a pact with a demon ... [who] sometimes appears as the head of the band ... and sometimes as the higher Power (*Puissance*) of the band" (*Thousand* 268). From the start, Lou's engagements with St. Mawr have something of this "higher Power" insistence – her initial idealized misrecognition of the stallion that later compels her to dismiss his "beauty" as an illusion (*SM* 137). From her first encounter, where St. Mawr appears as a "splendid demon" whom "she must worship" (*SM* 31) to her later perception of "the chaos of his horrid eyes" from which "demons upon demons" emanate (*SM* 41) (a multiplicity without any unity), he is a precursor of a more radical becoming for which he acts as initiator. For Lou, he sketches the "line of flight" she must take, away from "human subjectivity and human perspectives towards becoming imperceptible" to herself and to others.¹⁶ On the last of these initiatory encounters, St. Mawr's neighing, "like deep wind-bells resounding", evokes another "darker, more spacious, more dangerous, more splendid world than ours" to which Lou "wanted to retreat" (*SM* 41). As premonition of a transformation yet

to materialize, St. Mawr is a teleological lead-in to an ultimate becoming, when Lou encounters her own natural double.

Lou's extended debate with her mother at once marks the end of her becomings-St. Mawr, and the return to a safe logos-world, governed by precise signifying systems and rational argument (*SM* 58-62). Challenging those logocentric skills her mother has mastered, Lou at the same time transcends their intellectual limitations, especially in her depiction of her fantasized human ideal – her “pure animal man” who would be “all the animals in turn, instead of one, fixed, automatic thing” (*SM* 62). From her initiation into modes of becoming, Lou already recognizes the multiplicity of beings, including the human, as well as the plurality of relations that humans and animals share. If Mrs. Witt is a classic anthropocentric humanist type, assured of human superiority, though men lack the mental ascendency she demands from them, Lou is a Deleuzean *avant la lettre* whose intuitive sense of becoming-animal matches Deleuze's more theoretical practice.

Not by accident, Mrs. Witt's cutting of Lewis's hair in a Shropshire backyard (*SM* 56-58) precipitates the debate – her attempted transformation of the groom from a “human tom-cat” (*SM* 59) into a recognizable human, thus clearing up her species confusion about him: “When I speak to him, I'm not sure whether I'm speaking to a man or a horse” (*SM* 38). Not a mere decorative supplement (like a “necktie”), as Mrs. Witt had previously thought (*SM* 38), the beard is burgeoning animal-fur that conceals the vivid facial expressiveness that uniquely reveals his humanity. In chapter 7 of *A Thousand Plateaus*, entitled ‘Year Zero: Faciality’, Deleuze and Guattari spectacularly undermine the anthropocentric identification of the face with the human, which adds one further trait to the long historical list (language, reason, consciousness, etc), designed to secure ascendency over the animals. “[S]ubjectivity would remain absolutely empty if faces did not form loci of resonance that select the sensed or mental reality and make it conform in advance to the dominant reality” (*Thousand* 186), which is rigorously anthropocentric. What Deleuze and Guattari suggest about human

destiny has uncanny resonances with Lou’s embrace of becoming, as her mode of dismantling the self: “if human beings have a destiny, it is rather to escape the face, to dismantle the face and facializations, to become imperceptible … by quite spiritual and special becomings-animal” (*Thousand* 189). As the fetishized site that concentrates human expressiveness, and fixes identity, the face further deepens the abyss between human and animal that Lou desires to cross through her own special becomings.¹⁷

In the debate itself, Lou ingeniously reframes the traditional distinctions between human and non-human, proposing alternative viewpoints and perspectives. In contrast to those Cartesian mind-sets “clever” men possess that repeat the same verbal patterns (the “knitting” syndrome), Lewis “knows things without thinking them” (*SM* 60) with a molecular speed and agility human speech cannot match. Like the animal mind, his mind responds intuitively without the encumbrances of propositional thought. While Mrs. Witt’s “mind-men” are essentially molar, trapped within the segmentations language imposes, Lou’s “pure animal man” is exorbitantly molecular: as a new Deleuzean man, his clairvoyant impulsions and flows resist precisely those overcodings fixed signifiers produce. Burning “like a flame fed straight from underneath”, and through a plurality of becomings, he radiates heat, silence and power – a multiplicity of ontological potencies (“He’d be all the animals in turn” [*SM* 62]) that he shares with the rest of creation. Such utopian dismantling of Western anthropocentrism at once rescues animals from singular design-nations (as “brute” or “beast”) and endows them with powers humans thought unique to themselves. As if to confirm Lou’s hypotheses, Lewis reveals to Mrs. Witt (on their two-day horse-ride across central England) the secrets of a molecular universe, which challenge the molar rigidities of the one she inhabits.

II.

Because he breaks through the species barrier, incorporating the animal other as *Doppelgänger* into his human constitution, Lewis

moves uneasily between two disjunctive universes. As such, he may be read as confirming the Deleuzean hypothesis that the becoming-animal of the human is real, even though the animal he becomes is not (*Thousand* 262) (Mrs. Witt, for example, is far from convinced that he is genuinely human). In Deleuzean terms, Lewis possesses at once a territorialized molar self with a socially classified place in the world, and an intensely deterritorialized molecular life, which breaks through the boundaries the former imposes. Because Lewis fully embodies the animal other, his “line of flight” is already accomplished, thus ruling out the return to a single molar identity.

At the molar level, Lewis inhabits a world of substantive entities, where the discourses that constitute his identity – cultural, political, religious – are precisely the ones he most needs to escape: “I would never belong to any club, or trades-union, and God’s the same to my mind” (*SM* 110). While he keeps his humanized language repertoire intact, he consciously distances himself from the institutions, both secular and ecclesiastical, that would threaten his freedom. Yet a rigidly segmented class structure fixes his role as a servant (even in Lou’s eyes the gulf between master and servant is absolute in a way that the gulf between human and animal is not [*SM* 62]), though he perceives this as a mere economic necessity: “I have to be a servant to women now ... to earn my wage” (*SM* 111). Thus his double-life fluctuates between a commonplace molar world, where he functions as groom, and a fabulous molecular universe, whose uncanny influxes determine his role as a permanent outsider.

Critics commonly dismiss Lewis’s other-world as childish, animistic, folklorish – what Margot Norris calls his “juvenile Celtic cosmos”¹⁸ – and the rationale for such a curt dismissal is easy to understand. A Deleuzean reading, however, not only offers a fresh perspective on Lewis’s “cosmos”, it also enables finer discriminations between it and the molar segmentations to which it is opposed. In so doing, it avoids the psychoanalytical reduction of this other-world to an infantile regression – an escape from an adult

world to which Lewis is poorly adjusted. Both in its esoteric constitution and its occult singularities, its potencies have strong resonances with those of the Deleuzian universe. Bearing in mind the risks such “impossible” extrapolations involve, I shall sketch out certain analogies, without (I hope) pushing their implications too far.

Untouched by oppressive linguistic taxonomies, Lewis’s is an alternative universe, where “language never ruffled the growing leaves, and seared their edges like a bad wind” (*SM* 124). Opposed to the “visible, audible” world Mrs. Witt inhabits, its silent “invisibilit[ies]” (*SM* 104) are signs of molecular velocities that outstrip the grammar of human communication. The same instantaneous transfers as between Lawrence and the pine-tree outside his cabin ensure that, while trees sympathetically “watch and listen with their leaves”, they also assume negative human traits (they “hurt” people who cut them down [*SM* 107]). In offering its own exotic explanation of such “unnatural participations” (*Thousand* 267), *St. Mawr* associates it with “pan-vision” – a primordial microperception of “things that can’t be seen” with ordinary sight (*SM* 65). From the schizoanalytical perspective Deleuze and Guattari theorize in their earlier book *Anti-Oedipus* (1972), Lewis is at once a molar paranoiac whose enforced territorializations dislocate and oppress him, and a deterritorialized schizo whose “molecular direction … penetrates into singularities, their interactions and connections at a distance or between different orders” (*Anti* 280). To take one example: what appears to Mrs. Witt’s molar sight as a “shooting star” – one of a multitude, as she reminds Lewis, that fall from the sky in August – is for him a brilliant light-particle, a prognosticator of multiplicities, of difference and changes to come, “a gleam from the greater world” he also inhabits (*SM* 107, 109). “Cosmic phenomena”, as Deleuze and Guattari maintain, are more adequate configurations of libidinal “fluids and flows” than the constraints of Freud’s oedipal topologies that circumscribe sexuality in conceptual frames, such as individualized bodies or psyches (*Anti* 292).

At the centre of Lewis's decentred vision are non-Freudian de-individualized bodies – what the text calls “moon-people”. Fantasmatic creatures who “never speak”, and whose bodies “are clear almost like jelly”, through the multiplicity of their becomings they transmigrate from one state to another in serial immortallities (“people of the moon don't die” [SM 108]). Their closest analogue perhaps is with the Deleuzean “body-without-organs”, which also exists at the intensive molecular level, through “group displacement” and “migration” before the “organization of the organs” takes place (*Thousand* 169-70). Unlike the biological body, with its fetishized organs and eroticized zones of desire, the body-without-organs works through libidinal interpenetrations that dissolve the molar world of the human subject: unlike the stratified body, it reveals itself through the “connection of desires, [the] conjunction of flows, [the] continuum of intensities” (*Thousand* 179). In Lawrence's folklorish version, the moon-peoples' bodies are also transparent. Lacking substantial organs or centres, they pass without hindrance through “rocks and through the trunks of trees”. Though, as molecular beings, they lack an established language, they “know more” than humans, possessed, as they are, of intuitive perception, and the gift of ceaseless becomings. “[A]t full moon you can join the moon people”, Lewis declares (SM 108) – a transmigration, he implies, that he regularly undertakes. In sum, the moon-peoples' transparency, mutability, and the multiplicities of their becomings constitute an elemental version of Deleuze and Guattari's highly-theorized “body-without-organs” from whose absence of a centred subjectivity, all other affective fluidities follow.

From Lewis's perspective, Mrs. Witt's proposal of marriage intensifies the threat of a massive reterritorialization, a menacing consolidation of the molar world of class, status, and of a reified sexuality where fixed gender roles usurp the place of those liquid transfers becoming-the-other entails (SM 110-12).¹⁹ At this molar level, paradoxically, Lewis himself embodies a chauvinist ideology strangely at odds with the body-without-organs' libidinal flows and diversities: he fears women because they undermine the authority

which, he assumes, is man’s natural endowment (“No woman shall touch my body, and mock me or despise me” [SM 112]). If sexual contact, as Mrs. Witt ironically hints, would be injurious to Lewis’s “unapproachable” body, it is because that same body, as the narrative insists, has a potential for becoming-the-other that she intuits but cannot participate in.²⁰ Despite (or because of) her ruthless analytical skills, her world remains determinedly molar and segregated to the end of the novella.

III.

After our analysis of a partial becoming (Lou’s) and a completed becoming (Lewis’s), we now turn to a third style of becoming whose mode of transmission carries a psychopathic and phobic charge which the first two do not. Its key Deleuzean term is “contagion” (*Thousand* 266-68),²¹ which they associate with demonic pack-animals, especially rats. With its source in the Rockies, a lethal epidemic spreads threateningly out of the mountains, infecting the human inhabitants, who attempt to resist it by territorializing their claim to the place. Unlike St. Mawr – the “exceptional individual” who is also a loner (*Thousand* 268) – animal packs sow contagion through viral migrations from one species (rodent) to another (human). Opposed to heredity or sexual reproduction – the classic molar modes of transmission – the pack-rat virus penetrates the New England wife’s defences so that she in turn becomes a pack-rat. Exacerbating her sex-drive, disabling her mind and her speech, charging her with a pathogenic animal energy, the “grey rat-like spirit of the inner-mountains” attacks her “from behind” (SM 147).²² Disrupting her aesthetic contemplation of the “absolute beauty” of the desert landscape spread out before her, it forces her reterritorialization – her return to a “more human home” in the village (SM 150).

Before this occurs, however, the rhetoric of becoming switches dramatically from its lyrical celebration of the “tender” and “dreamy” (SM 134) (Lou’s response to the landscape as she drives up the mountain with her servant-retainer, Phoenix) to the demonic

and destructive, where non-human elements, especially rats, pose a threat to human existence (*SM* 133-4). Drawing on their long history as phobic animals, and on the human compulsion to exterminate them, Lawrence restores to pack-rats something of the rabid intensity that they were deprived of by Freud's symbolic domestication. Especially in the Rat-Man analysis, Freud "cages" these feral creatures, constricting their roles to the familial demands of the Oedipus Complex, and to specifically human erogenous zones.²³ With a fresh phobic fervidness, by contrast, the New England wife's becoming-rat weaves a network of fiendish associations around pack-rats: their frenzied sexuality, their anti-logos ferocity, their destructive multiplicities disintegrate human identity – not only the housewife's, but all other human beings on the ranch (*SM* 143).

Initially, like Freud, Lawrence domesticates the rat, restricting its function to drawing negative racial and sexual discriminations: Phoenix's attraction to Indian and Mexican women, for example, is that of the "secretive rat-like male" for the "furtive and soft and rat-like" female (*SM* 136). As yet, the becoming-rat of the human manifests itself solely in the underground stealth of their rat-sexuality. At precisely this point, and in preparation for Lou's "wild spirit" symbiosis, the connotations of the term "wild" undergo a curious circumscription. While it is positively applied to the great desert panorama – the "wild heart of the Rockies" (*SM* 140), the "little wild ranch" (*SM* 141), the "wild mountain hollows" (*SM* 149) – it is studiously withheld from feral animal life, now phobically associated with a "debasement malevolence" of which pack-rats are the dominant "symbols" (*SM* 143). The five hundred goats alone are exempted from the curse of the pack-rat: cicurated, neatly territorialized, they inhabit a "cosy woodshed", supplying humans with the foodstuffs (milk, cheese) the pack-rats devour (*SM* 142).

In those violent "animal sequences" in books and films that make one "scrape at one's bread like a rodent", Deleuze and Guattari locate that toxic infectiousness through which "Nature"

seems to operate “against itself” (*Thousand* 265, 267), sowing contagions that oppose its own benevolent powers. Infecting humans with their demonic compulsions, the proliferation of rats induces “a becoming-molecular that undermines the great molar powers of family, career, and conjugality” (*Thousand* 257).²⁴ In *St. Mawr*, pestilential emissions from the Rockies have all the molecular dynamism of Deleuzean plagues and pandemics. Like a “stupefying irritant gas, coming out of the unfathomed mountains”, a “malevolent breath” generates a lethal “inertia of indifference” in humans: the men’s bodies become corpse-like, and their “soul[s]” are “wast[ed]” away (*SM* 143).

The New England housewife’s becoming-rat is the most fully realized negative becoming in Lawrence’s fiction. Though she mobilizes all her molar defences against attack – fences without, and water-taps and bath-tubs within (*SM* 144) – these are useless against the insidious vapours that pour down from the Rockies. Dissolving the established ego, pack-rat becomings replace conjugal fidelity with hybrid and multiple bondings. Alienating the housewife from her husband, her becoming-rat obliterates her human intelligence, “empties” her mind, and deprives her of words “as if a pack-rat had carried [them] off”. Disabling *the* faculty (speech) that traditionally undergirds human claims to ascendency over the animals, an anti-logos offensive renders her mind aphasic and “blank” (*SM* 147). The “earthly paradise of the spirit” (*SM* 146) – the sumptuous landscape – upon which she feeds her eyes is undermined from within by the “half-created spirit of place” (*SM* 150), the molecular rat-contaminant that now intimately inhabits the woman’s body, as if it was her own self. Her retreat to the village is thus less a Deleuzean “line of flight” than a molar reterritorialization, a return to the safe place she repudiated when she first came to the mountains.

Intercalated between these dehumanizing scenarios, and as if by way of compensation for the housewife’s aphasia, the two prose-poems to “Absolute Beauty” display language at full stretch, charged with a resonant, exuberant energy that proclaims its status

as a uniquely human accomplishment. In a spectacular manner, it also tracks the Deleuzean shift from molar to molecular vision. Thus the first prose-poem is stylistically molar, as Deleuze and Guattari define it. As sharply-focused close-ups give way to long-distance perspectives, clearly organized, neatly segmented spaces reproduce the effect of a traditional sketch of a pastoral landscape. Distinctly etched adobe houses, twenty miles in the distance, and the canyon gateway, thirty miles in the distance, measure the carefully gradated scale of recession, as a twilight obscurity predictably yields pride of place to the morning sun, lighting up the valleys and the “green fields and long tufts of cotton-wood trees” (*SM* 146). As engaged focalizer (“she could watch,” “she could see” [*SM* 145]), the housewife’s vision selectively organizes the picture, domesticating its space-time dimensions to match the two-dimensional limits of her molar perception. Put differently, her purely aesthetic appreciation (“living through the eyes” [*SM* 146]) screens out those treacherous inhuman elements the untamed landscape embodies.

Concentrated molecular manifestations – rapid metamorphoses, affective intensities, multiplicities of becomings – mark the radical shift from the macro-stabilities of the first prose-poem to the micro-dynamics of the second, as turbulent becomings replace the measured tranquillity of the earlier scene. Dissolving her spectator control, tempestuous natural formations blank out the housewife’s presence, in the process dehumanizing the landscape. Like vast electro-magnetic events, high-velocity particles in an open trajectory cross and re-cross the desert: dust “whirl[s] in tall columns”, “solid mist from melted snow” blots out the “world below”, “black rain and cloud streak down”, and “rivers of fluid blue fire” explode on the earth – all travelling at molecular speeds that blur and disorientate human perception. Indeed, a more literal “line of flight” marks the sudden distance the (anonymous) narrator puts between this menacing cosmic fire-power and its capacity to liquidate earthly existence. Fleeing molecular bombardment, he

seeks refuge under the pine-trees from the “vast, white, back-beating light” that makes him “almost unconscious” (*SM* 146).

It is precisely this shock of “near things” – the “thing in itself”, as the text calls it (*SM* 147) – that the housewife retreats from, and Lou embraces as her “selfless double”, closer to her than she is to herself.²⁵ The finding of his double in the stallion, St. Mawr, that Lewis accomplishes (they met each other “half-way” [*SM* 35]) Lou now finds in the untamed wilderness, at once external in its power to liberate her, and internal as she actualizes its tumultuous, non-subjectified life-force within herself.

IV.

In her earlier encounters, Lou’s falling “in love with St. Mawr” (*SM* 28) generates her first awareness of multiplicities – her traumatic shift from her social, cultural and humanist identity as a London socialite to a deterritorialized and nomadic “becomer”: her “mystic new man (an impossible dream as she now realizes [*SM* 139]) would be all “the animals in turn” (*SM* 62), a plurality of evolutionary beings in metamorphic interplay with each other. In Deleuzean terms, for Lou, “[f]lows of intensity … their continuums and conjunctions … have replaced the world of the subject” (*Thousand* 179). Such an awareness of heterogeneity coincides with Lou’s conscious repudiation of the molar roles that an oedipal culture dictates – as lover, mistress or wife – in favour of internal multiplicities, the “successive inner sanctuaries of herself”, crystallized in the “Apollo mystery of the inner fire” (*SM* 139) that consumes itself in the process of its ceaseless becoming.

Thus Lou’s earlier threshold becomings with St. Mawr clear the way for an ultimate “wild spirit” becoming that brings into play “beings of totally different scales and kingdoms” (*Thousand* 263), and that is “bigger than men, bigger than people, bigger than religion” (*SM* 155). As Lou brings new “blood to the attack” (*SM* 151), the omens, however, are not entirely propitious. On her arrival at Las Chivas, for example, the text stages the reciprocal effect of an earlier becoming: the New England housewife’s

becoming-rat has its ominous double in a pack-rat becoming-human. Separated out from the pack, a boss-rat becomes the Deleuzean “exceptional individual” (*Thousand* 268), the specially chosen one who, since he has no fear of humans, assumes the role of guardian of the ranch. Sitting erect on a roof-plank with his hands folded over his “white belly”, he “keep[s] watch” like an “old immobile Indian” over a territory he clearly regards as his own (*SM* 152). One may take this event at face-value as the literal enactment of a two-way becoming, or alternatively as a minor diversion that throws the trauma of a real becoming-rat into comic relief.

Critics habitually undertake their own “line of flight” from Lou’s final speech of commitment to the “wild spirit” made to her mother (*SM* 158), decorously retreating into generalities about life or nature or the lure of the wilderness.²⁶ A Deleuzean reading, by contrast, highlights its continuity with, and difference from, Lou’s earlier becomings with St. Mawr, actualized in its near-exclusive vital concern with affective (sexual) intensities, which are also Deleuzean modes of becoming. Through a new logic of relations, there is no longer the original Lou or the “wild spirit”, but a metamorphosic circuit of states through which they become one another. Lou’s desire to be “alone” (*SM* 153) implies not only her “imperceptibility” to others (like St. Mawr,²⁷ Rico, Phoenix and the rest are consigned to the “world’s backyard” [*SM* 155]), but also to herself since she no longer possesses an intrinsic molar identity, a self that assumes a visible structure in the eyes of the other. As Deleuze and Guattari put it in relation to the heroine of Henry James’s *In the Cage*, by becoming “imperceptible”, Lou has “dismantled love in order to become capable of loving” (*Thousand* 218). Thus Lou’s rhetoric is studded with epithets of desire, alien to her habitual discourse, whose intensity increases as her speech to her mother proceeds. Her opening sense of an untamed, mysterious force that “loves” [her] and wants [her]” precipitates her new awareness of an inhuman molecular power that will “hurt” her and “wear [her] down”, climaxing in her conviction of its vehement desire for her (“it needs me. It craves for me” [*SM* 155]). Put

differently, falling in love with Deleuzean becoming mobilizes Lou’s libido in a manner no animal or human agent can match. No longer rooted in Freudian prohibition (castration) or in Lacanian lack (alienation), Lou’s conjunction with the “wild spirit” evokes an unbridled libidinal plenitude, untouched of repression or sublimation. No longer sabotaged by castration anxiety – “the negative law of the priest”, as Deleuze and Guattari call it (*Thousand* 171) – as it was with Rico, nor by cultural interdictions, as it was with the Vyners, desire is in no need of ritual catharsis or purification. Thus the dark feral double that sacrificial love renounces as a threat to salvation²⁸ is precisely the double that Lou fervently embraces (“it doesn’t want to save me either” [SM 155]) in her drive towards eroticized liberation.

As Deleuze and Guattari remark, “it is not easy to de-oedipalize even nature, even landscapes, to the extent that Lawrence could” (*Anti* 351) – a highly intuitive clairvoyance in relation to the “wild landscape” that turns Lou on. What Lou discovers, as it were, is another dimension of eros beyond those “shattering and exhausting” energy clashes with Rico, which quickly led to their total abandonment (SM 24). “Sexuality and love”, Deleuze and Guattari insist, “do not live in the bedroom of Oedipus”, already haunted by claustrophobic father and mother configurations, but in turbulent “wide-open spaces,” where “strange flows ... circulate that do not let themselves be stocked within an established order” and where desire wants what it wants (i.e. fulfilment) (*Anti* 116). Because desire does not engage with fetishized persons or things, but with “the entire surroundings it traverses”, it is characterized by a certain “gigantism” (*Anti* 292) – Lou’s sense that it is “bigger” than anything oedipalized men or religion have to offer (SM 155). If, as Deleuze and Guattari (quoting Marx) claim, the true difference is “not the difference between the two sexes, but the difference between human and the ‘non-human’ sex” (*Anti* 294), then Lou’s ultimate choice is of the latter.

From a Deleuzean perspective, *St. Mawr* may well be read as a quest-novella for a liberated erotics without limits or boundaries, uncontrolled by self-orientated or social or political forces. The Deleuzean conception of desire has its double in Lou's unmitigated "craving" (*SM* 155) for a sexuality freed from repression or lack. From its initially closed, claustrophobic, and urbanized context, where Lou's desire is anaesthetized (in her marriage to Rico), the novella moves through a revitalized becoming-animal on to an untamed landscape-becoming – the "wild spirit" of the Rockies that fuels her desire (here, of course, the "wild spirit" is not an ontological entity – a being – but a sequence of momentous events – *spirited* molecular energies in a continual state of discharge). The libidinal lack in those "incompetent" men (*SM* 138) Lou encountered in the past has its counterpart in a Deleuzean lack, produced by familial and oedipal mediations that create the unconscious. "[S]tifling the whole of sexuality as production of desire", these forms reduce it to the Lawrentian "dirty little secret", to a "private theatre rather than the fantastic factory of Nature and Production" (*Anti* 49). As the invisible force that drives its production, the "wild spirit" also fuels Lou's repudiation of conjugal roles ("I am not a marrying woman" [*SM* 139]) that social convention imposes.

Perhaps the most remarkable of these final convergences is between *St. Mawr*'s configuration of an untrammelled erotics, embodied in a wild landscape that "live[s] as the world of the gods" (*SM* 146), and the Deleuzean celebration of great cosmic spectaculairs – "electrical storms", "sunspot activity", "St. Elmo's fire", and the brilliant sky-shifts in colour and cloud formations (*Anti* 292). In *St Mawr*, however, the "wild spirit's" fiery performative potential is not revealed in Lou's last speech to her mother, which is argumentative, not descriptive, but in the second paean to "Absolute Beauty" that preceded it (*SM* 146): there its "fluid blue" fire-power, its explosive intensities, as well as the multiplicities of its manifestations attract Lawrence's electrified prose. Its strident atmospherics find their match in Deleuze's sky-

phenomena – both configurations closer to a liberated erotics than the fetishized figures of oedipal sex. As if by telepathic communication with the now-departed New England wife (molecular contact), Lou intuits the “wild spirit’s” dangerous power – its potential to disturb and disorientate her through their mutual possession of the same imperative needs and desires. In the disruptive “thing in itself” (*SM* 147) that defeated the New England wife, Lou dreams up the fulfilment of a sexuality that is “deeper” than she is herself (*SM* 155). Through this last spectacular becoming that enchants and enhances, her migrant desire at last finds its true double.

¹ For the sake of clarity, all references to works by Deleuze and Guattari will be cited in-text using parenthetical abbreviations. The texts and their abbreviations are set out below:

Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Steem, and Helen R. Lane (London: The Athlone Press, 1996) [*Anti*].

Kafka: Towards a Minor Literature, trans. Dana Polan (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1986) [*Kafka*].

A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia, trans. Brian Massumi (London: Continuum, 2004) [*Thousand*].

² To avoid awkward adjectival constructions, such as “Deleuze and Guattarian”, I use the shorthand term “Deleuze” to include both authors’ names. When the two names appear as nouns, however, I use the conventional “Deleuze and Guattari”.

³ Tom Conley, ‘Pantagruel-Animal’, in *Animal Acts: Configuring the Human in Western History*, ed. Jennifer Ham and Matthew Senior (New York: Routledge, 1997), 45.

⁴ James Urpeth, ‘Animal Becomings’, in *Animal Philosophy: Essential Readings in Continental Thought*, ed. Matthew Calarco and Peter Atterton (London: Continuum, 2004), 101-110: 102, 104.

⁵ Interestingly, Ouspensky already refers to Albert Einstein’s theory of relativity, where space and time are no longer separate dimensions, as in the old physics, but where matter and force are unified. Quoting A. N. Oumoff, Ouspensky writes: “Matter has disappeared: its variety is replaced by systems of electrical units ... the vastly different electro-

magnetic world". P. D. Ouspensky, *Tertium Organum*, trans. E. Kadloubovsky and the Author (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981), 103.

⁶ The quotation continues: "Melville stuck to his ideal of a perfect relationship ... one in which each party leaves great tracts unknown in the other party" (*Thousand* 209). Such a relationship anticipates Lou's with the "wild spirit", which exists as her double, and yet is "unknown" in so far as neither she nor it are knowing subjects.

⁷ L. D. Clark, *The Minoan Distance: The Symbolism of Travel in D. H. Lawrence* (Tucson: U of Arizona P, 1980), 315.

⁸ Margot Norris, *Beasts of the Modern Imagination: Darwin, Nietzsche, Kafka, Ernst, and Lawrence* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1985), 17-18.

⁹ Carrie Rohman, *Stalking the Subject: Modernism and the Animal* (New York: Columbia UP, 2009), 131. Slavoj Žižek's characterization of the Real as "the life substance in its mucous palpitation" conveys something of the material dynamism, the visceral discharges from St. Mawr's flesh when Lou touches it.

¹⁰ See especially Chapter 1 of *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* (PFU 7-12).

¹¹ As Linda Ruth Williams puts it, "Lawrence identifies femininity with ... cerebral powers of illumination, and the desire to see and penetrate visually" – exactly those powers and desires which Lou's early encounters with St. Mawr dissolve and dismantle. Linda Ruth Williams, *Sex in the Head: Visions of Femininity and Film in D. H. Lawrence* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993), 22.

¹² Metaphor, as Susan McHugh suggests, "provides a strong defense for poetics in the service of anthropocentrism, for communicating ... messages about our essential humanity". Lawrence's animal tropology in *St. Mawr* works insistently to defeat such attempts at anthropocentric recuperation. Susan McHugh, 'Literary Animal Agents', *PMLA*, 124 (2009), 487-95: 488-9.

¹³ Jacques Derrida, *The Animal That Therefore I Am*, trans. David Wills (New York: Fordham UP, 2008), 31.

¹⁴ Matthew Calarco, *Zoographies: The Question of the Animal from Heidegger to Derrida* (New York: Columbia UP, 2008), p. 42.

¹⁵ This sole use of the term "sacrifice" in *St. Mawr* identifies Rico as victim, whose unfitness to make the crossing into "that terrific equine

twilight” compels Lou to “sacrifice” him (*SM* 35). A sacrificial ideology appears in *St. Mawr* under different guises. In one of her letters to her mother, for example, Lou writes that Flora Manby, who wants the stallion castrated, “demanded her victim; Shylock demanding the pound of flesh” (*SM* 133).

¹⁶ Matthew Calarco, *Zoographies*, p. 42.

¹⁷ In *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, Lawrence effectively dismantles facializations: trees are “marvellous vast individual[s] without a face, without lips or eyes or heart … powerful and exultant in [their] two directions” (*PFU* 86).

¹⁸ Margot Norris, *Beasts of the Modern Imagination*, 186.

¹⁹ Defending Mrs. Witt’s implausible choice of husband (from the purely social perspective), the narrator insists that Lewis is a unique individual, “an aristocrat … of the invisible powers, the greater influences, nothing to do with human society” (*SM* 121). Jeff Wallace has illuminating things to say about the Lawrence/Deleuze and Guattari alliance, though his focus, especially in *St. Mawr*, is radically different from mine. See Jeff Wallace, *D. H. Lawrence, Science and the Posthuman* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2005), 137-41.

²⁰ Because of its association of sexuality with “cosmic phenomena”, Deleuze and Guattari judge Lawrence’s evaluation of sexuality as “more accurate” than Freud’s: while Freud’s neurotic lies stretched on a couch, “unable to speak of love”, the schizo strolls in the mountains, “under the stars, the immobile voyage in intensities on the body without organs” (*Anti* 292).

²¹ At the submicroscopic level, “contagion” is the molecular mode of becoming the other. Entirely heterogeneous, it involves crossings between “a human being, an animal, and a bacterium, a virus, a molecule, a microorganism” (*Thousand* 266-67).

²² This attack “from behind” suggestively links together Freud’s association of rat-phobia with anal-eroticism and with infectious diseases and Lawrence’s insistence that “elemental contact” is from the “hypogastric plexus and sacral ganglion” where the “dark forces of manhood and womanhood sparkle” (*PFU* 193).

²³ Commenting on Deleuze and Guattari’s assertion that, for Freud, “animals could serve only to represent coitus between parents, or, conversely, be represented by coitus between parents” (*Thousand* 32), Kelly Oliver sums it up succinctly: “Freud turns the wild wolves into

domestic dogs or humans, just as he does with the Rat-Man's rats, and even with Little Hans's horses which become even more domesticated in the figure of the father". Kelly Oliver, *Animal Lessons: How They Teach Us to be Human* (New York: Columbia UP, 2009), p. 254.

²⁴ The context is Deleuze and Guattari's discussion of Daniel Mann's film *Willard* (1972), which has pack-rats as its protagonists. Ben, the prodigiously intelligent rat-hero with whom the main human protagonist (Willard) forms an alliance, later tears Willard to shreds for his act of betrayal – his choice of a young woman whom he hopes to marry in preference to the company of pack-rats (*Thousand* 257).

²⁵ Lawrence's echo of the Kantian "Thing in itself" – the "negativity of the subject" that in Žižek's formulation is "extremely dangerous to approach" – is starkly relevant to the housewife's contemplation of the paradisal landscape: its aesthetic consistency is shattered to such a degree that it "destroy(s) the illusion she cherished of love, universal love". Slavoj Žižek, *Enjoy Your Symptom! Jacques Lacan in Hollywood and Out* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 136-7, 148.

²⁶ "Wild spirit" is an unfortunate term, since it evokes the metaphysical binary (matter/spirit) that Deleuzean becomings dissolve. The Deleuzean conception of desire is a strictly materialist one, which (they claim) Freudian oedipalization "burie[s] beneath a new brand of idealism" (*Anti 24*).

²⁷ Lou's rejection of St. Mawr, the text suggests, is oedipal-based. Like Freud's domesticated wild animals, St. Mawr follows "slavishly" at the heels of the boss's Texan mare (*SM* 132).

²⁸ This is the double which, as Žižek puts it, the "subject must renounce, sacrifice even, in order to start to live as a "normal" member of the community". Lou, of course, has no desire to live as a normal member of any community. See Slavoj Žižek, *Enjoy Your Symptom!*, 125.



D. H. Lawrence, September 1906.

(Courtesy of Manuscripts and Special Collections, The University of Nottingham, La Phot 1/2/1)

To Henry Savage
from
D. H. Lawrence

The inscription "To Henry Savage from D. H. Lawrence"
in a first edition of *The Trespasser*.

**“A MILLION THANKS FOR THE BOOKS”:
A RECENTLY DISCOVERED POSTCARD
FROM D. H. LAWRENCE TO HENRY SAVAGE**

JONATHAN LONG

Until recently we knew of eighteen letters from Henry Savage to Lawrence, the first being the note of thanks Lawrence sent to Savage for his enthusiastic review of *The White Peacock*, which was published in *Academy* on 18 March 1911. (A shorter but equally laudatory review of the book by Savage was to appear in the May 1911 number of the *English Review*). The remaining correspondence begins on 8 July 1913 and finishes just twelve months later.

Information about the relationship between Savage and Lawrence is sketchy. The 1930 two-page memoir by Savage reproduced on pages 209-211 of the first volume of Edward Nehls' *A Composite Biography* deals with several topics, including Savage's admiration for *The White Peacock* and the manner of his falling out with Lawrence, but its brevity leaves a lot of questions unanswered. One might hope to find more detail in Savage's autobiography, *Receding Shore: Leaves from the Somewhat Unconventional Life of Henry Savage*, published by Grayson & Grayson Ltd. in 1933. Sadly, it treads largely the same ground as the Nehls memoir.¹

If we turn to the otherwise very helpful notes in the first volume of the Cambridge *Letters* we are again disappointed. Very little seems to be known about Savage – not even his date of death. He was a “free-lance journalist and essayist … on the staff of *Vanity Fair* then under the editorship of Frank Harris. First met DHL on 16 July 1913 at Kingsgate, Kent. Joint editor of *Academy*, 1915; later assistant editor, *Bookman's Journal* and London editor of *Book Notes*. Author of *Richard Middleton* (1922), etc.” (1L 241).

None of this sheds much light on the correspondence to follow. For the twelve months from July 1913 Savage was to become one of the most significant recipients of Lawrence's letters, excluding those directly involved in his career, such as Edward Garnett, Edward Marsh and Douglas Clayton.

The previously published letters are set against the backdrop of the July 1913 meeting between Savage, Lawrence and Frieda, and Lawrence's attempts to develop the relationship thereafter. They evidently hit it off, since Lawrence describes the occasion as an "exciting debauch" (2L 43).

Savage was the admiring biographer of Richard Middleton, who had committed suicide two years earlier, in 1911. He was also the editor of two books of Middleton's poems. In subsequent letters, Lawrence appears to be counselling Savage about Middleton's death, Savage's unsuccessful attempts to establish himself as a poet, and his worries about his wife. The correspondence also deals with Lawrence's appreciation for the books Savage sent him (including something by Middleton); Lawrence describes his own fluctuating mood and events in his life, starting with his disclosure before the meeting that he was living with a married woman whom he calls "my wife" (2L 35). Sadly, we do not have Savage's replies to Lawrence's letters, so it is difficult to see what Lawrence got out of the correspondence. However, they shared an interest in literature, and for a time Savage was evidently prepared to listen to Lawrence's views and forthright advice about what he (Savage) should do to improve his own quality of life and his career. Savage admired Lawrence as a writer but did not take up all the invitations to meet. The last letter contains an invitation to see Lawrence and Frieda in London shortly before their wedding (2L 193). Lawrence wrote after the meeting in 1913, "[d]on't mind my wise preaching, will you?" (2L 43), but eventually Savage *did* come to mind it.

So, with this as the background, the appearance on the market of a copy of the first edition of *The Trespasser*, inscribed by Lawrence to Savage, and containing an unpublished postcard, was intriguing. The book was impressive in itself, the inscription in unusually large

and curvaceous handwriting. Inscribed association copies of Lawrence's early novels are exceptionally rare, and this one clearly underlines the significance of the relationship.

Savage writes in *Receding Shore* that he had sold all his letters from Lawrence and that they were probably all in the United States (a number of them are to be found today in American university libraries).² The bookseller's description was tantalizingly brief; it did not provide the full text of the postcard that Savage held on to, so I had to go and see it for myself.

The postcard was not from the end of November 1913 as I had originally thought; it is postmarked 5 November 1913. Now that the date of this postcard is known, the date of letter 673 (asking Savage to send some books), previously thought to be 15 November 1913, needs to be corrected. The postcard appears to have been used as a bookmark as it has a horizontal 'sun fade' line running across it. It may be that it was forgotten when Savage sold his other letters, but it is just possible that he kept the postcard deliberately as a memento of the enthusiastic and appreciative Lawrence he wished to remember, not the preachy, philosophizing Lawrence to be found in the other correspondence. We might conjecture that there are other Lawrence books out there, similarly inscribed – indeed the Beinecke Library at Yale University has a first English edition of *The Widowing of Mrs Holroyd* inscribed to Savage (see 2L 153 n.3), so it is reasonable to assume that he might also have had the intervening titles, *Love Poems and Others* and *Sons and Lovers*, although somewhat ironically Savage himself sent Lawrence a copy of the former title (2L 43).

Savage's reasons for breaking off his relationship to Lawrence may remind us of similar accounts by other friends and acquaintances. Like Philip Heseltine, Savage ultimately found Lawrence's personality too strong to accommodate: "Rightly or wrongly, it seemed to me that he had reached a point where one had to efface one's individuality and consent to become a mere echo or disciple. As shadows are not without substance, so even echoes and disciples have a certain value, but as I thought more of myself – in

both senses of the phrase – at that time than I do now, the break was clearly inevitable”.³

¹ Henry Savage, *Receding Shore: Leaves from the Somewhat Unconventional Life of Henry Savage* (London: Grayson & Grayson Ltd, 1933), 41, 102-3 and 105-6

² Henry Savage, *Receding Shore*, 106. Savage perceptively describes Lawrence's letters from Lerici as largely representing “the unexpurgated part of the book, *Twilight in Italy*”.

³ *Ibid.*

REVIEWS

Peter Preston, *Working with Lawrence: Texts, Places, Contexts*. Nottingham: CCCP, 2010.
Pp. 299. £19.99 (UK), \$35 (USA), €30 (EU) (paperback). ISBN 9781905510313 (UK), 97816022610283 (USA)

Reviewed by Keith Cushman

The world of D. H. Lawrence studies lost perhaps its most beloved figure when Peter Preston succumbed to pancreatic and liver cancer in October 2011. In 1991 Preston founded the D. H. Lawrence Research Centre at the University of Nottingham. A tireless worker, over the years he organized many Lawrence conferences. He travelled widely, carrying the Lawrentian banner to such countries as Japan, Italy (including Sardinia), Austria, Montenegro, Serbia, and Slovenia. He was a mainstay – some would say the heart and soul – of the annual Lawrence conferences at Université Paris Ouest, organized by Ginette Katz-Roy.

Peter Preston's career was capped by two accomplishments. In 2007 at the international 'Return to Eastwood' conference he received the Harry T. Moore Award for Lifetime Contributions to and Encouragement of D. H. Lawrence Studies. And in the late summer of 2011 the Critical, Cultural and Communications Press published *Working with Lawrence: Texts, Places, Contexts*, a selection of thirteen of Preston's essays. Happily, CCCP released the book in time for him to hold it in his hands and inscribe copies to family and friends.

The lovely photograph of Lawrence and his sister Ada on Mablethorpe beach, taken in late August 1926, graces the cover of *Working with Lawrence*. Peter Preston's Introduction begins with a fascinating interrogation of this photograph. He quotes David Ellis's description of Lawrence as "bedraggled but cheerful,

clowning on the beach with his favourite sister" (15). Lawrence is holding a small parasol to no particular effect. Preston speculates that Lawrence is smiling broadly because one of Ada's children – Peggy, aged seventeen, or Jack, eleven – is taking the photograph. If this supposition is correct, then the Lawrence we see is "a good uncle indulging a nephew or niece and wielding a prop thrust upon him by one or the other of them". The photograph was always one of Preston's favourites because of "this sense of the family life beyond the camera's frame" (16).

Preston's reading of this photograph is shrewd and confident. He seems to take delight in his interpretation of this pictorial "text" that no one has genuinely thought about before. His decision to begin his essay collection with a discussion of the photograph of Lawrence and Ada on the beach in 1926 communicates his belief that literature and the arts are important above all for their human value. Preston concludes his discussion of the photograph with an insightful account of this moment in the life of D. H. Lawrence:

This image offers an ongoing moment in the life of a famous, often troubled and sometimes notorious writer who had in every sense travelled far from his beginnings, but who is now for a time relaxed and happy back among his own people in a place he knew from his youth. It is intensely intimate, posed yet informal, a mere hesitation in a family event soon to be resumed. It shows a side of Lawrence we often too readily forget. (16)

The depth of Preston's understanding of Lawrence and the clarity of his prose are on display throughout *Working with Lawrence*.

Preston's unpretentious title is just right. As he explains:

"Working with" seemed an appropriate way of describing the nature of that engagement, because as I re-read and selected the essays for republication I was conscious of the extent to which I have read Lawrence with the grain, seeking always to follow the

direction of his thinking, his language and the patterns of his imagery. (17)

The thirteen essays are organized into three categories: Texts, Places, and Contexts. The texts in question are *Women in Love* and *Mr Noon* (something of a Preston specialty): two essays apiece. As Preston explains, the “Places” essays seem “to be largely concerned with the ways in which the texts discussed dramatise how Lawrence positions himself in relation to unfamiliar cultures, both contemporary and historical” (28). The “Contexts” essays demonstrate Preston’s fondness for what he calls “the construction ‘Lawrence and’” (30). Most of the essays originated as lectures and conference presentations. Even in the revised, expanded forms of these essays, Peter Preston’s voice – with its slightly nasal twang – unmistakably comes through. That voice is down-to-earth, self-assured, trust-worthy, and enthusiastic. The essays display an impressive command of Lawrence’s texts. They are persuasive, and they are also regularly witty.

Preston presented six of the essays at the annual Lawrence conferences at Université Paris Ouest in Nanterre. Thus these six first appeared in *Etudes Lawrenciennes*. He was skilled at choosing somewhat out-of-the-way topics and developing surprising, instructive conclusions. Various Nanterre conference themes led to such essays as ‘Seeing Florence to Death: Lawrence in the City of David’ – ‘Roman Power: The Politics of *Etruscan Places*’ – ‘Bathed in the Word of the Lord?: Lawrence, Bunyan and the Bibline’ – ‘Under the same banner??: Lawrence and Catherine Carswell’s *Open the Door!*’ and ‘Hamlet, ’Amblet and Amleto: Lawrence’s Singular and Plural Dane’. (The title of the essay about those three blokes is witty in itself). Many of Preston’s essays clearly originated in his curiosity. Curiosity invariably led to critical insight.

In his Introduction Preston tells us that “for many years” he was “rather frightened of” *Women in Love*. He shares his unhappy experience of attempting to present the novel to adult education

students during “graveyard hours in a basement room where the bottom half of the windows were below ground level and looked out on dustbins and the wheels of parked cars”. In the bargain the room was cold, and the “ceiling seemed to press on [everyone’s] heads” (25). But in my opinion the most outstanding essays in *Working with Lawrence* are the two substantial studies of *Women in Love*. These essays – “A wave of disruptive force”: Violence in *Women in Love* and “Beyond the sound of words”: Speech and Silence in *Women in Love* – are strikingly complementary. In both essays Preston demonstrates a thorough mastery of Lawrence’s demanding, perplexing, thrilling masterpiece. The two essays do full justice to their crucial topics while also engaging with other important elements of the novel. Newcomers to Lawrence as well as seasoned *Women in Love* veterans will profit from these essays.

Preston’s two essays on *Mr Noon* fail to convince me that the novel isn’t “broken-backed”, but they nevertheless provide authoritative textual, biographical, and critical perspectives on the novel. He also offers a convincing explanation for Lawrence’s failure to complete *Mr Noon*: “writing retrospectively” was difficult for a novelist for whom “journey and discovery” had “to be available to him as *process*, as fundamental features of his creative endeavour” (98). Preston’s essay ‘On Not Being DHL’ was part of his fascinating project titled *Lawrence After Lawrence: The Author in British Culture 1930-2010*, a project sadly left unfinished at his death. ‘The Novel and the Nail: Form and Metaphor in Lawrence’s Essays on Fiction’ takes up the neglected topic of the “metaphorical, linguistic and rhetorical strategies” Lawrence employs to “build his arguments” in these essays (30).

In “A little dash to Sardinia”: Lawrence and Departure’ Preston relates Lawrence’s “fresh response to a new culture” (28) to his sense of his own selfhood. Preston’s humorous account in his Introduction of the circumstances in which he delivered the original paper in a railway museum outside Cagliari reminds us of why we miss him so much. Preston’s audience sat in a narrow aisle between

rows of engines and rolling stock mounted on short stretches of railway track.

Necessarily, the ceiling was quite high – which did little for the acoustics – and in order to change the overhead projector transparencies I had to step carefully over the tracks, which for greater authenticity were filled with pebbles. A tall antiquated plant stand served as a resting-place for my script. The event was the third item in the next morning's television news, but any hopes I might have entertained of developing a new media career were quickly disappointed, as I appeared only in the background of the report, a tiny, distant, inaudible figure making speaker-like gestures. (29-30)

Andrew Harrison provides an excellent Foreword to *Working with Lawrence*. The book concludes with a bibliography of Preston's writings on Lawrence. How greatly D. H. Lawrence studies have been diminished by Peter Preston's death.

Serena Cenni and Nick Ceramella, ed., *Il Corpo, La Fiamma, Il Desiderio: D. H. Lawrence, Firenze e la sfida di Lady Chatterley*. Florence: Consiglio Regionale della Toscana, 2010.
Pp. 420. No price. No ISBN.

Reviewed by Andrew Harrison

The translated title of this handsome volume is *Body, Flame, Desire: D. H. Lawrence, Florence and the Challenge of Lady Chatterley*. It collects papers delivered at an international conference held in Florence, 29-31 May 2008, which was organised to celebrate the eightieth anniversary of the first publication of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in the place where the novel was written and published.

This is a bilingual volume. The editorial introduction by Serena Cenni is in Italian, but of the twenty essays which follow ten are in English and ten in Italian. The names of many of the contributors will be familiar to the readers of this journal. There are essays here by (among others) Howard J. Booth, Izabel Brandão, Nick Ceramella, Simonetta de Filippis, Ornella De Zordo, Vita Fortunati, Bethan Jones, Marija Knežević, Stefania Michelucci, Peter Preston, Natalya Reinholt and Stephen Rowley. This simple list should indicate something of the international flavour of the event: contributors to the conference travelled from locations in Italy, England, France, Brazil, Russia and Montenegro.

The volume is divided into four sections, entitled ‘Un romanzo tenero e delicate: Firenze e *L'amante di Lady Chatterley*’ [‘A Tender and Delicate Novel: Florence and *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*’]; ‘D. H. Lawrence: sollecitazioni culturali in Toscana’ [‘D. H. Lawrence: Cultural Engagements in Tuscany’]; ‘*L'amante di Lady Chatterley*: il testo, la censura, le interpretazioni’ [‘*Lady Chatterley’s Lover*: Text, Censorship, Interpretations’]; and ‘Decostruire / recostruire la sessualità’ [‘Deconstruction / Reconstruction of Sexuality’].

In ‘D. H. Lawrence and Tuscany: Art, Nature, Ideology’, Simonetta de Filippis takes *Aaron’s Rod* as her initial focus, showing how the composition of this novel between 1917 and 1921 incorporated elements of Lawrence’s post-War experience of Tuscany. She makes reference here to the essays ‘David’ and ‘Looking Down on the City’, suggesting that the former essay employs a cinematic technique for describing Florence which is reflected in the chapter from the novel simply entitled ‘Florence’. While *Aaron’s Rod* incorporated Lawrence’s early experience of Tuscany, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* is said to express an ideology based on “the contrast between nature and industry” and a sensuous approach to life which he subsequently developed through his appreciation of Italy and his fascination with the Etruscan civilisation. In the author’s own words, “Italy, Tuscany, Etruria ... offer to Lawrence a cultural experience that provides him with

significant answers to his long search, helping him to clarify his own ideals and his own vision of the world, those ideals and that vision that he fully expresses in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* through his provocative but vital and sincere message of life" (107).

Peter Preston's 'Receiving *Lady Chatterley's Lover*: The Novel in British Culture, 1960-2008' offers an engaging and often humorous insight into the place of the novel in the British literary and popular imagination in the aftermath of the Trial. The essay draws upon a range of different sources to assess the novel's impact, from contemporary newspaper coverage of Penguin's court victory, to the posed photographs used by the company to advertise the novel, to allusions in subsequent novels and in the contemporary media. One particularly comical example from the 'Style' column of the *Guardian* in May 2006 refers to the TV personality Monty Don as "a modern-day Lady Chatterley's Lover" (196). There is also an intriguing reference to the women's clothing company Ann Summers wanting to launch a 'Lady Chatterley' range of lingerie, only to be threatened with legal action by the Lawrence estate on the grounds that this would constitute a debasement of the author's name (202). Preston argues that the novel offers a series of short-hand 'tropes' through which subsequent writers have addressed issues of sexual and class transgression (e.g. "the gamekeeper trope, with the associated *topos* of the hut in the woods" [188]). The proliferation of the references to it in British culture confirms its entrance into the popular imagination; although some writers have felt compelled to negotiate in detail the novel's stylistic innovations and gender politics, one does not even need to have read the novel in order to recognise its subversive and risqué connotations.

The final essay in the volume, Howard J. Booth's "They *don't* think as we're all men together": Region, Class and Personal Relationships in the First Version of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, shifts the focus away from the Italian influence on the final version of the novel to emphasise how the theme of relationships across class boundaries was initially explored in response to the specific

political climate Lawrence encountered in the Nottinghamshire coalfields during his visit in September 1926. Booth notes that the Nottingham area was unusual in England from the late nineteenth century onwards for its reliance on a tacit “collaboration” between masters and workers; the area became a Liberal stronghold and its politics were rooted in the belief that “enlightened employers were acting in everyone’s best interests” (396). The General Strike and its aftermath disrupted this belief, leading not just to class division, but to internal division within the classes and to a more profound questioning of the basis of trust and cohesion within society. Booth shows how the first version of the novel explores these divisions and tensions through the interactions between Constance and Parkin, which reveal Lawrence’s sensitivity to the problems involved in establishing relationships across social and financial faultlines. If the final version of the novel drew on Lawrence’s experience of Italy in developing a language for contact, touch and tenderness, the first version responded to his shock at the state of industrial relations in Nottingham, dramatizing the difficulty of establishing trust and union at a time of widespread social unrest.

These brief synopses of three of the essays collected in *Il Corpo, la Fiamma, il Desiderio* should give some sense of its range and ambition in offering new angles on *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, and a fresh consideration of Lawrence’s engagement with Tuscany and Italy more generally. The volume contains some good work on Lawrence; English speakers unable to read the Italian contributions will still find much of interest in its pages. Although some of the essays contain tell-tale traces of their origin as conference papers, and there are occasional typos and omissions in the text, the quality of the contributions is much higher than we might expect from a volume of proceedings. Nick Ceramella and Serena Cenni should be congratulated for their editorial efforts. The only real sadness lies in the fact that the volume is not for sale, since the Tuscan Regional Council is a non-profit making organisation. If you are unable to acquire one for yourself by contacting the editors, then it is certainly worth going out of your way to borrow a copy.

Howard J. Booth, ed., *New D. H. Lawrence*.
Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009.
Pp. xvi + 200. £55 (hardback). ISBN 9780719078361

Reviewed by Keith Cushman

New D. H. Lawrence is a collection of nine new essays that engage with Lawrence “using current and emergent themes in English Studies” (1). The essays are “driven by theme and approach” (9). The sheer variety of the critics’ approaches marks Lawrence as a central figure in the literary, intellectual, and cultural life of England in the first half of the twentieth century. The essays also demonstrate that the scale and complexity of Lawrence’s ambition and accomplishment make him a figure of enduring interest over 80 years after his death.

Howard Booth’s Introduction is perhaps the most valuable feature of the collection. Booth provides a concise, thoughtful, and comprehensive overview of the history of Lawrence criticism. This overview is not merely descriptive. For example, when he (mildly) acknowledges that Kate Millett’s *Sexual Politics* “can ... be questioned as criticism” (4), he also accurately observes that Millett’s chapter on Lawrence was “a necessary correction to a popular deployment of Lawrence that held him up as a guide for personal development and the conduct of relationships” (a “deployment” that the older generation of Lawrence scholars grew up with). Booth also points out what still needs to be done in Lawrence studies. I find his unwavering seriousness appealing at this time of the great cultural marginalization of literary studies.

It is fairly simple to divide the essays between those employing “current” themes and those whose themes are “emergent” although perhaps one or two reside in an in-between grey area. Among the traditional approaches to Lawrence, Andrew Harrison’s exploration of the marketing of *Sons and Lovers* demonstrates the impact of commercial pressures on the final shape of Lawrence’s first great novel. The essay is notable for Harrison’s meticulous scholarship

and the lucidity of his style. Howard Booth brings a persuasively fresh approach to the Marxist analysis of *The Rainbow*. His essay analyzes Christopher Caudwell's Marxist criticism of the 1930s as well as more recent Marxist readings of the novel. Booth also interrogates issues of colonialism in the novel.

Focusing on 'The Ladybird', Stefania Michelucci argues that the impact of World War I led to Lawrence's shift from realism to the mythic mode, from the "line" to the "circle". Bethan Jones's easy-going, insightful exploration of "comedy and gender" in the late short fiction connects nicely with her excellent *The Last Poems of D. H. Lawrence* (2010). One of the highlights of her essay is her discussion of the two fictional fragments, 'The Woman Who Wanted to Disappear' (published for the first time in 2006 in the CUP *Virgin and the Gipsy* volume) and 'The Man Who Was Through with the World'. Sean Matthews shrewdly argues that the trial of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* "was the climax of a drama of class, criticism and culture which had begun in the 1940s". Matthews seems to me to overstate his case when he claims that "the Chatterley Trial seems not the beginning but rather the culmination of a Lawrence revival" (170).

Both Holly Laird and Hugh Stevens write about *Women in Love*. Although it is news to me that suicide studies has become an "emergent theme", Laird intriguingly demonstrates how Lawrence takes "suicide as part and parcel of thorny, multi-faceted existential dilemmas, both potentially comic and fiercely tragic in outcome" (75). Hugh Stevens's psychoanalytic approach to *Women in Love* draws on Freud, Riviere, and Winnicott. Although this approach isn't exactly "emergent", his argument relating psychoanalytic theories of war to an exploration of "the relationship between mourning and aggression in personal relationships and between nations" (10) offers an insightful new perspective on the novel.

Jeff Wallace writes about "democracy, abstraction and the machine in Lawrence, Deleuze and their readings of Whitman", concluding that abstraction can be as "beguiling an entity in Lawrence as it is in Deleuze and Guattari" (113). Wallace's theme

is resoundingly “emergent”, but one wonders how many Lawrence scholars are equipped to engage with his philosophically and theoretically dense argument. At the same time Wallace’s essay has the virtue of its questioning of the nature of human experience in our post- (or post-post-) modern world. Fiona Becket has become the leading eco-critic among Lawrence scholars. Her essay stakes out a theoretical position (in relation to the writing of Freya Mathews, Val Plumwood, Mary Midgley, and Dana Phillips) before discussing *Birds, Beasts and Flowers*. As this reader sees it, Becket’s essay will be of interest primarily to academics interested in refining the theory of eco-criticism – while Lawrence risks getting lost in the shuffle.

New D. H. Lawrence impressively exhibits the continuing vitality of Lawrence scholarship. Lawrence scholars will find much that is fresh and challenging in these essays, and yet it is difficult to escape from the feeling that we are speaking to ourselves and no one else. Now if only new Lawrence (and old Lawrence too) could locate some new readers and could also find his way back into more English Department syllabi.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

GERALD DOHERTY taught literary theory at the University of Turku, Finland, until his retirement in 1994. His books include *Theorizing Lawrence* (1999), *Oriental Lawrence* (2001), *Dubliners' Dozen* (2004) and *Pathologies of Desire* (2008). He lives in the village of Rymättylä in southern Finland.

DAVID GAME received his PhD from the Australian National University, Canberra, in 2009, and is a School Visitor in the School of Cultural Inquiry. He has had articles published in the *Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies* and the *D. H. Lawrence Review*, and is working on a book proposal arising from his thesis provisionally titled 'D. H. Lawrence's Australia: Anxiety at the Edge of Empire'. With Nancy Paxton, he was co-convenor of the 12th International D. H. Lawrence Conference held in Sydney in June-July 2011.

ANDREW HARRISON is Lecturer in Twentieth-Century Literature at the University of Nottingham and Director of its D. H. Lawrence Research Centre. He is currently writing the volume on Lawrence for the Blackwell Critical Biographies series.

JONATHAN LONG is a solicitor practising in Suffolk, specialising in agricultural law. He has been a Lawrence enthusiast for over thirty years, and is a member of the D. H. Lawrence Societies of Britain, North America and Australia. He is a regular contributor to the D. H. Lawrence Society *Newsletter* and speaker at the Society's meetings. He is also a contributor to the *Journal of the D. H. Lawrence Society of Australia*.

PAUL POPLAWSKI has published several books and articles on Lawrence, including the revised third edition of *A Bibliography of D. H. Lawrence* (Cambridge UP, 2001). He was Series Adviser for

the new Penguin Classics series of Lawrence's texts and he is the contributing editor of *English Literature in Context* (Cambridge UP, 2008).

SUSAN REID completed her PhD on 'Masculinities in the Novels of D. H. Lawrence' at the University of Northampton UK in 2008. She is Co-Editor of the peer-reviewed journal *Katherine Mansfield Studies*, Reviews Editor of the *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, and Editor of the Mansfield Blog: www.katherinemansfieldsociety.org/kmtoday. She recently co-edited *Katherine Mansfield and Literary Modernism* (Continuum, 2011) and has published several articles on Lawrence, Mansfield and Woolf.

OLIVER TAYLOR has published on D. H. Lawrence and Virginia Woolf in a variety of periodicals (*Etudes Lawrenciennes*, *The D. H. Lawrence Review*, *The Journal of the Short Story in English*) and edited collections (*The Companion to the British Short Story* [2007]; *The Hand of the Interpreter* [2009]) and is completing a book on Lawrence's letters and postcards. He is currently working in the Access and Learning Team at Gloucestershire Archives on an oral history project that documents the lives and experiences of different generations and cultures in two multicultural, inner city areas of Gloucester (www.bartonandtredworth.org.uk).

JOHN WORTHEN's most recent books are *D. H. Lawrence: The Life of an Outsider* (2005), *Robert Schumann: Life and Death of a Musician* (2007), *T. S. Eliot: A Short Biography* (2009) and *The Cambridge Introduction to Coleridge* (2010).

ABBREVIATIONS

Letters of Lawrence

1L *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence Volume I: September 1901–May 1913*. Ed. James T. Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979.

2L *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence Volume II: June 1913–October 1916*. Ed. George J. Zytaruk and James T. Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.

3L *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence Volume III: October 1916–June 1921*. Ed. James T. Boulton and Andrew Robertson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.

4L *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence Volume IV: June 1921–March 1924*. Ed. Warren Roberts, James T. Boulton and Elizabeth Mansfield. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.

5L *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence Volume V: March 1924–March 1927*. Ed. James T. Boulton and Lindeth Vasey. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.

6L *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence Volume VI: March 1927–November 1928*. Ed. James T. Boulton and Margaret H. Boulton with Gerald M. Lacy. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.

7L *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence Volume VII: November 1928–February 1930.* Ed. Keith Sagar and James T. Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

8L *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence Volume VIII: Previously Uncollected Letters and General Index.* Ed. James T. Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

Works of Lawrence

A *Apocalypse and the Writings on Revelation.* Ed. Mara Kalnins. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980.

AR *Aaron's Rod.* Ed. Mara Kalnins. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.

BB *The Boy in the Bush.* With M. L. Skinner. Ed. Paul Eggert. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

EME *England, My England and Other Stories.* Ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

FLC *The First and Second Lady Chatterley Novels.* Ed. Dieter Mehl and Christa Jansohn. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.

Fox *The Fox, The Captain's Doll, The Ladybird.* Ed. Dieter Mehl. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

FWL *The First 'Women in Love'.* Ed. John Worthen and Lindeth Vasey. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

IR *Introductions and Reviews*. Ed. N. H. Reeve and John Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.

K *Kangaroo*. Ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

LAH *Love Among the Haystacks and Other Stories*. Ed. John Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.

LCL *Lady Chatterley's Lover and A Propos of 'Lady Chatterley's Lover'*. Ed. Michael Squires. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

LEA *Late Essays and Articles*. Ed. James T. Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

LG *The Lost Girl*. Ed. John Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.

MEH *Movements in European History*. Ed. Philip Crumpton. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.

MM *Mornings in Mexico and Other Essays*. Ed. Virginia Crosswhite Hyde. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009.

MN *Mr Noon*. Ed. Lindeth Vasey. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.

P *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence*. Ed. Edward D. McDonald. London: Heinemann, 1936.

2P *Phoenix II: Uncollected, Unpublished, and Other Prose Works by D. H. Lawrence*. Ed. Warren Roberts and Harry T. Moore. New York: Viking, 1968.

Plays *The Plays*. Ed. Hans-Wilhelm Schwarze and John Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.

PM *Paul Morel*. Ed. Helen Baron. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

PO *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories*. Ed. John Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.

Poems *The Complete Poems of D. H. Lawrence*. Revised Edition. Ed. Vivian de Sola Pinto and Warren Roberts. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1977.

PS *The Plumed Serpent*. Ed. L. D. Clark. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.

PFU *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious*. Ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

Q *Quetzalcoatl*. Ed. N. H. Reeve. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011.

R *The Rainbow*. Ed. Mark Kinkead-Weekes. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.

RDP *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine and Other Essays*. Ed. Michael Herbert. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.

SCAL *Studies in Classic American Literature*. Ed. Ezra Greenspan, Lindeth Vasey and John Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

SEP *Sketches of Etruscan Places and Other Italian Essays*. Ed. Simonetta de Filippis. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

SL *Sons and Lovers*. Ed. Helen Baron and Carl Baron. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

SM *St. Mawr and Other Stories*. Ed. Brian Finney. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.

SS *Sea and Sardinia*. Ed. Mara Kalnins. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

STH *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays*. Ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.

T *The Trespasser*. Ed. Elizabeth Mansfield. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.

TI *Twilight in Italy and Other Essays*. Ed. Paul Eggert. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

VicG *The Vicar's Garden and Other Stories*. Ed. N. H. Reeve. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009.

VG *The Virgin and the Gipsy and Other Stories*. Ed. Michael Herbert, Bethan Jones and Lindeth Vasey. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.

WL *Women in Love*. Ed. David Farmer, Lindeth Vasey and John Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.

WP *The White Peacock*. Ed. Andrew Robertson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.

WWRA *The Woman Who Rode Away and Other Stories*. Ed. Dieter Mehl and Christa Jansohn. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.