

## EDITING SONS AND LOVERS

Helen Baron

Part of a lecture given at a one-day conference at the D.H. Lawrence Centre, Nottingham, on 14 November 1992.

### RECEPTION

Our edition of *Sons and Lovers*<sup>1</sup> has so far received the attention of about 30 newspaper notices and reviews in Britain, America, Italy, Australia, India, Japan and Brazil; and four radio programmes: on Nottingham local radio, Radio 3, Australian ABS radio based in Sydney, and American Public Broadcasting Services which are relayed throughout the United States.

The reviews and radio programmes have chiefly focused on our main textual decision: to reinstate the ten-per-cent of Lawrence's manuscript which was cut out by Edward Garnett in 1913 and never published in print - until now.

The first newspaper notice in Britain appeared in the "Peterborough" section of *The Telegraph* (7 August), the last part of which read:

Peter Preston, a D.H. Lawrence scholar from Nottingham University, calls the new edition "a very significant event". And I hear that those skittish souls at the D.H. Lawrence are planning a conference this autumn, at which the editors of the new version will be grilled as to whether they think Lawrence would really have been happy with their text.

The vast majority of commentators have welcomed our decision to print the complete novel, but there were two fierce attacks: in *The Guardian* (15 August) by Philip Hensher and in the *Weekend Telegraph* (15 September) by Michael Shelden. The attacks were not without wit, for example:

Just when you thought the merits of D.H. Lawrence were about as controversial as the merits of the works of Martin Farquar Tupper,

<sup>1</sup>. Helen Baron and Carl Baron, eds., *Sons and Lovers* by D.H. Lawrence, Cambridge University Press, September 1992.

Cambridge University Press has brought out a new edition of *Sons and Lovers*.<sup>2</sup>

But in rejecting our text Hensher and Shelden appear to be saying "the less of Lawrence the better", for they are very critical of what they see as Lawrence's inadequacies. Shelden describes his writing as containing "Physical descriptions" which are "absurdly overwritten"; and finds it "obvious" that "Lawrence needed a good editor." In Hensher's judgement: "Some cuts were for reasons of censorship; but much more was simply to remove material thought to be irrelevant, untidy or simply embarrassingly bad. Lawrence was still a young and inexperienced author; it was the treatment young and inexperienced authors received and still receive."

But Hensher does not rest his case in Lawrence's youth, for he not only calls Lawrence a poorer writer than Henry Green, he evidently considers Lawrence mad: "At this stage Lawrence was by no means the self-proclaimed genuine and megalomaniac he later turned into.... some [of the passages Garnett cut were] the more dated conversations about the rights of women where Lawrence's various insanities will no longer manage to raise anyone's passions much."

Shelden was more sparing of Lawrence, calling him merely a "bearded wild-eyed genius", but he was harder on us as editors.

... the Cambridge editors insist that the novelist was never enthusiastic about the cuts and agreed to them because he needed money and wanted the novel out as soon as possible. As support for their view, they cite Lawrence's statement to Garnett: "It's got to sell. I've got to live."

No doubt he felt considerable pressure to go along with the changes, and it is true that he was initially reluctant to submit his work to any kind of editing. But after Garnett completed his job, Lawrence had only praise for the result. "You did the pruning jolly well, and I am grateful. I hope you'll live a long time, to barber up my novels for me before they're published." As one measure of his gratitude he dedicated the book to his editor. And he was delighted when the first copy reached him, declaring that he was "fearfully proud of it." He told Garnett: "I reckon it is quite a great book... Thanks a hundred times."

The Cambridge editors cannot explain why Lawrence would say such things about a text which they call "debased". Since his favourable comments undermine their argument, they play them down and confidently conclude that Lawrence "did not desire to have his MS modified by Garnett" ...

<sup>2</sup>. *Guardian* 15 August. Martin Farquar Tupper (1810-89), prolific writer of prose and political works on moral, protestant and empire themes.

... But you need a compelling reason for substituting one kind of editorial interference for another, and the Cambridge editors simply fail to provide one for *Sons and Lovers*. In any case, why should we prefer their interference to that of Garnett, who at least had the advantage of knowing the author?

Before replying to these charges, I would like to read part of Anthony Burgess's review, which contained one of the most vigorous counter-arguments: an attack on Garnett as editor. It was published in *The Atlantic Monthly* (25 August) and in the Saturday book section of *The Times* (29 August).

The man responsible for the sanitisation of *Sons and Lovers* as well as the excisions...which both cleansed and rendered the novel sufficiently brief for public acceptance, was Edward Garnett... Lawrence desperately needed the £100 advance, and his gratitude that the book should be published at all outweighed his agony at the misrepresentation of his art. Garnett has a lot to answer for...he rejected Joyce's *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* as "ill written" and provoked Ezra Pound's vituperation... but history has treated him kindly. A man who gets a book published, however much this entails misrepresentation of the author's intention, has to be a hero of sorts.

I think that publishing tradition needs, at this point to be taken to task. The editor, who lacks the creative gift but is compensated with artistic taste, has been overmuch lauded...

Editors rarely amend orchestral scores or panoramic paintings; why should the novelist be singled out as the one artist who doesn't understand his art?...

To read *Sons and Lovers* as Lawrence wrote it is a revelation. The Cambridge edition[s]... clearing away of the negativities which presented it as an acceptable dish for the neo-Georgians is an admirable act.

The chief issues, then, which are raised by the reviewers, are whether Lawrence accepted or did not accept the pruning of his novel by Garnett; and whether regardless of his preferences his manuscript was so full of short-comings that it needed to be edited by Garnett whether Lawrence liked it or not.

## DID LAWRENCE ENDORSE THE CUTS?

Have we done justice to Lawrence's "You did the pruning jolly well, and I am grateful"?<sup>3</sup> Is our decision to rescind Garnett's editorial labour really justified?

We have taken the view that Lawrence's wishes in 1912-1913 should be the deciding factor, and that when his wishes are carefully pondered they must lead an editor to reject Garnett's cuts. I would like to take three issues: Lawrence's attitude to publication, his views on "form", his gratitude to Garnett.

## PUBLICATION

An unusually great deal survives on record about Lawrence's life, because of his prolific letter-writing and his friends' penchant for writing memoirs. But this should not lead us into the illusion that we know everything about him. There must in principle have been thoughts and feelings that went unrecorded.

However, an editor must try to weigh all recorded utterances, and weigh them in context, not as isolated statements.

It is now well-known to this gathering that Lawrence was only just beginning -- at the time in question -- to establish himself in his literary career: his reputation had not been guaranteed by *The White Peacock* and *The Trespasser*. He firmly believed it was the third novel that was make or break for an author.<sup>4</sup> In the meantime he had given up his teacher's income and had to support himself on the income from his writings - and support Frieda as well. Have we given enough thought to what it means to live by one's pen -- and at the age of 27? The phrase has a slightly romantic tinge, but Lawrence was living a much more desperate scramble than it implies.

But he was at least under contract to Heinemann for this novel. And he sent it to London in June 1912, when it was in its third draft and still called *Paul Morel*. Heinemann rejected it outright. His reasons were first its sexual explicitness and second its lack of "unity".<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> James T. Boulton, ed. *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence*, Volume I, Cambridge University Press, 1979 (hereafter *Letters*, i.) p.517

<sup>4</sup> 'E.T.': *A Personal Record of D.H. Lawrence* by Jessie Chambers, 1935, p.189.

<sup>5</sup> *Letters*, i. p.421 n. 4

Heinemann's outright rejection infuriated Lawrence, and he let off steam to Garnett in an angry letter: "I could curse for hours and hours." But at the end of his tirade he added a significant P.S.: "And Heinemann, I can see, is quite right as a businessman."<sup>6</sup> I remind you of this because I think it is a crucially important strand in the whole situation: Lawrence -- at this period --divided his attitude between his artistic ambitions on the one hand and his realisation that there were current market constraints on the other.

Garnett's response -- in fact we are at a disadvantage because Lawrence didn't keep the letters he received, so we have to guesstimate from his replies to Garnett what precisely Garnett offered. It appears he gave a fairly firm offer of publication by Duckworth but first (and at Lawrence's request) he wrote a long list of criticisms of this third version of the novel, on the basis of which Lawrence completely rewrote it from beginning to end.

Lawrence eagerly volunteered that he would compress it, but it is fairly certain he made it a lot longer.

He also believed he had made it a million times better and when he sent off the finished product to London he sent Garnett a sort of impassioned testimonial on the novel's behalf.<sup>7</sup> He thought of his letter as a defence of *Sons and Lovers*. And the grounds on which it needed defending against rejection by Garnett were not "explicitness" but lack of "unity". He insisted that even if Garnett could not see the book's careful construction, it had been carefully constructed, and it really did have form. "Its development is slow like growth" - a significantly organic expression, as I hope to show.

That was 19 November 1912. On 1 December he received Garnett's reply: clearly an ultimatum that Garnett was himself going to shorten the book.

I sit in sadness and grief after your letter. I daren't say anything. All right, take out what you think necessary - I suppose I shall see what you've done when the proofs come, at any rate. I'm sorry I've let you in for such a job - but don't scold me too hard, it makes me wither up.<sup>8</sup>

All the ingredients of his later thanks to Garnett are here in this postcard. As an artist he has received a shock comparable to the shock Heinemann had given

<sup>6</sup>. *Letters*, i. p.422

<sup>7</sup>. *Letters*, i. p.477

<sup>8</sup>. *Letters*, i. p.481

him, but he could see that as a businessman Garnett had a point. He needed money and was certain no-one else would publish him. If Garnett's proposal led to publication, he had to resign himself with good grace to accepting that Garnett would cut out what he thought necessary. The "pruning" was now inevitable. Garnett might do it hideously, he might emasculate the book by zealous fullscale censorship, but Lawrence would not know until it had already been set up in print. He could only hope the book would not be ruined, would be published in some state, and would make his reputation and solve his financial difficulties.

Shelden's "No doubt he felt considerable pressure to go along with the changes," is simply too much of an understatement.

## FORM

The fact that Lawrence's acceptance of Garnett's decision came from the side of his mind that acknowledged market forces and not from that part of him which was passionately involved in his artistic drive is -- it seems to me-- extremely clear, particularly when one ponders that word "form."

Heinemann's objection that the third draft lacked "unity" had signalled the critical orthodoxy of the time, a preoccupation with "form", as practised by Flaubert. Lawrence always rejected it and was at this time dogged by it. And although Lawrence clearly had not expected his book to be totally rejected by Heinemann, he had in fact anticipated this reaction. For when he had sent the manuscript to Heinemann, he had written to Heinemann's chief editor de la Mare: "It's not so strongly concentric as the fashionable folk under French influence - you see I suffered badly from Hueffer re Flaubert and perfection - want it. It may seem loose..."<sup>9</sup>

Lawrence did not complain at Garnett -- apart from the protest "don't scold me" --but within a month of receiving Garnett's scolding ultimatum, he burst out in denunciation of "form" in a letter to another correspondent (24 December 1912):

These damned old stagers want to train up a child in the way it should grow, whereas if it's destined to have a snub nose, it's sheer waste of time to harass the poor brat into Roman-nosedness. They want me to have form: that means, they want me to have their pernicious ossiferous skin-and-grief form, and I won't.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup>. *Letters*, i. p.417

<sup>10</sup>. *Letters*, i. p.492

"What does 'pernicious ossiferous skin-and-grief form' mean?" I hear you cry. Well, I take my bearings from an earlier expression of Lawrence's, when he was three-fifths of the way through rewriting *Paul Morel* as *Sons and Lovers*: "I've got a heap of warmth and blood and tissue into that fuliginous novel of mine."<sup>11</sup> This is an image of getting deeper below the surface into a living subject. The work of art is a living body. Note that Lawrence's imagery -- "warmth and blood and tissue" -- is, as it were, physical with abstract connections ("warmth" is a physical attribute which is also an emotional ingredient); and there is a very similar blend in "ossiferous skin-and-grief" to suggest un-alive art with disembodied emotional force.

Now compare these words on "form" which Lawrence wrote in a review of Thomas Mann which was published in July 1913:

And yet it seems to me this craving for form is the outcome, not of artistic conscience, but of a certain attitude to life. For form is not a personal thing like style, it is impersonal like logic. And just as the school of Alexander Pope was logical in its expressions, so it seems the school of Flaubert is, as it were, logical in its aesthetic form. "Nothing outside the definite line of the book," is a maxim. But can the human mind fix absolutely the definite line of a book, any more than it can fix absolutely definite line of action for a living being?<sup>12</sup>

This is entirely in tune with Lawrence's organic metaphor for *Sons and Lovers*: "the development...is slow like growth."

### LAWRENCE'S GRATITUDE TO GARNETT

An editor should surely take seriously the fact that Lawrence thanked Garnett several times and dedicated the finished product of Garnett's pruning labours to Garnett himself.

Actually Lawrence had first proposed to dedicate the novel to Garnett on 19 November 1912:<sup>13</sup> the day after he had posted the complete manuscript to London from northern Italy, and two weeks before he learned of Garnett's intention to cut it.

<sup>11</sup>. *Letters*, i. p.462. Fuliginous is a word Lawrence probably met in Thomas Carlyle, meaning "smokey, sooty, obscure."

<sup>12</sup>. *Phoenix*, ed. E.D. McDonald, 1936, p.308

<sup>13</sup>. *Letters*, i. p.477

I should like to dedicate the 'Paul Morel' novel to you - may I? But not unless you think it's a really good work. 'To Edward Garnett, in Gratitude.' But you can put it better.

On 27 February,<sup>14</sup> when about to correct the last of the proofs, Lawrence reminded Garnett, but slightly changed the wording:

You did well in the cutting - thanks again. Shall you put in the dedication 'To my friend, Edward Garnett' -or just 'To Edward Garnett' or what?

In the end "To Edward Garnett" appeared in the book. The dedication cannot be taken as proof that Lawrence endorsed the artistic character of Garnett's cutting of his novel. He was not in the sort of situation or relationship in which he could or would have withdrawn the dedication.

What are we to make of Lawrence's repeated generous thanks to Garnett? I have said, and re-emphasise here that I believe Lawrence was by this time convinced that Garnett was the only person who would certainly get this novel published for him. If it weren't for Garnett's help, he would have to try to find another publisher. He might face outright rejection again, or might again have to alter, shorten or rewrite his manuscript. At the minimum there would be delay, and he was already running out of money. The way in which he thanked Garnett before he saw the results of the cutting shows this unmistakably (29 December 1912):

I'm glad to hear you like the novel better. I don't much mind what you squash out. I hope to goodness it'll do my reputation and my pocket good, the book. I'm glad you'll let it be dedicated to you. I feel always so deep in your debt.

I have been thinking also, when I come back to England, I shall have to find a job of some sort. Either I shall get a teaching place, or if I could I would do some work for a publisher.<sup>15</sup>

Then while he was on with the job of revising the galley proofs of *Sons and Lovers*, but actually more enthusiastic about "The Insurrection of Miss Houghton" which he was writing, he wrote Garnett (18 Feb 1913):

<sup>14</sup>. *Letters*, i. p.520

<sup>15</sup>. *Letters*, i. p.496

I corrected and returned the first batch of *Sons and Lovers*. It goes well, in print, don't you think? Don't you think I get people into my grip? You did the pruning jolly well, and I am grateful. I hope you'll live a long time, to barber up my novels for me before they're published. I wish I weren't so profuse - or prolix, or whatever it is. But I shall get better. This new novel is going quite fast. It is awfully exciting, thrilling, to my mind - a bit outspoken, perhaps. I shall write it as long as I write it as long as I like to start with, then write it smaller. I must always write my books twice.<sup>16</sup>

It is rather painful that Lawrence is so ashamed at this stage about the fact that he writes at length, especially because it was that tendency which led, during the next few years, to his creation of his greatest novels, *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* out of what had begun as one novel, *The Sisters*. And it is notable that he shook off Garnett's influence while in the early stages of creating those works. His apologies about his prolixity show clearly how much his self-confidence had been dented by Garnett's attitude and tone ("scolding" as he called it) and the impact of the pruning.

And even though Lawrence wrote these thanks to Garnett after he had seen some of the results of Garnett's work, it would be a mistake to argue from Lawrence's thanks that he positively preferred the abridged text. Indeed, confirmation that it is a mistake, comes, in my view, in Lawrence's use of the word "pruning" years later, long after they had gone their separate ways. Garnett got in touch in 1921 and Lawrence replied (17 October 1921):

I was glad to hear from you again - wonder what you are doing - still looking after books, pruning them and re-potting them, I know.<sup>17</sup>

Lawrence took the opportunity to request the return of one of his early manuscripts from Garnett, and he evidently received it with some comments, for he was provoked in his next letter to put Garnett firmly in his place (10 November 1921):

No my dear Garnett, you are an old critic and I shall always like you, but you are also a tiresome old pontiff and I shant listen to a word you say,

<sup>16</sup>. *Letters*, i. p.517

<sup>17</sup>. Warren Roberts, James T.Boulton and Elizabeth Mansfield, eds. *The Letters of D.H.Lawrence*, Volume IV, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987 (hereafter *Letters*, iv.)p.100

but shall go my own way to the dogs and bitches, just as heretofore. So there.<sup>18</sup>

A pontiff - the Pope - gives judgements Ex Cathedra, which brook no discussion. But Lawrence is not merely objecting to Garnett's tone, his tendency to scold, here, but to his "old" critical opinions. Surely, as an artist Lawrence never accepted Garnett's revision of *Sons and Lovers*, and if it had been a matter of pure critical debate and not a matter of bread and butter Lawrence would have rejected Garnett's interference in 1912-3.

## ECCLECTICISM

For better or worse those are the issues on which we based our decision to rescind Garnett's cuts. It is impossible to answer absolutely the question "What text would Lawrence have preferred to see in print if he had had the choice?" but there is no alternative to asking that question and coming to a conclusion on balance.

What is absolutely clear is that an editor may not make this decision in terms of his or her likes and dislikes, or on the basis of his or her critical appraisal of the passages which Garnett crossed out. And it is certainly not possible to pick and choose among those passages, and reinstate only some and not others. We could not replace Garnett's 90 per cent with the Barons' 95 per cent *Sons and Lovers*. The reading public - those who think deeply enough to mind whether they are reading a corrupt text or a soundly-based one - do not want the Barons' idea of what Lawrence should have done. The Barons should get out of the way and mediate to the reading public what Lawrence really did, as far as it is humanly possible to discover.

Nonetheless it is an intriguing question: which of the once-deleted passages make which readers wince or cry "embarrassingly bad, irrelevant, untidy!"

There was a considerable amount of comment in the reviews about the irrelevance of passages describing William's youth and about the embarrassingly bad descriptions of Clara's breasts. In fact Carl and I did not find these passages embarrassing. What did make me cringe was the dialogue at Wingfield Manor between Paul and his friends cut by Garnett which now occurs at the bottom of page 204. I inwardly groaned at its would-be witty imitations of Walter Scott's imitations of mediaeval mannerisms, and was dismayed at the knowledge that if we did decide in principle to reinstate the suppressed passages, these puerile exchanges

<sup>18</sup>. *Letters*, iv. p.115

would also have to be printed. Surely, I thought, if Lawrence had read them on the proofs he would have done something about them!

But once the decision is made to reinstate the passages Garnett cut, they must all be reinstated, willy-nilly: and we must adapt ourselves to consequences. So, having made the decision, I turned to this and other passages to try to sense why Lawrence had included them. It seemed that they were related to Garnett's drastic trimming of a series of scenes showing Mrs Morel interacting with her neighbours and local traders. Those scenes in fact combine to give a relentless impression of her subtle isolation. Similarly Lawrence's sketches of Paul's engaging in embarrassingly puerile witty exchanges with the galumphing young men who took part in the Easter hikes serves a purpose. Once the reader has been presented with the variety of clownish or callous alternatives, it is much easier to comprehend the pressures which drove Paul to seek Miriam's company. Garnett cut away many of these contributory shades in the tapestry, as if to him they were merely excess examples of proletarian banter and bickering.

Perhaps the greatest variety of comments in the reviews focused on one of the passages Lawrence originally intended to be included in the novel which still has the power to surprise or even shock: where Paul dons Clara's stockings. On p. 381, after Paul and Clara have been to the theatre, Paul misses his train and so Clara invites him home, intending to give him her bed while she sleeps with her mother. He is finally despatched to bed by the vigilant mother and almost falls asleep. But he wakes, and in Garnett's version the text reads:

He sat up and looked at the room in the darkness, his feet doubled under him, perfectly motionless, listening.

But in the manuscript Lawrence had written:

He sat up and looked at the room in the darkness. Then he realised that there was a pair of her stockings on a chair. He got up stealthily, and put them on himself. Then he sat still, and knew he would have to have her.

After that he sat erect on the bed, his feet doubled under him, perfectly motionless, listening.

The most surprising and interesting comment on this in the reviews was that by John Bayley in the London Review of Books (10 September):

The Barons seems a bit at a loss as to how to pigeonhole the incident sexually, hesitating between transvestism and latent homosexuality. But it seems quite normal, though probably only Lawrence at the time could

have said so. If you want the girl you want her stockings, and if you put the stockings on you want her still more. Whatever he felt about it himself Garnett must have at once seen it wouldn't do - not for the reading public of the time.

What was Lawrence doing here? In the speculations we offered in the preface to the Trade edition we were trying to articulate a range of readers' responses: for example, Is Paul in some way empathising with Clara before he can believe that intimacy is possible? Is Lawrence hinting at incipient transvestite or homosexual tendencies in Paul? Is the image of Paul's leg entering Clara's stocking a way of suggesting sexual intercourse? Is it a predatory metaphor, reminiscent of the huntsmen of primitive culture who prepare themselves for the hunt by enacting the movements of the animal they hope to kill, so as to get into its mind-set before endeavouring to outwit it?

But actually what we were most keen to convey, but there was not space in that introduction, was the interesting parallel with an incident in Paul's childhood which concerned his relationship with his elder brother, William, and William's relationship with their mother.

In a scene from Paul's childhood (which was, incidentally, shortened by Garnett) William dresses as a Scottish Highlander in preparation for a fancy dress ball (pp.76-7). William parades in the kilt before his little brother. They both think it extremely manly, but as William admires the sight of his own legs in the Scottish skirt, Paul is doubtful:

Paul wondered vaguely why he should ever want to wear a kilt. He could not aspire to his brother's brawn and stature, being slight and small himself.

"How do my knees look! - all right, don't they? Ripping knees they are - ripping knees - legs altogether!"

Mrs Morel disapproved of dances, and therefore:

"His mother was cool with him for a day or two. But he was so adorable -! And yet - a tinge of loneliness was creeping in again, between her and him."

Both these passages were removed by Garnett. What is striking is that Lawrence here built in a controlling pre-echo of Paul's psychology. When Paul dons Clara's stockings, all these rivulets of influence are operating. Their mother demanded that they consider her. She resented their independent foraging for

women. She was lonely without them. She found them "adorable". But she also somehow undermined their manliness. So, in preparing for their most confidently virile acts William and Paul acted out something feminine. In William's case, a more extrovert gesture, more apparently in tune with current codes of masculinity, but containing a dubious undertone. In Paul's case, a more introvert gesture, which more obviously challenges the conventional notion of virility as something separate and totally distinct from empathy with the female.

However these related scenes are interpreted, they are yet a further instance of the way in which Lawrence had, as he claimed, carefully constructed his novel.

## "LIBIDINAL STRUCTURE AND THE REPRESENTATION OF DESIRE IN *SONS AND LOVERS*"

Robert Burden

### *SONS AND LOVERS* AND PSYCHOANALYTIC CRITICISM

The reception of *Sons and Lovers*<sup>19</sup> has been dominated by two kinds of reading: the biographical and the Freudian. The latter has so often been called upon to illustrate the former.<sup>20</sup> Both kinds of reading have been through periods of discredit. It has for a long time been considered naive, at least in academic scholarship, to search for the meaning and significance of the text in the life and intentions of the author. Lawrence studies, however, have been, and still are dominated by the biographical, not the least because the works are exceptionally infused with the life of the author.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, it has recently been suggested that literary theory has largely left Lawrence alone precisely because of that authorial presence in the writing.<sup>22</sup> For F.R. Leavis the significance of *SL* in the life and works of Lawrence was, of course, a settled matter, and nothing more needed to be said.<sup>23</sup> Yet the hunting for clues to the author's original intentions in the documented

<sup>19</sup> First published by Heinemann, 1913. All page references in text are to the Penguin edition, Harmondsworth, 1967; hereafter referred to as *SL*.

<sup>20</sup> A tradition which began with Alfred Kuttner's review, *New Republic* 10 April 1915, reprinted in Draper (ed) *D.H. Lawrence: The Critical Heritage* (Routledge, London, 1970, 1979) pp.76-80. (Article) "A Freudian Appreciation", *Psychoanalytic Review* July 1916, reprinted in Salgado (ed) *Casebook: Sons and Lovers* (Macmillan, London, 1969, 1979)

<sup>21</sup> Jessie Chambers, *D.H. Lawrence: A Personal Record* (Frank Cass, London, 1977. First published by Cape, 1935); cf. p. xxvi and pp.184-5, 202-3 for the autobiographical reference to the mother-son relationship in *SL*. John Middleton Murry, *Son of a Woman* (1931). Also, F.R. Leavis's influential insistence on the author's "genius" and the qualities of life in the works in *D.H. Lawrence: Novelist* (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1973. First published, Chatto, 1955); and the many biographies, the latest being John Worthen, *D.H. Lawrence: The Early Years* (CUP, 1991).

<sup>22</sup> Paul Eggert, "Opening up the text: the case of *Sons and Lovers*" in Keith Brown (ed) *Rethinking Lawrence* (OU press, Milton Keynes, 1990), pp.38-9.

<sup>23</sup> Leavis, op. cit., p.19.