

emerged only in the recent editions of the Letters. This and the two remaining volumes of the Cambridge Biography are thus bound to form the standard reference for Lawrence's life.

Given this fact, certain of Worthen's emphases and omissions deserve scrutiny. When he remarks (251) that Jessie Chambers 'was only the first of a number of women to whom Lawrence would go for sex' in 1910 and 1911, he is quite clearly giving an impression which he knows the evidence alone does not substantiate. It can be established that Lawrence had (extremely unsatisfactory, clandestine and fleeting) sexual relationships only with Jessie Chambers and Alice Dax before meeting Frieda. Speculation about how far his relationships with Helen Corke and Marie Jones (his Croydon landlady) went is of limited value; wild guesses about a mystery woman called 'Jane' and a possible prostitute called 'Pauline' have none at all. Lawrence's relative lack of sexual experience is, of course, embarrassing for an entire generation of Lawrence readers who assumed that his sexual pronouncements had authority, but this alone cannot justify Worthen's inferences that there was more than meets the eye.

Worthen brilliantly relates Lawrence's sexual ambitions to his social mobility (368-70), but revealingly stops short of drawing the conclusions which a socialist or feminist commentator would find inevitable. He shows that Jessie Chambers and Alice Dax had attitudes to sex that were determined by their social position. For such women, economic emancipation and sexual liberation did not go hand-in-hand: Jessie Chambers would have lost her job were it known that she had slept with Lawrence. At pains to avoid judgmental conclusions, Worthen fails to make the obvious point that the kind of sexual life which Lawrence demanded was deeply bourgeois. In fact, it was a minor aristocrat (who never did a day's work in her life) who provided him with it. Lawrence's marriage may have been an immense personal gain, but it was also a profound social loss, for it signified his definitive break with the working class and the beginning of a journey into an appalling morass of right-wing politics.

Worthen, however, ignores politics almost entirely. The political organisation of Lawrence's community is bypassed. His interest in socialism is treated as a flirtation (which is at least arguable), but can this justify an almost total neglect of his relationship with the Hopkins? Enid Hilton, the Hopkins' daughter, has stated that Lawrence met Philip Snowden, Ramsay MacDonald and Sydney and Beatrice Webb, among others, at the Hopkin household, but this, amazingly, is not cited by Worthen. The Guild Socialism espoused by Orage (whose *New Age* Lawrence read regularly during 1908 and 1909) goes unmentioned, as does Lawrence's reading of William Morris. Arthur Lawrence's membership of the Miners' Federation is ignored, and the industrial unrest of the late Victorian and Edwardian periods hardly

explored. Most revealingly, Lawrence's active involvement in the 1912 national miners' strike (the only evidence we have that he was ever involved in a practical left-wing cause) is suppressed: on 2 April 1912 he went 'round with a friend delivering Relief tickets' to strikebound families (see *Letters*, vol.1, 380).

If there is room for generous speculation about possible prostitutes, surely there ought to have been space for such known facts? A more profound point is that these facts are extremely important for an understanding of Lawrence's work and development. Knowledge of his active commitment to the 1912 strike puts into sharp relief that later document of astonishing class betrayal, 'Return to Bestwood', written in the aftermath of 1926. Knowledge of early contact with metropolitan political figures similarly qualifies our sense of Lawrence's provincialism. If Worthen synthesises various sources effectively, he does not by any means give the whole story. Readers interested in Lawrence's politics in particular will find that The Cambridge Biography is less than reliable.

Macdonald Daly

D.H. Lawrence, *Sons and Lovers*, ed. Helen Baron and Carl Baron (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992; pp. lxxxi + 675; cloth £70.00).

Sons and Lovers has perhaps been the most keenly anticipated volume in the Cambridge edition. In part this has to do with the special place the novel occupies both in the minds of Lawrence's readers and in the canon of his work. Often, it is the first (sometimes the only one) of Lawrence's novels to be read. Its subject matter and themes of the growth from childhood to adulthood, family life, conflict between the generations, class and education have a compelling interest, especially for English readers. Furthermore, because of its supposedly 'autobiographical' content, however much that may have been challenged by research into Lawrence's life, readers are still inclined to regard *Sons and Lovers* as the book in which they are most likely to be able to 'read' Lawrence himself. The eagerness with which this new edition of the novel has been awaited, however, also has much to do with its textual history, some of whose details have been known to students of Lawrence for many years, but which is now set out in its full, troubled complexity for the first time.

The novel was first conceived in the autumn of 1910 and occupied Lawrence, with two or three breaks of some months, for two and a half years. Those thirty months saw his life change dramatically with the death of his mother, the publication of his first two novels, his engagement to Louie Burrows, his own serious illness, his break with Louie, his resignation from his teaching post and, finally, his meeting and departure for Germany, in May 1912, with Frieda Weekley. The manuscript of the novel, then called 'Paul Morel', travelled with him to Germany. It was by now in its

third version, which he had begun in November 1911, in response to Jessie Chambers's comments on 'Paul Morel' II, and Lawrence had received its final pages from Jessie, with her notes, about a month before he left England. He began revising the manuscript soon after arriving in Germany, hoping that Heinemann would publish it soon. But Heinemann, to Lawrence's despair, rejected the novel on almost every grounds. However, he immediately sent the manuscript, by request, to Edward Garnett, whom he had known since the autumn of 1911. Garnett's notes on this version arrived in mid-July 1912 and impelled Lawrence to begin yet another revision, which he worked on between August and November of that year. It seemed that at last he was finished with the 'great, terrible but unfinished' novel. But there was one more twist in the drama, for by the beginning of December he knew that Garnett felt the novel still needed more work – it needed to be shorter and to be modified in other ways. Lawrence, short of cash, keen to maintain the momentum of his literary career, and wishing to see the end of a phase of his life as man and writer, reluctantly agreed that Garnett should carry out the necessary excisions and revisions. Garnett cut 10% from the novel's length, representing about 50 printed pages, and, after further revisions by Lawrence in galley and page proofs, it was published in May 1913. (The first edition is hereafter referred to as *1913*).

The restoration of the passages excised – the term 'expurgated', widely used in press reports and reviews of the Cambridge edition, is wholly inappropriate – by Garnett is the principal claim to originality of this new text (hereafter *1992*). Some of the restored passages, such as the 150-line account in chapter VII of Paul and Miriam's visit to the Mechanic's Institute library have had a kind of currency since the publication in 1977 of Mark Schorer's edition of the manuscript in facsimile; one or two textual errors have been corrected in recent editions, like the misprinting of 'whispered' for 'whimpered' in the novel's last line. But even some familiarity with the 1977 facsimile does not prepare the reader for the impact of reading *1992* after years of close acquaintance with *1913*. What is astonishing is the nature of Garnett's cuts. His intervention in the manuscript was not simply to cut out redundant material: self-indulgent bits of fine writing or otiose examples of clearly established points of character, relationship or theme. Nor does he seem simply to have been seeking to produce a text whose shape conformed to his notions of what a novel should be: form had always been a bone of contention between Garnett and Lawrence. No; Garnett cut not just flesh but bone; less liposuction than amputation.

How, then, do the restored passages alter the experience of reading *Sons and Lovers*? The title itself provides one starting point. For most readers, *1913* is a novel about one son, Paul; *1992*, as the dustwrapper justly claims 'fulfils the plurals of the title'. The logic of the plot demands that William Morel must die young, in order to create the space which Paul will come to occupy. The sense of unfulfilled potential that surrounds him probably further demands that he

functions best as a slightly shadowy figure, making occasional, brilliant but increasingly fevered appearances in the novel. But he is, in *1992*, a good deal less shadowy than in *1913*. Garnett's pencil fell most heavily on the first part of the book, and nowhere more heavily than in chapter III, 'The Casting off of Morel, the Taking on of William'. In *1992*, this chapter runs to some 800 lines, 329 (or 41%) of which do not appear in *1913*. At a crucial point in the development of the story, Garnett chose to remove: a passage about Morel's feelings for Paul (63-4); a conversation between Mrs Morel and a neighbour about William's supposed attack on the latter's son (65-66); a very long passage which includes William giving home lessons in shorthand, Morel's pride in William's prowess as a cyclist and William's ability to make his mother laugh (70-3); and several passages of dialogue and interior monologue about William's relationships with women and his mother's fears that he may fail to fulfil his promise because of his similarities to his father. Every one of these passages adds something to our understanding of the relationship between William and his mother, not least the fact that he makes her laugh (so does Paul, but there's a more intense and cloying side to their relationship, absent when she is seen with William) and the fearful anticipations of William's destruction by the divisions in his personality. The latter motif is developed in a number of later restored passages, revealing, incidentally, that Garnett was a skilful and consistent surgeon (see 115-6, 125-6, 161-4). The restored parts of Chapter III need also to be read in the light of some earlier restorations, where Garnett had thinned out some of the arguments and everyday irritability in the Morels' relationship (see 29, 47-8, 51-2). In *1992*, by comparison with *1913*, the 'casting off, taking on' motif of the chapter therefore strikes with much greater force. Furthermore, we can now see why Mrs Morel, having witnessed the fulfilment of her worst fears with regard to William and women, is so protective of Paul against Miriam and Clara; while the little scene about William's shorthand lessons balances nicely with Paul's attempts to teach Miriam algebra (188). In both cases, Garnett actually interfered with the novel's shapeliness and sense of balance and contrast.

Another kind of cut has to do with the feminist aspect of the novel. There is an extremely interesting restored passage (149-50) just before Paul and his mother visit the Leivers at their farm for the first time, when Mrs Morel talks about Mrs Leivers's hard life and the odd kind of pride she takes in her poverty. This restoration gives extra force to her remarks after the visit, which survived in *1913*. Together with other restored passages (see, for example, 186 and 273) these form an argument, continuing throughout the novel, about the role of women, and the interconnection of marriage, class, education and sexuality. In a larger sense, these cuts strike at the novel's religious, psychological, political and philosophical underpinning, for Lawrence poured into the text much detail and speculation derived from the reading and thinking of his early adult years.

This leads naturally to one of the two other aspects of 1992 that deserve special mention. The explanatory notes are exemplary as both scholarship and explication. Helen and Carl Baron have traced, often to the smallest detail, the sources of Lawrence's ideas and expressions, and in the process reveal the extent and depth of his reading. In particular we can see how the work of Herbert Spencer was an influence on Lawrence, both for Spencer's own ideas and as a conduit for information about science, philosophy and sociology in general. The scene on the swing in Chapter VII, for instance, has often been discussed for the light it throws on the developing relationship between Paul and Miriam; but how often have we read the sentence 'For the moment he was nothing but a piece of swinging stuff, not a particle of him that did not swing' (182), without considering what Lawrence knew of particles? Here it is traced to Spencer's *A System of Synthetic Philosophy: Vol. I, First Principles* (1900). A few lines later, Paul, speaking of one of his paintings, tells Miriam "'It's because—it's because there is scarcely any shadow in it—it's more shimmery—as if I'd painted the shimmering protoplasm in the leaves and everywhere, and not the stiffness of the shape. That seems dead to me. Only the shimmeriness is the real living. The shape is a dead crust. The shimmer is inside, really.'" (183). The thoughts on 'shimmeriness' can be linked to the ideas of the Impressionist painters, while 'protoplasm' again comes from Spencer, in particular *The Principles of Biology* (1899), which Lawrence seems to have read.

Finally, 1992 is 'new' not only in terms of language, but also in its restoration of Lawrence's punctuation. For example, in the passage I have just quoted from page 183, the first sentence of Paul's speech contains three dashes, only the first of which survived in 1913, the second being replaced by a semi-colon and the third by a comma. Thus the rhythm of the sentence, and indeed the whole speech is altered. In 1992 Paul first reaches, hesitantly, for the words to convey what he wants to say; 'shimmery' gives him the key and after three tentative clauses, the sentence is completed by a longer, more confident and confirmatory statement as Paul becomes more sure of himself. The 1913 punctuation makes Paul seem sure of himself much sooner and renders the sentence more formal and complete. A further striking example is found in Chapter XII, 'Passion'. In 1913 we read

Miriam pondered this. She saw what he was seeking—a sort of baptism of fire in passion, it seemed to her. She realized that he would never be satisfied till he had it. Perhaps it was essential to him, as to some men, to sow wild oats.

In 1992 the last sentence reads, 'Perhaps it was essential to him—as to some men to sow wild oats' (362). Here, the 1913 alteration of the dash to a comma and the insertion of a second comma after 'men' pretty well reverses Lawrence's meaning.

Paul does not want 'to sow wild oats'; quite the reverse: he is seeking something much more profound and committing. But his compulsion to seek 'a sort of baptism of fire in passion' is compared by Miriam to the compulsion that *other* men (another *kind* of man) may have to sow wild oats. These may seem like small examples, but the cumulative effect of such changes is significant, causing many alterations in tone, rhythm and meaning.

So far, I have written as if the restoration of Garnett's cuts was inevitable, as if no theoretical or critical issues lay behind the decision of Helen and Carl Baron to reintroduce the excised material at the appropriate points in the text, rather than printing it in an appendix with a textual symbol indicating each omission. My own feeling is that this is the right decision. Lawrence may have consented to Garnett's cuts, but he did so with reluctance because, for a variety of reasons, *Sons and Lovers* was a novel that he very much wanted to see in print. But his decision was pragmatic rather than artistic, and I think we can be fairly certain that he regarded the manuscript he submitted to Duckworth in November 1912 as finished to his satisfaction. To say this is to beg many questions, of course. The 1912 manuscript contains its own problems, even if we ignore Garnett's interventions; and in the past few years there has been a continuing debate about the Cambridge edition as a whole. Scholars have questioned the principles that lie behind the statement, to be found on the copyright page of this and all other Cambridge volumes: 'the text ... now correctly established from the original sources'. The notion of an 'established' text, a text which, as the editors have said, they hope will now be read, taught and discussed as the only *Sons and Lovers*, suggests that it is possible to establish such a text, and therefore to know what the author would have wished to see in print. It has also been argued that by seeking to establish authoritative reading texts, the Cambridge project turns its back on the notion of text as process, a process which even with the best of textual apparatus, it is difficult and unwieldy for the editor and reader to recreate. In this sense, we are baffled by the restrictions of the printed book and will need the aid of the computer to provide us with the ideal 'text in process' edition. Taking all these important questions into consideration there remains, in the case of *Sons and Lovers*, a clear argument for restoring Garnett's cuts and for eliminating other corruptions in 1913. Such work is not merely technical; it requires the editors to make critical judgements at every turn and, for one reader at least, they have done their work meticulously and imaginatively. Equally, there was an urgent need for a properly annotated edition of *Sons and Lovers*, and this too they have provided, showing how Lawrence responded to his reading and participated in the central intellectual issues of his time. Lawrence was always convinced that he had written a great novel; we may continue to debate the sense in which that is true; and this edition helps us to ground that debate.

Peter Preston