

Death of a Porcupine: D. H. Lawrence and his Successors

John Fordham Middlesex University

They used sometimes to walk through a pleasant wood of young birch trees which were just beginning to come into bud. The stems reminded Mr Mybug of phallic symbols and the buds made Mr Mybug think of nipples and virgins. Mr Mybug pointed out to Flora that he and she were walking on seeds which were germinating in the womb of the earth. It said it made him feel as if he were trampling on the body of a great brown woman. He felt as if he were a partner in some mighty rite of gestation.¹

Mr Mybug in Stella Gibbons's *Cold Comfort Farm* is immediately recognizable as a somewhat absurd apostle of the prophet Lawrence whose sexual politics and vitalist philosophy became, towards the end of his life and in the years immediately after his death, the centre of a literary cult. Gibbons's target was not only Lawrence but the vogue then current in middle-class writers for bucolic settings, versions of pastoral in which a mystical relationship with the earth is the source both of a literary aesthetic and a spiritual value. For a discerning reading public the more obvious objects of her satire would have been Lawrence's contemporaries, Mary Webb and the Powys brothers (John Cowper and Theodore Francis), but also implicated was a generation of younger writers from the provincial industrial-rural borderlands – including H. E. Bates and Rhys Davies – whose social orientation was closer to Lawrence's own. However, a longing for English rurality was not the only Lawrentian legacy, since his commanding presence also dominated a new group of specifically working-class writers – particularly from mining communities – for whom Lawrence was the foundation of a different aesthetic.

Such a divergent relation to Lawrence among his successors has implications for how we now read him. Is he, as Christopher Caudwell claimed, typical of the 'bourgeois artist', and a slave to that class's cultural 'limitations',² or, as Raymond Williams has counter-claimed, the working-class writer in crisis who, against the cultural pressures of his age, is struggling to reassert a communal identity?³

The title of this paper – 'Death of a Porcupine' – is taken from the Welsh novelist Olive Moore's essay of 1932, in which the recently deceased Lawrence is likened to the eponymous object of his famous essay.⁴ The implication is that Lawrence was a somewhat prickly subject, expounding quasi-religious theories of 'the fourth dimension' and the mystical doctrine of a phallic, sun-worshipping 'natural aristocracy'.⁵ Moore's essay, however, is concerned not so much with Lawrence himself, as with the post-mortem squabbling over his remains by the first biographers:⁶ each apostle with his or her version of Lawrence, derived not from his status as artist but from Lawrence's own 'preferred ... spectacular rôle of popular prophet'.⁷ As such he has become for Moore 'a demi-God in a few drawing-rooms', a figure whose fascination relies on the biographical sources – 'domineering wives and infantile-mother-fixations' – of his psycho-sexual moralizing.⁸ Caudwell's critique locates Lawrence securely among the biographers and their readership's avidity for the cult of the individual: a novelist who, despite his anti-bourgeois 'prickliness', finally is imprisoned by the very individualism of that culture he sought to revolutionize, 'incapable of that subordination of self to others, of co-operation, of solidarity as a class which is the characteristic of the proletariat'.⁹ Caudwell's assumption is that Lawrence has become one of that class to which he was ostensibly so opposed, but this relies, as does Moore's reference to the prophetic Lawrence, on a retrospection confined to the decade of mysticism from 1915–25. Raymond Williams's later appraisal addresses the Lawrence of the final years when, in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, he, in a sense, re-establishes an allegiance through the language of class to the 'knowable community' of the Nottinghamshire coalfields.¹⁰ Moore's own conception of Lawrence's worth recognizes the 'passionate revolt', the 'undercurrent of anger and pain', the struggle for artistic expression, all of which is gesture enough without the necessity for any biographical probings.¹¹ The idea of struggle, then, takes us beyond biographical criticism for a reading of Lawrence through his successors, to argue that it is not among the critical community that the legacy of Lawrence is to be traced, but among the novelists: constituted, on the one hand, by Moore's own small mostly middle-class literary circle and, on the other hand, by the miner-writers, for both of which groups Lawrence was still the 'thorn in the dog's muzzle' of bourgeois literary practice. It is to those porcupine qualities that a new generation of writers looked for inspiration.

Moore's essay was written for Charles Lahr's 'Blue Moon Booklets' (a title

suggested by Lawrence himself)¹² which were a series of satirical commentaries on current social, political or literary themes. Lahr was an eccentric German political refugee and anarchist who owned the Progressive Bookshop in Red Lion Street, Holborn. His tiny shop – a chaotic array of radical journals, second-hand books and privately-printed editions – was, from about 1925 to the outbreak of the War, the object of pilgrimage for a disparate group of mostly left-wing, middle- and working-class writers whom Lahr encouraged either through his many literary connections or by publication of short works on his own small press. Among them were Moore and Davies, Bates, James Hanley and Hugh MacDiarmid, as well as the more established writers like T. F. Powys and Liam O’Flaherty. If any one factor could be said to unite such a heterogeneous group, then it was surely the figure of Lawrence. Lahr was a friend and devotee, having published both the unexpurgated versions of *Sun*, 1926 and *Pansies*, 1929.¹³ Rhys Davies personally reported to Lawrence at Bandol in 1929 the ‘admiration and respect’ in which he was held by the younger London writers, all of whom ‘looked to Lawrence for direction’.¹⁴ H. E. Bates, thought *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* ‘immense’, a work of ‘real loveliness’ and even MacDiarmid was an admirer.¹⁵ The new spirit in which Lawrence was being received, however, is best represented in Liam O’Flaherty’s introduction to the Northumberland writer J. C. Grant’s novel *The Back-to-Backs* (1930):

D. H. Lawrence, T. F. Powys, Rhys Davies, James Hanley, all our best writers of the present day have done what Grant is beginning to do. They cry out against the tyranny of ugliness.¹⁶

It is significant that Lawrence, at the head of a line of his notable successors, is identified not as the *primum mobile* of some new mystical cult, but as the scourge of the bourgeois critical community. ‘What do the critics know of life?’ asks O’Flaherty:

Let them go among the masses, in factory towns, in docks, mines, army barracks, ships, jails, workhouses, asylums. Then they will realize that the vitality of this modern world has fled the cottage, the villa and the boudoir. Power is in the shrieking, smoking, machine. It is a rough, swearing, violent power ...¹⁷

It will be argued by some devoted Lawrentians that the author is simply unrecognizable in such a description. However, O’Flaherty’s perception is salutary. It is a reminder that much of the originality of Lawrence’s vision – and that of his successors – derives from the fact that they were either working-class or had lived close to a particular industry. O’Flaherty’s claim that the source of their literary value derives from ‘ugliness’ is close to Adorno’s injunction that art should ‘make use of the ugly in order to denounce the

world which creates and recreates ugliness in its own image'.¹⁸ Yet in order to make sense of the ostensibly ugly, the industrialized domain inevitably requires a necessary counter to its dominating presence. Therefore, this paper will make reference to those writers whose work, like that of Lawrence, is suffused with the dual ambience of the industrial and the rural: those from the middle class such as Rhys Davies (South Wales valleys) and H. E. Bates (Northamptonshire); and from the working class, Grant and his fellow-writers from the coalfields, principally J. C. Boden and Walter Brierley (Derbyshire) and Harold Heslop (South Shields).

H. E. Bates published his first novel, *The Two Sisters*, in 1926 when he was just twenty, having been discovered by Lawrence's former reader Edward Garnett. The ostensible debt to Lawrence in the title is further confirmed by the novel's setting and its evident social differentiation between the rural domain of the two women in question and 'the revolting swarm ... the horrible gloom of the streets' into which – like Gudrun Brangwen – Tessie, the younger sister, is ineluctably drawn.¹⁹ The language is characteristically Lawrentian, invoking a singular human figure to represent the 'strange powerful bond between man and nature'.²⁰ The emblematic Michael is a local owner of a fleet of barges and possesses both the manly qualities of an 'industrial magnate' – ennobled by his struggle with the elemental power of the river – and the neo-romantic status of poetic dreamer who had:

...fallen more than once to [the river's] seduction and changeableness when he had wandered for hours under a sky crowded with stars or dominated by the wisher of the moon.²¹

The estrangement of the sisters and their complex rivalry for Michael's love is resolved by a final metaphoric transformation into a tragic mode, in which he dies battling against a tumultuous flood, the river itself and the pastoral regions of its upper reaches becoming both the signifier of spiritual value and the space of re-unification for the two women.

Davies's eligibility to become a worthy Lawrence successor was endorsed when the ailing writer – through Lahr's introduction – invited him to Bandol after having read and admired his first novel, *The Withered Root* (1927). Again, as with Bates, the novel ranges across the available Lawrentian symbolic vocabulary of industrial and rural imagery. As if to confirm Flora Poste's reminder that 'there was always someone called Seth or Reuben',²² the novel's central character is Reuben Daniels, a miner who becomes the leader of a Welsh religious revival. Initially his figural representation of muscular worker qualifies him for the pagan pantheon of chthonic demi-gods:

He was silent for some time, munching his food slowly and methodically like an animal. And when he took up his pick to resume work again he seemed like a god, a god of the underworld, complete in his supremacy and

strength. Here, below, he was at peace with the earth. He was one of those colliers who became alien to the sun.²³

Subsequently, however, his religious quest involves him in a fundamental struggle between the vital, more natural life of the miners – symbolized by his repressed desire for the naturally erotic Eirwen Vaughan – and the life-denying power of religious fanaticism. In the ensuing conflict, the function of novelistic resolution is, again as with Bates, assigned to the presiding presence of the natural world, which has both a restorative and a destructive power:

He crept into the pool and, gently immersing himself, lay down on the fine gravel of its bed. And the water crept over him like the smooth embraces of a quiet lover, passing softly and caressively over his relaxed thighs, his belly, his throbbing breast, his vaguely smiling face

[...]

He got out of the water and shook himself like an animal, crawled up among the trees, lifting himself on their outstretched branches, and standing upon the bank at last, he flung his arms about the trunk of an elm tree and pressed his naked flesh against it. The rough bark seemed to yield into soft and sleek tissue against his taut strength.²⁴

Ruben is no Birkin, but, like the latter's alter ego Gerald Crich, he is destined in his inner struggle between pagan and Christian mysticism for a solitary snowbound mountain trek towards death:

Then quietly, like a final benediction, the last flakes fell, and Reuben, looking about, was astonished at the beauty of the world.

Ridge after ridge of pure white, pale shoulders of snow resting tranquil in a primeval solitude, and, higher up, beyond, stretching dim under the evening sky, banks of pale gold snow, and higher still, ridges of pale blue – softly coloured snow almost in the sky. Astonished, he stopped. And immediately he stopped something seemed to break within him.²⁵

Here, both Bates and Davies have re-constructed their own forms of specifically bourgeois closure, an assumed Lawrentian aesthetic in which social conflicts and tensions are symbolically resolved or dissolved by a re-connection with the natural world. While Lawrence was clearly flattered by these patent tributes and by Davies's claims for him as an inspirational figure, he recognized in Davies's novel uncomfortable traces of something regrettable in the development of his own oeuvre. Lawrence's reaction to Davies's praise was unexpectedly vitriolic, denouncing the young for their too easy tolerance of 'the impositions of the world, the old taboos and the mongrel trashy contacts of the civilization they were forced into':

All you young writes have *me* to thank for what freedom you enjoy, even as things are – for being able to say much that you couldn't even hint at before I appeared. It was *I* who set about smashing down the barriers.²⁶

Yet what Davies does not report is that Lawrence also issued to him a stern warning. In his autobiography, Jack Lindsay recalls his friend P. R. Stephensen hearing Lawrence's impassioned plea to Davies, 'Don't desert your class! Don't run away from your class!'²⁷ Lawrence's perception of Davies's class orientation is not quite accurate – his father was a local grocer in Clydach Vale – yet Lindsay's comment to the effect that 'the speaker was attacking himself and regretting that he had not himself carried out the good advice he gave' is evidence that Lawrence, towards the end of his life, was re-evaluating his own class allegiances and was impatient with those younger writers who, like himself – and, ironically under his own influence – would be caught up in the inevitable process of *embourgeoisement*.

Both Bates and Davies were implicitly aware of that tendency and of the new vogue for proletarian writing since, in their novels published in the immediate aftermath of Lawrence's death, there is a much more conscious allegiance to the working class of their respective industrial homelands, initially in Bates's third novel, *Charlotte's Row* (1931), and in Davies's fourth, *The Red Hills* (1932), both of whose protagonists profess a sympathy with the socialist struggle. However, despite the ostensible affinity of these narratives with a specific class position, the traditional family and communal ties are inimical to the pursuit of new sexual and social relations being discovered beyond the urban community. Although their subsequent novels and stories continue to be rooted in the communities of their childhood, the narrative movement in both Bates and Davies is increasingly outwards toward the surrounding countryside where an individual contentment in rurality provides the necessary escape from the insoluble conflicts of the industrial domain.²⁸

Yet, as earlier intimated, Lawrence's working-class successors were relatively unencumbered by the trappings of bourgeois individualism. Working-class literary discourse was all too aware of his pervasive influence. In Walter Brierley's *Sandwichman*, his novel of a miner's struggle through adult education, a working-class student attempting to *épater les bourgeois* – boasting of the sweat and vitality of mining – is condemned for having 'gone all Lawrence',²⁹ while the literary pages of the *Sunday Worker* had been harangued in the late 1920s by an anonymous letter-writer, calling himself 'Clydebank Riveter' concerned about 'the awful sex bunk that is being rotted out in issue after issue' and 'the latest spasm about Lady Chatterley and some nut called Lawrence'.³⁰ It is certainly true that nearly every miner's novel has its narrative of sexual awakening yet, unlike in Lawrence, sexuality does not constitute the *sine qua non* of the regenerated human subject. In Frederick Boden's *Miner*, the young eponymous Danny is oppressed by 'the shadow of death in the earth. The dreadful shadow of violent and bloody

death underground in the darkness. The shadow of the mine.³¹ By contrast he experiences with Anne:

[t]he sense of a great, glittering wave, the swirl and crash of sound and sense, the moment of suspense, and then the terrific instant and the grass and the trees coming clear out of the spray, the sound of birds singing overhead and the last, dim ripples of the rosy sweetnesses and odours as they fade and vanish in the glow of the setting sun.³²

Like Bates and Davies, Boden here borrows from Lawrence a characteristic sexual vocabulary. Yet sexuality does not figure as part of an expression of individual crisis, but as a necessary counter to the language of morbidity imposed by the presence of the mine, re-establishing the primacy of human feeling in a world in which all ordinary human relations have become debased. That determination to seek solace when confronted by the presence of death is made more explicit in Harold Helop's *The Gate of a Strange Field* by the miner Joe Tarrant who turns to the comforts of romantic longing after the death of his mother:

The moon came out from behind a cloud and lit the earth with her beautiful radiance, smiling upon their happiness. Perhaps it knew. How often had the moon thus coloured the romance that oozes out of the soulless industry which poisons the glorious North.³³

Yet, despite the struggle to kindle a literary flame, to lighten the enveloping gloom, the chiaroscuro effect is ultimately characterized by the greater degree of darkness. Darkness is a frequently encountered trope within the worker-writer's metaphorical vocabulary. Inspired not only by Lawrence but by Zola's nascent expressionism, it provides the most potent source of a specifically working-class aesthetic, no more so than in the writing of miners.³⁴ Compare the following:

What was it after all! A squirming in the dregs of an industrial town [...] A gasping, a guzzling, a spawning in chip-shops and public-houses, a tortured yelp in the darkness, and the end.³⁵

Like the mayflies of the swamps, men and women burst from the white slime of primeval passion, fluttered for a spasm of time on hopeless ludicrous wings, and sank back at last into the black slime of civilized passion – white, black and white, coally flesh and white flesh, darkness and light then blackness forever.³⁶

The children grew into the pit as they grew into breeches. Their going was as sure as sunrise, certain as death. The buzzer blew for all alike – reveille, lights out, the last post.³⁷

J. C. Grant and F. C. Boden shared that brutal sense of an industrial life's brevity and danger long before any Beckettian abstractions. In Lawrence, of course, the subterranean metaphor was eventually reversed and became central to his conception of a 'primeval' mode of spontaneous living, which, as represented in 'The Bitterness of Ecstasy' chapter in *The Rainbow*, had been suppressed by the 'artificial light' of modernity's false consciousness: in Lawrence's terms 'falsified to a social mechanism'.³⁸ Yet in the late essay 'Nottingham and the Mining Country' that metaphorical use of darkness can still be traced to its roots in a lived experience – to 'the intimate community' of the underground world of the miners:

... they brought with them above ground the curious dark intimacy of the mine, the naked sort of contact, and if I think of my childhood, it is always as if there was a lustrous sort of inner darkness, like the gloss of coal, in which we moved and had our real being.³⁹

This is clear evidence of Lawrence's final return to a working-class allegiance, a structure of feeling far removed from, for instance, Gudrun and Ursula's abstracted conception of Beldover as 'like a country in an underworld' or as 'this violation of a dark, uncreated, hostile world'.⁴⁰ For the miner himself, the physically invasive properties of coal determine an altogether different ontology:

Portions of his body were doomed to blackness because of the fragments of coal beneath the flesh. These he could never get rid of. The pit had actually permeated his body. He was coally, part of the pit. His blood, thronging with tiny black particles, was partly coal also. When he died and shrank to dust, it would be coal-dust, not just baccy ash.⁴¹

Here, the working-class writer is inspired not so much by the persuasiveness of Lawrence's vision, but by the figural power of his expression. Darkness here has permeated the essence of the miner to produce a politically potent aesthetic of 'social ugliness'. What is ironic is that just such a form of expressionism is close to Lawrence's own representations of a reified humanity, reduced to the level of automata or human extensions of the industrial machine. A reductivist interpretation would support the allegations against Lawrence of social Fascism and his bourgeois disdain for a passive working class.⁴² Yet the inspired use of expressionist techniques in Lawrence's successors from the mining community is a cogent reminder that it was Lawrence, the working-class writer, who was their literary and political inspiration. Their perception of him as revealed in the writing is confirmed by the Lawrence of the last works. As Graham Martin has argued, the two earlier versions of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* disclose a more politically active and communist-inspired Mellors;⁴³ and Raymond Williams has asserted equally

persuasively that the foregrounding of the dialect words in the final version represents not so much the last gasp of the sexual prophet, but rather a longing for the 'ordinary' language of a communal way of life.⁴⁴ For his bourgeois inheritors, Lawrence became increasingly the pastoralist and the 'priest of love': for the working-class writers he was primarily a spokesperson for their class; which is not to claim some ultimate proletarian identity for Lawrence, but to recognize him as a more complex writer who, in the forging of a different aesthetic within the bourgeois form of the novel, was always inevitably involved in a determinedly social and correspondingly textual class struggle.

Notes

1 Stella Gibbons, *Cold Comfort Farm*, (London, 1932, new impression 1942) p. 152.

2 Christopher Caudwell, *Studies in a Dying Culture* (London, 1938), p. 69.

3 Raymond Williams, *The English Novel from Dickens to Lawrence* (London, 1987), pp. 182–84.

4 That is 'Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine' (1925) in D. H. Lawrence, *Reflection on the Death of a Porcupine and Other Essays*, edited by Michael Herbert (Cambridge, 1988)

5 These are two of the key concepts in Lawrence's social-Darwinist 'reflections' in the 1925 collection of essays. The 'fourth dimension' is his term (derived from Blavatsky) for a mystical mode of being which stands outside both space and time, i.e. beyond ordinary human relations (see *Ibid.*, 'Him With His Tail in His Mouth', pp. 312–6; 'Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine', pp. 358–63 and 424n); and a 'natural aristocracy' for Lawrence is constituted by those exceptional Nietzschean heroes who 'can initiate or establish a new connection between mankind and the circumambient universe' (*Ibid.*, 'Aristocracy', pp. 368–70, but see also *passim*).

6 Namely Rebecca West, *D. H. Lawrence: An Elegy* (1930), William Gerhardie's memoirs of Lawrence in his autobiography, *Memoirs of a Polyglot* (1931), Catherine Carswell, *The Savage Pilgrimage* (1932) and John Middleton Murry, *Son of Woman*, (1931). See Olive Moore, *The Apple is Bitten Again: Self-Portrait and A Collection of Aphorisms* (London 1934), p. 150.

7 Olive Moore, 'Further Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine (Final Word on D. H. Lawrence)', reprinted in Moore, *The Apple is Bitten Again*, p. 154.

8 *Ibid.*, p. 164.

9 *Studies in a Dying Culture*, p. 71.

10 Raymond Williams, *The English Novel from Dickens to Lawrence*, p. 186

11 Caudwell, Moore, *The Apple is Bitten Again*, p. 163.

12 The following account is from David Goodway's, 'Charles Lahr: Anarchist, Bookseller, Publisher' in *London Magazine*, June/July 1977, pp. 46–55.

13 The publication of *Pansies* has been wrongly attributed to P. R. Stephensen who had earlier published the book catalogue, *The Paintings of D. H. Lawrence*, under his Mandrake Press imprint. Although Stephensen's name appears on the title page (to confuse the censors), it was Lahr who typed, set and distributed the text. See *ibid.*, p. 49.

14 Rhys Davies, *Print of a Hare's Foot: An Autobiographical Beginning* (London, 1969), p. 138.

15 H. E. Bates, 'Letter to Charles Lahr', No 30, 23.8.1928, Sterling Library, Uni-

versity of London and MacDiarmid, 'Letter to Compton MacKenzie' in Alan Bold (ed.), *The Letters of Hugh MacDiarmid* (Athens, 1984).

16 Liam O'Flaherty in J. C. Grant, *The Back-to-Backs* (London, 1930, reprinted 1970), p. vii.

17 *Ibid.*, p. vii.

18 Theodore Adorno, *Aesthetic Theory* (London, 1984), p. 72.

19 H. E. Bates, *The Two Sisters* (London, 1926, 1992), p. 86. Compare Gudrun's 'nostalgia' for the 'atmosphere of intense, dark callousness' at the Friday evening market in *Women in Love*, edited by David Farmer, Lyndeth Vesey and John Worthen (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 115–18. 'Sisters' is the title of the first chapter of *Women in Love*; 'The Sisters' was the title of the first and second drafts. See *ibid.*, pp. xxi–xxxv.

20 Bates, *The Two Sisters*, p. 207.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 195. Lawrence's gendered 'moon' imagery is well known. See particularly Birkin shattering the moon's reflection in the pond in *Women in Love*, pp. 246–48.

22 *Cold Comfort Farm*, p. 18.

23 Rhys Davies, *The Withered Root* (London, 1927), p. 25.

24 *Ibid.*, pp. 230, 231. Cf. the naked Ruper Birkin clasping the 'silvery birch-trunk against [his] breast, its smoothness, its hardness, its vital knots and ridges ...', *Women in Love*, p. 107.

25 *The Withered Root*, p. 279. Cf. Gerald Crich of whom Lawrence writes 'something broke in his soul' at the point of death, *Women in Love*, p. 474.

26 Rhys Davies, *Print of a Hare's Foot: An Autobiographical Beginning* (London, 1969)p. 138.

27 Jack Lindsay, *Fanfrolico and After* (London, 1962), p. 149.

28 See Bates's *The Fallow Land* and *The Poacher* (London, 1932, 1935) and Davies's Welsh Trilogy, *Honey and Bread; A Time to Laugh; Jubilee Blues* (London, 1935, 1937, 1938).

29 Walter Brierley, *Sandwichman* (1937, reprinted London, 1990), p. 59.

30 Quoted in Andy Croft, *Red Letter Days: British Fiction in the 1930s* (London, 1990), p. 59. See also ff. Chapter 2, 'Lawrence Country: Fiction from the Coalfields' pp. 59–95, a very comprehensive analysis of Lawrence's influence on 'miner-writers' of the 1930s.

31 F. C. Boden, *Miner* (London, 1932), p. 76.

32 *Ibid.*, p. 157.

33 Harold Heslop, *The Gate of a Strange Field* (London, 1929), pp. 54, 55.

34 But see also James Hanley's claustrophobic world of merchant ships and labyrinthine Liverpool, particularly in his first collection of stories, *Men In Darkness* (London, 1931).

35 Boden, *Miner*, p. 85.

36 J. C. Grant, *The Back-to-Backs*, p. 159.

37 *Ibid.*, pp. 6–7.

38 D. H. Lawrence, *The Rainbow*, edited by Mark Kincaid-Weakes (Cambridge, 1989), p. 415.

39 D. H. Lawrence, 'Nottingham and the Mining Country' (1929) in *Selected Essays* (Harmondsworth, 1968), p. 117.

40 Lawrence, *Women In Love*, pp. 11, 12.

41 Grant, *The Back-to-Backs*, p. 11.

42 See again *Studies in a Dying Culture*, p. 56 and Alick West, 'D. H. Lawrence' in *Crisis and Criticism and Literary Essays* (London, 1975), p. 275, although the latter recognizes work of 'the highest value' in Lawrence (*ibid.*, p. 260).

43 See 'History and Myth in D. H. Lawrence's Chatterley Novels' in Jeremy Hawthorn (ed.), *The British Working-Class Novel in the Twentieth Century* (London, 1984), pp. 62–74.

44 Williams, *The English Novel from Dickens to Lawrence*, p. 184.