

## THE BANCROFT LIBRARY TYPESCRIPT OF D.H. LAWRENCE'S 'STUDY OF THOMAS HARDY'

THE WORK WHICH READERS OF D.H. LAWRENCE know as 'Study of Thomas Hardy' had its origin in a commission by the publisher James Nisbet for a little book on Hardy for his 'Writers of the Day' series in July 1914. As Lawrence wrote and rewrote the book over the next four months it became a quite different work — 'mostly philosophicalish, slightly about Hardy' he later described it — and was clearly not the sort of book Nisbet envisaged. He even gave it the strange title *Le Gai Savaire* indicative of this change. Failing to find a publisher, Lawrence decided to rewrite it purely as his 'philosophy', and so the text was laid aside. It was first published in full in 1936 in the large volume of his posthumous papers entitled *Phoenix*.<sup>2</sup> When he agreed to edit the volume, E.D. McDonald, author of *A bibliography of the writings of D.H. Lawrence* (Philadelphia, 1925), received a 216-page typescript of the 'Study' from the American publishers, Viking Press. Viking in turn had received the copy from Martin Secker in London, who, before circumstances late in 1934 forced him to sell his D.H. Lawrence interest to Heinemann, was to have been the English publisher of *Phoenix*. Secker had been given two copies of this typescript by Curtis Brown, Lawrence's London agent, in 1931. McDonald had no reason to question the authenticity or the reliability of his copy text.

It was perhaps twenty years later that McDonald made a note in his papers, before they were passed to the University of Texas, which reads: 'Lawrence Powell (The MSS of D.H.L.) pg 59, lists a 194 page typescript of this essay. This needs looking into. I freely confess that at the time of compiling 'Phoenix' I did not really read this study intently, nor have I done so to this day.' McDonald's task had been to provide clear, readable texts of his material, and to check and note any previous publication. It was not part of his brief to authenticate the materials provided by Lawrence's agent. In the case of the 'Study' he had no reason to suspect either that his typescript was a 1930 copy, and a faulty one, of an earlier typescript made from Lawrence's manuscript, or that the earlier typescript, noted in 1937 by Powell, was at the time in the possession of Lawrence's widow in New Mexico. In any case it would have required some very 'intent' reading to ascertain that his copy contained errors and some quite extensive omissions. Quite unwittingly and in spite of his best intentions, McDonald published an inferior version of Lawrence's book.

The McDonald typescript (in fact a carbon copy) is now in the Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas at Austin.<sup>3</sup> In the months following Lawrence's death (3 March 1930) Laurence Pollinger, then a member of Curtis Brown's staff in London, arranged to have copies made of all the unpublished manuscripts and typescripts in the agent's and in Frieda Lawrence's possession. The originals were then safely stored in bank strong-boxes until a court decided whose property they were, since Lawrence had died apparently intestate. These copies were then used in negotiations with publishers.

The 'Study' was copied in July 1930 since Curtis Brown's expense account notes payment for it on 22 July: 'To the cost of typing *Thomas Hardy*, 52,000 words — £5-4-0'. The Chancery Lane Typewriting Bureau was employed for such work, and the similarity of format of this work to others known to have been done by the Bureau confirms the origin of the copy. It was not, however, the Bureau's best work: a total of 120 words were lost in four places through typist's eye-skip, and numerous errors like 'myself' for 'my own', 'scheme' for 'system', 'fleshily' for 'fleshly', 'State educations' for 'states and nations', 'age' for 'ego' etc. remained uncorrected, despite evidence of erasures and corrections of a quite routine kind having been made.

It is however not the aim of this article to examine the shortcomings of this copy, and hence the unreliability of the *Phoenix* edition, but rather to establish that the typescript of which it is an inferior copy is the one listed by Powell in 1937, and is now in the Bancroft Library in the University of California at Berkeley, and that it was made from Lawrence's manuscript by his Russian friend S.S. Koteliansky in 1914. The procedure is first to establish its provenance, and then to consider the evidence provided by the typescript itself.

## I

The Bancroft typescript was purchased by the University of California in 1957 from the Estate of the late Frieda Lawrence Ravagli, and so was presumably in her possession at the time of her death.<sup>4</sup> Yet in 1948 when E.W. Tedlock published his *Frieda Lawrence Collection of D.H. Lawrence Manuscripts*, a book compiled in close association with Frieda, he neither listed the typescript nor made any mention of the work at all. In 1946 Frieda wrote 'it hasn't so much to do with Thomas Hardy, but I love it',<sup>5</sup> and elsewhere expressed her particular affection for it. Neither Professor Tedlock nor anyone else has been able to account for this omission of a favourite work.<sup>6</sup> Nor does the typescript appear in an appraisal list of Lawrence materials in her possession made for Frieda by Jacob Zeitlin and dated 10 October 1954.<sup>7</sup>

The typescript answers exactly to the description of the one exhibited with other Lawrence manuscripts in 1937 in the Los Angeles Public Library — the occasion for which Lawrence Clarke Powell produced his *Manuscripts of D.H. Lawrence: A Descriptive Catalogue*. Powell lists it as item 86. The manuscripts were on loan from Frieda who had brought them to America with her when she decided to settle at her New Mexico ranch on the conclusion of the legal settlements in London in 1932-3. As has been noted already, until Lawrence's estate was settled and the ownership of his manuscripts established, they were held in safe-keeping in Barclay's Bank Henrietta Street by Curtis Brown for Frieda. The inventory which lists the 'Study' typescript as being so held cannot have been made later than July 1930 and was probably done a month or two earlier.

Immediately after Lawrence's death, many friends, including John Middleton Murry, returned manuscripts in their possession to Frieda or to Curtis Brown. In the present case, Lawrence appears to have given the typescript of the 'Study' to Murry for safe-keeping during the war, as was stated in an editorial note which preceded Chapter III when it was separately published in *The Book Collector's Quarterly*, January 1932. Since this chapter was offered to the *Quarterly's* editor, Desmond Flower, by Laurence Pollinger of Brown's the note must be considered reliable.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, the chapter as published must have been derived from this typescript and not the later copy since a significant number of readings agree with it against the later copy. Two letters by Pollinger, dated 6 April 1932, add some support to Murry's having had possession of the typescript. To Frieda's lawyer who was handling the case of the disputed ownership of the manuscripts he wrote:

Of course nearly all of these manuscripts were given to Mrs Lawrence by friends at the death of her husband. For instance, Mr Middleton Murry brought me in a batch to hand to her . . .

To Frieda herself he added to a copy of this letter:

You must back me up in this. I cannot say when the various manuscripts were handed to me by Murry, . . . but I have witnesses here who would testify that this was so.<sup>9</sup>

Clearly Murry returned the typescript in March or April 1930. Exactly when Lawrence gave it to him, however, cannot be ascertained: it might have been at the time of his move from Buckinghamshire to Sussex in January 1915 or as late as the period of their residence in Cornwall in 1916-7, during which time Lawrence disposed of a number of manuscripts — mostly to the flames!

Thus, despite two points at which documentation fails, it is possible to trace the locations of the typescript from its present repository back to Lawrence himself. But is it all or in part Koteliansky's work and therefore the closest we can come to Lawrence's manuscript? The question has been in dispute, but without a thorough examination of the typescript and surrounding evidence.<sup>10</sup> The following analysis seeks to resolve the question.

## II

The typescript is a composite one consisting of 186 leaves assembled as follows:

a) pages 1 - 77 in purple carbon copy. Two consecutive pages are numbered 50, the second having 'bis' added in pencil after the numeral. Page 57 is missing so that there is a break in the text of about 27 lines or 300 words.

b) pages 78-86 in black carbon copy. Page 86 consists of 3¾ lines only, but there is no break in sense between this and the following page.

c) 100 pages in ribbon copy numbered 95–194. The typed numbering of these pages has been cancelled in pencil and renumbered 87–186 in pencil beside the cancelled numbers. Powell's 1937 catalogue notes 194 pages, and it is clear that the revised numbering was done after that date. (See below.)

The first 88 pages of the typescript are on cartridge paper with serrations down one edge where they have been detached from a pad or booklet. The paper bears no watermark apart from wire and chain lines, the chain lines being 2.7 cm apart. The pages measure 25.4 cm by 20.2 cm. The remaining 98 pages are on light-weight paper, water-marked Silver Linen and measuring 25 cm by 20 cm. Apart from the odd fact that the first two pages in the ribbon copy are on the heavier paper — reverse side — it must be inferred that at one time there were two complete copies of this typescript — a ribbon copy on Silver Linen paper and a carbon copy on the thicker paper.

Strangely, it is this division of the typescript into two sections (perhaps together with the odd pagination at the break) that has reinforced the suggestion that it is only in part Koteliansky's work. The only record of any other typing of the work during Lawrence's lifetime is found in a letter to Amy Lowell. In November 1914, hearing of his extreme poverty, Miss Lowell had sent Lawrence an L.G. Smith Bros. Premier No. 2 typewriter, rather than embarrass him by a gift of money. On 18 December he wrote to her: 'My wife and I we type away at my book on Thomas Hardy . . . which I must write again, still another time.'<sup>11</sup> But this was, by his own account, thirteen days after he had despatched 'the last of the MS' to Koteliansky.<sup>12</sup> Two days before that he had been encouraging Koteliansky to get the typing done so that he could send the book to the publisher and 'get a little money for it'.<sup>13</sup> There can be little doubt from this that the book was complete and Koteliansky's job within sight of the end. Lawrence was busy rewriting *The Rainbow*.<sup>14</sup> The suggestion is that Koteliansky typed only part of the book, and that Frieda and Lawrence typed the remainder. This view cannot be upheld since a comparison of a known specimen of Lawrence's typing on his own machine with the present typescript reveals not only work of a different typist but also that a different machine from his was used and that the same typewriter was used for the whole of the 'Study'. Furthermore the typing is uniform throughout in the nature of its amateurish mistypings, spacing and layout. From a professional typist's point of view, Koteliansky was right when he told a correspondent in 1946 that he couldn't type and had never been able to.<sup>15</sup> How then do we explain the Lowell letter? In December 1914 Lawrence was still dissatisfied with the book even while Koteliansky was completing his typing task. He was also concerned that Amy Lowell should feel that her gift was being well used. Probably he and Frieda were in fact at that point typing some portion of a revised version, but this revision was soon set aside as *The Rainbow* was more pressing and indeed more exciting. Nothing relating to the 'Study' survives from Lawrence's typewriter.

That the typescript is made up of both ribbon copy and carbon copy positively bears out Lawrence's request of 5 October 1914 that Koteliansky should make 'a duplicate also'.<sup>16</sup> In April 1915, when asking him to type a new version of his philosophy, Lawrence specifically asked for Silver Linen paper.<sup>17</sup> The ribbon copy pages 86-186 of the 'Study' are on Silver Linen. What became of the duplicate copy is not known. It may have gone to Nisbet who had commissioned the book on Hardy in July 1914, or to Pinker, Lawrence's agent at the time.<sup>18</sup>

Close examination of the typescript reveals details which require some explanation, but in the end can add support to the case that this is the Koteliansky copy. Of two pages numbered 50, the first, which contains the second page of Chapter V, ends in mid-sentence after only 19¾ lines. The average full page has 25 lines. On page 86 there are only 3½ lines of text: 'Cunning and according to female suggestion . . . flesh of its mother' (from Chapter VII). Page 87, although given the typed number 95, begins with no indentation and no evident sense-break: 'And the birth . . .'. This page is the beginning of the ribbon copy section of the typescript.

Lawrence's letters to Koteliansky at the time suggest a rationale for these breaks. The week before Koteliansky received the first instalment of manuscript Lawrence told him: 'I have done about 50 pages — rewritten them.' Something in excess of 50 manuscript pages would reduce to 50 typed pages. In less than three weeks Lawrence sent a second parcel of manuscript. Some 35 typed pages seems a reasonable amount for two weeks of writing and recasting. It was five weeks later that he sent on the last of the manuscript. The dates, the evident size of the batches and the breaks in the typescript can be seen to match: 1-50, ms sent 11 October; 50(bis)-86, ms sent 31 October; 87-186, ms sent 5 December. The numbering of the second page 50 may be explained by the fact that Lawrence picked up the first part of the typing personally on a visit to London some days before he sent the second batch of manuscript. Koteliansky mistook his previous end point as his new starting point.<sup>19</sup> The misnumbering of page 87 as 95 may be more difficult to explain. Possibly Koteliansky simply followed the manuscript numbering.

It might be urged against this rationale that Lawrence is unlikely to have broken his manuscript in mid-chapter — even mid-sentence — to send copy to his typist. On the other hand what he was sending was, at least in part, revised manuscript and he may have considered that there were convenient break points on the pages in question. Furthermore he does not say to Koteliansky 'Here are chapters 1-4' but 'Here is some more manuscript'.

Something of the nature of this manuscript can be inferred from the chapter divisions and numberings in the typescript. They read: I (the chapter is divided into two sections only the second of which is numbered, -2-), II, III, III, V, V, IV (in the course of this, the seventh chapter, the misnumbering of pages begins with 86 as 95), VIII, IX (a subsection is numbered -2- as in chapter I), XII. This

suggests that the order and the arrangement of the chapters was altered in Lawrence's rewriting immediately before the typing. If the reader will examine the work as published, taking the chapters in the order I, II, IV together with VI, and then the opening of VII, he will find that it reads as a continuous argument, excluding all reference to Hardy, and (with the exceptional inclusion of VI, noticeably the shortest in the book) follows the chapter numbering of the typescript: I, II, the second III (including the second V), IV. This adds substance to Lawrence's complaint to his agent when he first began the book that it would be about anything but Thomas Hardy. It also accounts for both the comparative isolation of chapter III 'Containing Six Novels and the Real Tragedy' and its self-conscious opening. It was an easy piece to detach for separate magazine publication. Perhaps all the Hardy material existed in the first draft late in the book and closer to chapter IX (on *Tess* and *Jude*). Indeed the discrepancy in pagination at page 86 may have come about through the re-placing of manuscript material. It is conceivable that in the earlier form chapter IX itself was two separate chapters — perhaps 10 and 11 so that the conclusion was then numbered XII. Lawrence's attempts to unify the book by placing the Hardy material at suitable points in the general philosophical argument were to some extent motivated by the hope that Nisbet would still accept the book, and that he would 'get some money for it'. The opening of chapter III and the ironic title of chapter IX 'A nos moutons' show a characteristic improvisation.

One important feature of this typescript requires explanation. Apart from the re-numbering of the pages already referred to there are 42 markings or 'corrections' in the typescript. Three stand out by virtue of their being in blue ink and being small corrections which alter the sense of their context. On p.45 'did know' is changed to 'did not know' by means of a caret and 'not' inserted above the line; on p.46 'owing' is changed to 'owning' by an n above the line; on p.149 'stretched' is changed to 'outstretched' by a caret and 'out' above the line. I am not convinced that they are Lawrence's own, but they are clearly necessary for the correct sense in each case. They may be of a part with the others. The remaining 39 are all in pencil: (i) four quite inexplicably cancel a word in the text, (ii) two are meaningless marks, (iii) one is a mistakenly placed 'And' at the beginning of a paragraph, now erased (discussed below), (iv) seven are attempts (including erasures) to make sense of the chapter numberings, those that stand give the published order I-X, (v) nineteen are 'corrections' to spelling, punctuation or word-division, (vi) four make substantive alterations of which two can be justified (discussed below), and finally, (vii) two are erased notes — at the top of pages 50(bis) and 178. These two erased notes (vii) provide the clue to almost all of the pencillings since they were initialled AR.<sup>20</sup> In the 1950s Angelo Ravagli, Frieda's third husband, took a proprietorial interest in Lawrence's manuscripts, much to Frieda's relief, it seems: 'Fortunately Angelino is quite interested in making those dull lists and things [of Lawrence's books and manuscripts] with a secretary, I don't,' she wrote to Richard Aldington in 1954.<sup>21</sup> The notes suggest that in this case he was concerned to make sense of the typescript and its wayward pagination. On the second page 50 he wrote 'I think the place for this' and at 178,

which was typed 186, he wrote 'mss page 187'. This is at the head of the last chapter. At this point it seems he had discovered two pages 50 but had not noticed the missing page 57 or the mispagination at 87ff. The notes would then have been erased when he discovered the mistake and renumbered the pages. The groups (i), (iii) and (vi) make sense when the typescript is read against the printed text. They are Ravagli's half-hearted attempt to bring the text into line with a text which, as we have seen, derived from an inferior copy. Support to this is given by (iii). On page 160 consecutive paragraphs begin: 'And great . . .' and 'Great . ..'. Before the second, Ravagli pencilled in 'And', having misread the text. On discovering his error he erased the word. To the same page he made two of the marks noted under (ii). For the recovery of Lawrence's text, then, most of the substantive 'corrections' must be disregarded.

In the interests of neatness, one last tantalizing explanation may be offered for the missing page 57. The surrounding pages from 50 to 61 are stained on the bottom left-hand corners with oil or paraffin which has permeated the paper. The backs of pages 56 and 58 particularly are dirtied with mud and scraped, as if by shoes or rubbing against a hard surface. This suggests accidental scattering. In reassembling pages badly soiled in this way it is possible that either the missing page was mislaid, or so badly damaged as to be unusable. Early in December 1914 at the time of the assembling of the typescript, Lawrence was living in an isolated farmhouse near Chesham, Bucks. In a letter to Koteliansky of 3 December, urging him to complete the typing, Lawrence mentions a storm so violent that it blew their attic window 'clean out'.<sup>22</sup> There is no way of proving a connection between the two events; if something of the kind occurred it might perhaps explain why the incomplete (damaged) copy was given to Murry to keep while Lawrence held on to the other.

This review of the available evidence both external and internal does, I think, establish beyond reasonable doubt that the Bancroft typescript of the 'Study of Thomas Hardy' is what it seems to be — Koteliansky's typing of Lawrence's revised manuscript between October and December 1914. That it was in fact the copy text for the McDonald typescript as asserted at the beginning of this article and supported by the evidence presented can now be confirmed by one significant detail. When the copy typist reached p.86 of the Koteliansky typescript she was faced with a problem: her copy text had only 3¾ lines of text, and its next leaf was numbered 95. Were there just over eight pages missing? She assumed there were. In her typing so far she had gained an extra sixteen pages on her copy, or more than one page in five. Thus each page of Koteliansky was 1.6 in her version. She therefore allowed 8 × 1.6 plus a bit to give a round thirteen pages for the gap. Thus her p.102 is followed by p.115. Later the words 'or 103' have been added, in ribbon on the carbon copy, and p.116 has been overtyped '104', after which the numbering proceeds correctly. That there was in fact no break in the text was soon picked up, perhaps by a supervisor. But the typist's moment of doubt leaves us a clinching piece of evidence.

Bruce Steele,  
Monash University.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The title is editorial, and was given to the book by Lawrence's agents in 1930. His own title mentioned below, *Le Gai Savaire* is a linguistic curiosity. Why he chose French (and erroneous French) is not known. The allusion is to the Provencal troubadours' term for their art, but Lawrence is probably thinking of Nietzsche's use of the term.

<sup>2</sup> *Phoenix*, pp.398-516.

<sup>3</sup> In addition to its extensive collection of DHL manuscripts, letters and books, the H.R.C. at Austin has a collection of E.D. McDonald's papers and correspondence and the Curtis Brown Archive — both relating to DHL. I thank the University of Texas for permission to quote from these collections, which provided basic source material for this article. I am indebted to Ellen Dunlap and the reading room staff for their assistance with my work at Austin. The 'Study of Thomas Hardy', edited from the Bancroft Library typescript, with variants from the 'McDonald' typescript, will appear in a volume in the *Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence*. A grant from the A.R.G.C. made the research for this article, and for the volume, possible.

<sup>4</sup> I acknowledge here the particularly generous assistance of the Head of the Manuscripts Department of the Bancroft Library, Estelle Rebec, who provided useful information from the accessions file in both correspondence and conversation relating to this problematical typescript, and gave permission for it to be quoted in this article.

<sup>5</sup> *Frieda Lawrence, The Memoirs and Correspondence*, ed. E.W. Tedlock, Jr., (New York, 1965), p.308. Quoted by permission of the Frieda Lawrence Estate and Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

<sup>6</sup> Letter to author, 27 April 1979.

<sup>7</sup> Now in the Bancroft Library.

<sup>8</sup> Information supplied by Dr. Flower. See *Book-Collector's Quarterly*, v(January 1932), pp.44-61.

<sup>9</sup> Copies of these letters are in the Curtis Brown Archives, H.R.C., Austin, Texas.

<sup>10</sup> See for instance George J. Zytaruk, ed., *The Quest for Ranim* (Montreal, 1970), p.17 and George J. Zytaruk and James T. Boulton, eds., *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence* vol.ii (Cambridge, 1981; hereafter *Letters* ii), p.239, but cf. Keith Sagar, *D.H. Lawrence: A Calendar of His Works* (Manchester, 1979), p.55-6.

<sup>11</sup> *Letters* ii, 243. For permission to make this and subsequent quotations from the 'Study of Thomas Hardy' and from D.H. Lawrence's *Letters* acknowledgment is made to Laurence Pollinger and the Estate of Mrs. Frieda Lawrence Ravagli.

<sup>12</sup> *Letters* ii, 239.

<sup>13</sup> *Letters* ii, 239.

<sup>14</sup> *Letters* ii, 240. As Sagar points out (see note 10), DHL abandons typing his revision of the novel as too painfully slow a process. It is unlikely, therefore, that he would proceed at the same time to type the whole of his 'philosophy'!

<sup>15</sup> Unpublished letter to Lucy O'Brien, 11 February 1948 in Koteliensky Papers in the British Library.

<sup>16</sup> *Letters* ii, 220.

<sup>17</sup> *Letters* ii, 317. The letter is on Silver Linen paper.

<sup>18</sup> Catherine Carswell, a loyal friend of Lawrence's, stated in a review of *Phoenix* that the 'Study' was 'everywhere rejected at the time' (*Spectator*, 27 November 1936, p.960).

<sup>19</sup> *Letters* ii, 227.

<sup>20</sup> Similar notes, some in Italian, with the same initials are to be found on several Lawrence Mss and Tss.

<sup>21</sup> Harry T. Moore and Dale B. Montague, eds., *Frieda Lawrence and Her Circle* (London, 1981), p.113.

<sup>22</sup> *Letters* ii, 239.



**Copyright of Full Text rests with the original copyright owner and, except as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, copying this copyright material is prohibited without the permission of the owner or its exclusive licensee or agent or by way of a license from Copyright Agency Limited. For information about such licences contact Copyright Agency Limited on (02) 93947600 (ph) or (02) 93947601 (fax)**