D.H. Lawrence. *That Women Know Best*. Ed. Roy Spencer. Santa Rosa, CA: Black Sparrow Press, 1994. Pp. 40. Distributed gratis for friends of the Black Sparrow Press.

Lawrence declares in "Blessed are the Powerful" that "it's probably a good thing to have the press—the newspaper press—crushed under the up-to-date rubber heel of a tyrannous but harmless dictator." One senses that this was not a man who rushed out each morning to fetch his daily newspaper.

He also once told a Mexican interviewer that journalism was as "needless as influenza." His later essays and *Pansies* sometimes rail against the way films, radio, and papers tended to spoon-feed to the Great British Public (GBP) what he called "counterfeit" or "stock emotion." Thus we're perhaps surprised to discover that he turned to writing newspaper articles for that GBP during his last two years of life. He needed money, was often too ill to produce long works, and evidenced in letters the pleasure he got from writing articles that, in some cases, could draw up to 2,000,000 British newspaper readers a day—vastly more than the meager audience his creative works had attracted through the 1920s.

Now Roy Spencer has discovered a published newspaper article that Lawrence bibliographers have heretofore missed, or misidentified, and Black Sparrow Press in California has issued it in an attractive little book of 40 pages. Titled *What Women Know Best*, it was published in softbound copies "for friends" of the Press, plus 50 numbered copies handbound in boards by Earle Gray. Keith Sagar in *D.H. Lawrence: A Calendar of His Works* says that Lawrence sent a piece from the Villa Mirenda titled "What Women Know" to agent Nancy Pearn on 21 May 1928, and that it later appeared in *Assorted Articles* as "All There." But "All There" is *not* the article Lawrence sent to Pearn on that date for publication in the London *Daily Chronicle* on 29 November as "That Women Know Best," part of a series of "confessions" by six well-known male authors (including Compton Mackenzie, and André Maurois) on the topic "What Women Have Taught Me." Bibliographers had known for years that Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley, held a holograph titled "That Women Know Best," but editors of Cambridge University Press's *Letters* subsequently declared that "the newspaper appears not to have published" the piece. Spencer

dug up the *Daily Chronicle* of 29 November, in Colindale's Newspaper Library, to show that the article had indeed been published.

The Black Sparrow book includes the "Finished Manuscript Version" along with a "Variorum Manuscript Version" and the *Daily Chronicle* text, together with Spencer's introduction, a commentary on "Sub-editorial Revisions," a closing commentary on the article, and two pages of notes. Some might consider this scholarly packaging a bit of overkill for an article that falls under 10,000 words and that Spencer himself admits is "a harmless piece of philosophising."

But *That Women Know Best* does offer an interesting sidelight to what *Sons and Lovers* reveals about the dynamics of Lawrence's family, the way his father sought futilely to be "lord" of the household but ultimately surrendered sovereignty to his wife. At a tender age, Lawrence writes, he realized it was the *woman* who held power in the home, who held "the big stick" that "dictated what was right and what was wrong." Only slowly did he realize that, though his mother wielded "her moral sceptre" with authority, she possessed no real inner "gift" of infallible moral knowledge. Instead, she and all women simply exhibited "superb bravado," while men sat idly "round on their hams" and ceded power. Lawrence concludes: "Perhaps the things that one can unlearn from women are more effective than the things one can learn. How not to be too sure of right and wrong for example!" He thus never gets around to acknowledging that women had, in fact, "taught" him anything. Also, as Spencer rightly notes, Lawrence makes *no* reference to anything his wife Frieda might have "taught" him, and writes as if only one woman influenced him : his mother. Although this is not surprising, it seems unqualifiedly unfair to Frieda.

As we track the changes made from the holograph to the *Daily Chronicle* article, we discover *no* substantive alterations. We see Lawrence pruning repetitions and sharpening phrases, but we learn *nothing* new about his composition process. The editorial house styling (shorter paragraphs, subheads, punctuation changes) is what any writer could have expected from any good newspaper editor, and Spencer overheats when he refers to that editing process as a case of the author's work having to pass through "the teeth of the Moloch" to prepare it for consumption by the GBP.

Spencer asks: "Did Lawrence regard writing for newspapers, for the Great British Public, as `beneath' him? And was he reluctant to write, feeling that he was belittling his standing in the literary world?" The answer to that—*NO*—seems obvious, from Lawrence's letters. John Worthen also answers that emphatically in *D.H. Lawrence: A Literary Life*, where he first notes that

Lawrence once (1908-1911) toyed with the idea of entering journalism professionally (as a reviewer/critic), and then shows how intrigued Lawrence was with the idea of gaining a new popular market when his London agents opened up that prospect to him in spring 1928. Lawrence wrote Pearn saying, "I find it really amusing to write these little articles. . . . Perhaps after all the public is not a dull animal, or would prefer an occasional subtle suave stone to polish its wits against. Let us see!" At any rate, between 8 May and 13 October 1928 he published seven articles in the *London Evening News*, and then turned to write other pieces for the *Sunday Dispatch*, *Daily Express*, and *Daily Chronicle*, in all publishing 15 articles in London's popular press. He received fairly good pay, and showed clearly that, had he pursued journalism earlier, he would have been very good at it. Readers will value *That Women Know Best* for what it shows of Lawrence's journalistic talents, and especially for the tiny new beam of light it casts on the dynamics of his Eastwood family and on his views of women.

Dennis Jackson
University of Delaware

D.H. Lawrence. *The Trespasser*. Ed. Elizabeth Mansfield with an Introduction and Notes by John Turner. Twentieth-Century Classics. London: Penguin, 1994. Pp. 285. $9.95 (paper).

—. *Sons and Lovers*. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by Helen Baron and Carl Baron. Twentieth-Century Classics. London: Penguin, 1994. Pp. xlv + 498. $9.95 (paper).

—. *The White Peacock*. Ed. Andrew Robertson with an Introduction and Notes by Michael Black. Twentieth-Century Classics. London: Penguin, 1995. Pp. xlviii + 367. $10.95 (paper).

I would like to express the academy's gratitude to Penguin Books and John Worthen, the advisory editor, for making it possible to own and even teach the definitive (Cambridge) text of D.H. Lawrence without making special arrangements with the local Credit Union. Naturally, Penguin books does not wish to neglect those Lawrence scholars who have already taken out their second mortgage, so for each volume it has supplied, in addition

to the original (Cambridge) text, a new scholarly apparatus: introduction, notes, chronology, bibliography, map, and appendices.

An "apparatus" is a kind of orthopedic contraption useful, though often galling, to the culturally challenged. Textual notes are particularly trying; to paraphrase Nietzsche's remark concerning panhandlers, it is annoying to read them and annoying not to read them. It is annoying when superscripts mar the flow of both type and thought to suggest impertinently that there's something better worth reading than the next line of text; annoying either to yield to that suggestion or to continue reading with the sneaking feeling one might be missing something; most annoying when the compulsive finger in the back of the book turns up something already well known, irrelevant, or mistaken. It is to the credit, therefore, of the advisory editor, that in none of these three volumes is the text molested or the reader importuned. The notes remain quietly at the back, to be referred to easily by page and line number if the reader is caught short.

Within Worthen's framework, the scholars vary considerably in their approach. John Turner's introduction to *The Trespasser* is concerned to refute critics who object to the novel's frequent use of heavy metaphors: "Slower and slower went the hawks of Siegmund's mind, after the quarry of conclusion"; the "rhythm of the train stamped him . . . with a brand of catastrophe", and so on. To do him justice, Turner does not try to defend *these* examples, but he feels that "a few little silver tortoises of cloud" and the novel's "metaphoricity" in general indicate "the general laws of the world beneath its multiplicity of particular forms, referring each individual phenomenon to the greater life behind it; and in this way *The Trespasser* is a religious book." Naturally, writers must stick up for the works they introduce.

Turner is at his best when offering what students will need in order to respond to the novel in a culturally informed manner; key concepts in Wagner, Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, and H.G. Wells are given clear and relevant explanations. Students will also benefit from Turner's approach to allusions. His notes do not merely give a reference (which very few would ever pursue) but explain the context of the allusion briefly and effectively, thus bringing the Wagnerian and other intertexts to life in the mind of the reader. There are also historical notes on events like Tsar Nicholas's visit to the Isle of Wight, which serve to emphasize the docudrama. In general, Turner shows good judgment both in what is included and what left out.

Unlike ourselves, this volume has no fewer than five appendices. Three contain writings by Helen Corke, which startlingly reveal that she has as much right to have her name on *The Trespasser's* cover as does Mollie Skinner on *The Boy in the Bush*'s. Startling also is the quality of the writing, which in some episodes is the equal of Lawrence's, if not better. The other two are, respectively, Lawrence's manuscript version of the *Doppelgänger* episode and the obituary of Siegmund's original, the unfortunate H.B. McCartney.

Sons and Lovers is edited and annotated by Helen and the late Carl Baron, who also collaborated on the Cambridge edition. Their introduction is a fine piece of textual analysis, whose aim is to lay out the organic structure and form which the novel's first critic and editor, Edward Garnett, was unable to discern. The essay seems aimed primarily at undergraduates, with a series of useful, teacherly (not patronizing) questions, the answers to which lead the reader to appreciate how deeply the "patterning" of the novel runs throughout the text, and how many apparently superficial details are in fact anchored firmly in the deeper structure.

The notes, however, seem to me less successfully managed than Turner's. Like Turner's they are largely informative rather than interpretive, but while the allusions are referenced they are not often explained. Some notes are overly detailed and fussy, and there is some inconsistency. A reader who needs to be informed that the story of Adam and Eve and the apple is in Genesis ii-iii will also need to be told what the Annunciation is. The former reference is provided; the latter is not. Those who do not know that "Cherchez la femme" means "Look for the woman (French) i.e. a woman is the cause of this trouble" are likely to trip over "Tu te rappelleras la beauté des caresses," which is not translated. Some of the notes and the two maps of Eastwood seem aimed at the D.H. Lawrence tourist industry; most readers would benefit more from a map of the fictional world of *Sons and Lovers*—like the map accompanying the Penguin editions of Hardy.

Two quibbles: on page 402 occurs the word "marrain," apparently referring to the marram grass on the sand dunes. The variant "marrain" does not occur in the OED or Webster's, nor is it in the dialect glossary appended to this volume. Is this a typo, or a misreading of the manuscript, or a misspelling of Lawrence's? It needs correcting or annotating. And, I regret to add, there is a downright mistake: the person whom Shahrazad entertains in the Arabian Nights is the Sultan Shahrayar, monarch of India and China, not "the Caliph of Baghdad"!

The rest of the apparatus includes Lawrence's own Foreword, an interesting brief summary of the history of the text, and a list of Edward Garnett's textual revisions and censorings.

Both of the foregoing sets of notes differ strongly from Michael Black's annotations to *The White Peacock*, which begin unattractively, thus: "3:14 his bare arm See introduction p. xxx, and 14:31; 48-23-8; 51:18; 118:31; 150:29-30." Many of Black's notes invite the reader to follow hair references and cow references and so forth through the novel. I think this is unfortunate, as interpretive notes imply a particular way of reading the novel, inviting the student to skip the authentic response and go straight for an acceptable exam answer. Interpretation in an introductory essay does not carry the same problem; the essay is a personal genre—addressed to a reader who has presumably already formed some opinions. Not that appropriate and useful information is lacking from the notes. The reader will be glad to discover, for example, that Alice's "Abode of Love" is a risqué reference to a "topical scandal" concerning carnality in a supposedly spiritual commune.

Perfect consistency is not to be found here. Persephone is explained, but not Apollo. A reference to Schopenhauer and love needs a note but doesn't get one; an earlier note on Schopenhauer describes him merely as an "advocate of late nineteenth-century pessimistic naturalism," which would mean very little to anyone who didn't already know something about Schopenhauer. Black, in short, is uncertain of his audience and thus likely to annoy everyone at some point.

The introduction is another matter. Michael Black has probably published a greater number of words on Lawrence's early fiction than anyone, living or dead, and the depth of his engagement shows as he expounds Lawrence's method of composition, the problems of the narrative method (poor Cyril!), the issues of social class and links with other Lawrence novels. He is sensible on the homosexuality issue, and humane in his treatment of the infuriating Lettie and her contemporary tragedy.

The appendix contains two fragments of early versions of this novel, which serve, if no other purpose, to show how radically Lawrence rewrote.

Peter Whelan
Francis Marion University

D.H. Lawrence. *Mr Noon.* Edited with Notes by Lindeth Vasey and an Introduction by Peter Preston. Twentieth-Century Classics. London: Penguin, 1996. Pp. xliv + 319. $12.95 (paper).

—. and M.L. Skinner. *The Boy in the Bush.* Edited with an Introduction and Notes by Paul Eggert. Twentieth-Century Classics. London: Penguin, 1996. Pp. xxxvi + 390. $12.95 (paper).

The Penguin Twentieth-Century Classics series makes available moderately priced editions of the Cambridge University Press texts of Lawrence's works for readers who want an accurate text without the full scholarly apparatus. The works under review invite an expanded appreciation of two of Lawrence's lesser-known novels. *Mr Noon*, left unfinished as a first draft in 1921, became available in its incomplete entirety only in 1984 when Lindeth Vasey's Cambridge text appeared. Paul Eggert's Cambridge edition of *The Boy in the Bush*, Lawrence's re-written version of Mollie Skinner's manuscript, was published in 1990.

These Penguin paperbacks combine the virtues of books that are pleasant to handle and to read for enjoyment with sufficient material in the way of introduction, notes, maps, and other background information to assist fuller understanding. The cover of each bears a well-chosen reproduction of a painting that reflects the theme and spirit of the novel. *The Boy in the Bush* is illustrated with a detail from Russell Drysdale's "The Cricketers," depicting a lonely homestead in arid, wild country with an energetic male figure in the foreground. Ernst Ludwig Kirchner's "Nude Behind a Curtain: Franzi" on the cover of *Mr Noon* beautifully captures the warm, lighthearted eroticism of Lawrence's style and attitude in this novel.

The novels feature new introductions and notes together with some of the appendices that appear in the Cambridge editions. The texts provide no indications to point readers to the explanatory notes. Although perhaps Penguin decided that the asterisks used as markers for notes in the Cambridge texts would seem like pedantic intrusions, it can be irritating to search for a note that is not there. The glossary of Australian and slang terms in *The Boy in the Bush* could have been more conveniently incorporated within the textual notes, as in the Cambridge volume.

Unlike the Cambridge editions, these two Penguin books include critical introductions to the themes of the novels as well as to the background and history of the texts. Peter Preston discusses the narrative voice in *Mr*

Noon, which establishes an adversarial relationship with the reader, whose values and literary expectations are constantly undermined. Preston also considers *Mr Noon* as a reflection of Lawrence's own experience of liberation from provincialism of thought and mores when he first left England, and he notes the significance of Lawrence's departures from factual accuracy in recounting events that had happened nine years earlier. Because, for instance, Gilbert has no mother and Johanna is not torn by anguish at the prospect of losing her children, the second half of the novel can focus centrally upon the development of their relationship of fruitful combativeness. As to the question of why Lawrence did not complete the novel, Preston considers that the terms of the earlier love relationship were outdated for the Lawrence of 1921. At the same time Lawrence already knew this story's outcome and was not motivated to complete a mere narrative.

Paul Eggert, the Cambridge editor of *The Boy in the Bush*, brings to his comments on the novel a fresh conviction of its authenticity as a fully Lawrentian work, and also a close knowledge of Australian culture. He is at pains to defend the novel against the critical disfavor in which it has usually been held, and to urge upon us the strengths of the work, despite some possibly offensive themes. He notes the vigor and skill of Lawrence's narrative technique and effective use of the shifting authorial voice, and emphasizes the "physical" nature of experience which is powerfully invoked for revealing character and for comic effect. In company with many readers, however, he finds unconvincing some of the grandiosity of the later Jack, gold-miner and patriarch, and believes that the late addition of the final chapter, showing Jack in the reality of his life of domination, was probably misjudged.

The novel belongs among the problematic works of the New Mexican period that reflect the integrity of Lawrence's vision yet explore very private and sometimes extreme notions of revitalizing Western culture following the First World War. Like *Mr Noon*, *The Boy in the Bush* is a provisional text, captured at one point in its creation, but less a finished or considered statement than most of Lawrence's fiction. In their gaps and inconsistencies these works give insights into Lawrence at key moments of transition.

Margaret Storch
Independent Scholar

Paul Poplawski. ***Language, Art and Reality in D. H. Lawrence's "St. Mawr": A Stylistic Study*****. Lewiston, NY: Edward Mellen, 1996. Pp. vii + 292. $89.95.**

After the 1998 Taos conference, Hugh Wittemeyer of the University of New Mexico e-mailed a question to the Lawrence discussion group: why had so few papers addressed the texts Lawrence wrote in New Mexico, particularly *St. Mawr*? Wittemeyer himself intelligently suggested that the publication of *Quetzalcoatl* had drawn attention away from Lawrence's writing from this period, but my own reaction to his e-mail worked at a more prosaic and practical level. I thought that since Lawrence scholars are sensible people they would be unlikely, in a twenty-minute paper, to address in *St. Mawr* the text that has perhaps proved more resistant than any other to a fully convincing reading.

Paul Poplawski has a whole book to devote to Lawrence's short novel, an unusual opportunity given the ossification of forms of publication as English Studies becomes an "old" discipline. As Poplawski's theme is the use of language in the text, using stylistics as his mode of analysis, such space is perhaps necessary. Providing a summary of his book is a difficult task as Poplawski favors splitting up each issue into a list of headings and often delineating further sub-categories. Any account could soon look like a contents page or even (heaven forbid) an effort to briefly summarize Lawrence's account of the bodily centers in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. Actually, the basic headings Poplawski uses are broad and open. After a brief introduction he offers a "provisional reading" of the text as a starting point. His main argument is to establish the need for close analysis of Lawrence's language, and to argue that in *St. Mawr* Lawrence overlays myth, social satire, and comedy. Part One of the book contains chapters on *St. Mawr* and issues of representation. The heart of the book is Part Two, where Poplawski takes three different hundred-line passages to explore the "satiric," "mythic," and "comedic" languages. (The section on the language of the comedy has appeared, in tighter form, as a chapter in *D.H. Lawrence and Comedy*, edited by Paul Eggert and John Worthen). Part Three, which also serves as the conclusion, is on *St. Mawr* and discourse.

If I were to doubt Poplawski's project I would suggest that it at lacks a really incisive overall thesis about the novel, and that the use of sub-sections is unwieldy and in the end counterproductive, militating against clarity. (Poplawski is an honest critic and feels the need to qualify many of the distinctions he makes.) The structure and approach try to let the overall argument about *St. Mawr* emerge gradually. This is a difficult way of writing, and it only succeeds when the author has a very keen sense of how to lead a reader to adopt a set of conclusions that have been fully thought through before writing commenced (one thinks, for example, of Freud's writings). But, troublingly, the beginning and end of Poplawski's book seem at odds about the basic nature of his intervention. Chapter Two opens with a declaration that he will be making a radical break with Leavis's account of the short novel in his *Scrutiny* article (later included in *D.H. Lawrence: Novelist*). While the method may be different, whether Poplawski actually presents a different interpretation of the short novel can be questioned. The last sentence of Poplawski's own prose in the book—before a quotation from "Why the Novel Matters" ("The novel is the one bright book of life")—runs: "*St. Mawr* is a novel *par excellence* because in it we find ourselves engaged, almost willy-nilly, in a superabundance of dialogues which help to display to us, and to engage us in play with, *potentialities* of language, art and reality - potentialities, that is, of life." In its linkage of the novel to the rich interplay of voices and "life"—as well as the use of a language of near-religious enthusiasm and intensity—Poplawski is very much within the approach and preoccupations Leavis voiced throughout his career, from his doctoral dissertation through to his last books. The phrase "almost willy-nilly" here is particularly unfortunate, as it suggests that Poplawski is not able to offer an account of how the various different languages he identifies build together into the text we read. To use modern methods of analyzing language that would test out Leavis's contentions about Lawrence, society, and language would have been a possible approach for the book. But what Poplawski promises is a new position, and this does not emerge.

Poplawski makes a number of suggestive insights, even if the need to soon go on to the next sub-heading does prevent full development. For example, there are interesting insights on the importance of the visual in *St. Mawr*, and about the complexity of Lawrence's handling of Mrs. Witt's role—how she is at once being criticized for unremitting cynicism while being used to carry much of the text's social satire. Overall, I suspect that issues of

Lawrence and language are best addressed through debate on Lawrence, *philosophy*, and language—how, for example, Lawrence attempted to find a language beyond the splitting of the self found in modernity, how he used image and metaphor to think and argue, and on his effort to write in a way that was not self-conscious and cerebral. The books of Michael Bell, Michael Black, and Fiona Becket have all helped to open up and explore these and other issues. But such studies as Poplawski's (and one could also mention Allan Ingrams's *Lawrence and Language*) begin to answer an important question: how did Lawrence use the English language?

Howard J. Booth
University of Kent

Gary Day and Brian Docherty, eds. *British Poetry, 1900-50: Aspects of Tradition.* New York: St. Martin's, 1995. Pp. x + 228. $39.95.

As one might expect from such essay collections, *British Poetry 1900-50: Aspects of Tradition* is neither comprehensive (the "Aspects" of the title points to its selective nature) nor entirely consistent in its methodology. However, this is an important volume for two reasons: first, it attempts to provide a much-needed reappraisal of the modern British canon, challenging many longstanding prejudices against Georgian verse, women poets, and provincial outsiders; second, it attempts to liberate poetry criticism from the stranglhold of New Critical critieria. To accomplish these two goals, the editors have assembled a distinguished group of critics, including Stan Smith, Clive Bloom, John Pikoulis, and others. The task of each contributor, as Gary Day writes, was to respond to their subject in the context of two crucial questions: "what is the relation of poetry to society?" and "what is the role of a poetic tradition?" By treating the poem(s) as a mode of social discourse, or as Day rather idealistically puts it, "an oppositional force," capable of "subvert[ing] the intitutionalised narratives of capitalism," generated in part by its social circumstances, the essayists hope to locate a more socially and historically viable measure of literary value.

The essays are arranged, for the most part, chronologically, beginning with the Georgians, Rupert Brooke, the War Poets, Edith Sitwell and Charlotte Mew. Then come Lawrence, Auden, Graves and Riding, MacDiarmid, the Surrealists, Poets of the Second World War, and Muir. (Although Yeats and Eliot are taken up briefly in Alistair Davies' "Deconstructing the High-Modernist Lyric," Irish, Anglo-American, and late-Victorian components of modern British poetry are omitted, as are important figures such as David Jones and Edward Thomas.)

Neil Roberts' fine essay, "Lawrence, Imagism, and Beyond," focuses on Lawrence's early affinity with the imagists—"what imagism made possible"—in order to account for his decision "to break with the well-made poem," transcend Georgian poetics (the poetry of the young man), and evolve the vital, organic approach of his mature phases (the poetry of the present). Roberts' aim is to draw critical attention to Lawrence's "contribution to the most distinctive genre of modern poetry: the long poem/sequence." Although much of what Roberts writes about the evolution of Lawrence's sequences and their basis in his theory of the "poetry of the present" covers familiar ground, this partial review is necessary to advance Roberts' somewhat ingenious *apologia* for the unevenness of Lawrence's poetic output. One of Lawrence's major contributions to the modern poetic sequence, Roberts argues, is the manner in which his poems are "open to each other" without forming a "poetic whole," which he calls Lawrence's "rhetoric of incompleteness and of process." In other words, the inferior poems are necessary to, and ought to be considered along with, the superior ones, not in the manner that a draft is a rough version of a finished poem, but rather, as Roberts argues, the way "a series of pulses, of thought and feeling, sometimes form, [and] often merge into each other." In theory, Robert's injunction, "Read it whole," makes perfect sense, but in practice should one have to read through all of *Pansies* in order to catch the full radiance of its isolated gems?

Another interesting idea found in Roberts' essay is that the incomplete nature of thoughts and feelings in Lawrence's verse ought not to be taken as a statement of a firmly held belief. That is, this "rhetoric of incompleteness" enacts a process of thought and feeling that never completes itself or comes to rest, and one must look to other poems in the sequence for retractions, restatements, revisions, and/or contradictions. Roberts illustrates his theory via deft analyses of "The Gazelle Calf" and "Desire is Dead" to show

that Lawrence's work gains "from being read not as complacently self-sufficient monuments but as strands 'flying' to connect with other very different poems." Taking this into consideration, Roberts notes, an argument could be made that Lawrence's "fantasies about virility and male dominance are not definitive." And herein lies the problem with this otherwise liberating approach to Lawrence's poetry. Because it creates a problem in discerning when Lawrence really means what he writes, certain utterances can be dismissed as whim (a momentary impulse) whereas others can be promulgated as genuine belief (a carefully arrived-at opinion).

The significance of *British Poetty 1900-50: Aspects of Tradition* lies in the crucial questions it raises about canonicity and value in a modern literary genre that is sorely in need of reappraisal. Even if it fails to offer adequate answers to these questions, the volume should serve as both a stimulus and barometer for future studies in this field.

Jonathan Bolton
Auburn University

Asker, D.B.D. *The Modern Bestiary—Animals in English Fiction 1880-1945*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1996. Pp. viii + 212. $89.95.

From the morally exemplary creatures in Kipling's *The Jungle Book* to Bismarck the vicious rabbit in Lawrence's *Women in Love*, English literature of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is teeming with animals. That's what makes the premise of D.B.D. Asker's *The Modern Bestiary: Animals in English Fiction 1880-1945* so interesting. Asker believes that bestiary art, which was very popular in Europe during the medieval period, became less common in the Renaissance and thereafter, only to enjoy a rebirth in the late nineteenth century. He attributes this renewed interest in part to the Romantic interest in vitality and horror at the increased ur-

banization and mechanization of society and in part to the impact of Darwin's *Origin of the Species*.

Asker provides some solid, though generally familiar, readings of individual works by the seven authors to whom this book is devoted: Rudyard Kipling, George Orwell, Thomas Hardy, D.H. Lawrence, H.G. Wells, David Garnett, and John Collier. The strongest component of this study is Asker's analysis of Wells: Asker convincingly argues that Wells was haunted by a fear that another species would evolve rapidly, but without an ethical sensibility, and would threaten humanity.

Nonetheless, this study is a decidedly disappointing work of scholarship. It is badly dated, containing no citations and no bibliographical references to any literary criticism, literary theory, biographies, or even editions of texts published after 1977! Asker refers to Penguin editions of Lawrence's works from the late 1940's to the mid-1970's. (Strangely, Asker's Penguin citations are not even consistent; he cites the 1975 *Rainbow* in his footnotes, but the 1949 edition in his Selected Bibliography.) The most recent piece of Lawrence criticism cited is Charles Rossman's article "Towards D.H.L. and His Visual Bestiary," published in 1974.

Furthermore, despite his references to cultural influences that might have shaped modern novelists' interest in bestiary art, Asker's thesis is surprisingly vague: "the great variety of animals we find constitutes a substantial revival in the fortunes of Bestiary art. Within their prose, all of these writers have turned with renewed vigour to a representation of animals, and through this have sought to present a fuller picture of the world. They have each done this in their own way, and we would scarcely expect such disparate writers as Kipling and Lawrence to share any special similarities in style or theme." Asker is somewhat more specific, but still predictable, when he states that "Nevertheless, we shall see that all the modern Bestiarists have relied on their animal characters, symbolic, realistic, or both, to act as analogues by which human predicaments may be presented and clarified." This book also has some stylistic weaknesses, including a fondness for the passive voice, the use of the royal "we," and several typographical errors.

In spite of these significant flaws, *The Modern Bestiary* provides some interesting close readings of individual works and some reasonably convincing generalizations about particular authors' use of animals in their fiction. In his Lawrence chapter, Asker notes that Lawrence "despised anthropomorphism" and adds "Rather, from Lawrence's point of view, it is

humans . . . who must become zoophiled." He also notes that, in Lawrence's view "Animals and birds can teach a jaded humanity what this life is."

Among the stronger components of this chapter are Asker's readings of *The Man Who Died* and "The Fox." Some of Asker's analyses of particular works, however, are curiously incomplete. For instance, Asker devotes considerable attention to *The Rainbow*, and discusses in detail the scene in which Ursula is chased by the horses. He neglects to mention, however, that Ursula is pregnant with Anton's baby and that running from the horses apparently causes her spontaneously to miscarry, a rather significant and symbolic event.

Similarly, although Asker makes several insightful observations about representations of animals in *Women in Love*, he seems wedded to the idea that Lawrence's animals are depicted naturalistically, without complicated figurative significance. He thus does not observe that Bismarck the rabbit (spelled "Bismark" throughout Asker's text) is a symbol of uncontrolled sexuality, even though this is rather apparent in the text of the novel. Also rather surprising is his failure to discuss the frequent identification of Loerke with various animals in the later chapters of *Women in Love*: "he was a chatterer, a magpie," "His eyes were arresting--brown, full, like a rabbit's," "He sat hunched up, as if his spirit were bat-like," "She looked at his thin, brown, nervous hands, that were prehensile, and somehow like talons, like 'griffes', inhuman," "She [Gudrun] was fascinated by him, fascinated as if some strange creature, a rabbit or a bat, or a brown seal had begun to talk to her." According to Birkin, Loerke "lives like a rat, in the river of courruption."

One might also question Asker's selection of works. Asker discusses twelve Lawrence works: "Study of Thomas Hardy," *The Man Who Died*, "Adolph," "Rex," "Love Was Once a Little Boy," "Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine," *Sons and Lovers*, *The White Peacock*, *The Rainbow*, *Women in Love*, "The Fox," and *St. Mawr*. He also makes some passing references to *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Surprisingly, though, Asker omits *The Plumed Serpent* from his discussion. *The Plumed Serpent*, which begins with a powerfully rendered bullfight, and which explores the possibility of the resurrection of the Aztec pantheon with its animal gods, seems as if it would be an integral part of any discussion of animal life in Lawrence's works.

Asker's book might have some limited usefulness for undergraduates,

but scholars would be better off going elsewhere.

Rebecca Lee Carpenter
Western Maryland College

Trudi Tate. *Modernism, History and the First World War*. New York: St. Martin's, l998. Pp. viii + l96. $69.95 (cloth); $22.95 (paper).

Trudi Tate's assertion that her book is "a study of the relationship between modernist fiction, the First World War, and cultural history" is rather misleading. Texts by Woolf, Ford, H.D., Faulkner, Kipling, and Lawrence figure significantly, but, just as significantly, so do war memoirs, newspaper stories, and propaganda. *Modernism, History and the First World War* is actually a wide-ranging, somewhat miscellaneous gathering of essays concerning World War I, connected by the author's central interest in cultural history.

Tate's topics are both predictably late-20th-century and engaging. She explores the question of whether civilians suffered from "war neuroses," and she analyzes the cultural implications of the representation of mutilated bodies. She also discusses the representation of wounded soldiers returned from the Front, arguing that the "Great War was not simply a 'crisis of masculinity.'" Instead the war "made visible - and intensified - differences *within* masculinity," differences that were at once bodily, historical, and fantasmatic" (*sic*). Here her main texts are "The Blind Man" and Faulkner's *Soldiers' Pay*.

Tate's fascinating cultural history of the tank from l9l6 to the end of the war is the best chapter. Clarissa Dalloway's "confusion over Armenia and Albania" is a topic worthy of serious discussion, but here Tate as cultural historian seems to me to seriously misread the novel.

Tate brings an unusual perspective to her few pages about Lawrence: she is concerned with this noncombatant's representation of veterans of the Great War. She notes that "Lawrence's soldiers are often remarkably

serene; indeed, many are less disturbed than his civilian characters." This even includes the mutilated Clifford Chatterley, who "remained strange and bright and cheerful, almost, one might say, chirpy."

Tate's interesting reading of "The Blind Man" aptly argues that in making Maurice's war injury "a source of deep insight, virility, and joy," Lawrence inverts the conventional representation of wounded, disfigured soldiers. The conclusion of the story, which "articulates a powerful erotic interest, both sadistic and masochistic, in the body of the soldier," is more characteristic of the period.

Modernism, History and the First World War cannot be said to constitute a major contribution to our understanding of the Great War. But the book is nevertheless fresh, insightful, knowledgeable, and very readable.

Keith Cushman
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Jill M. Farringdon. With contributions by A.Q. Morton, M.G. Farringdon, and M.D. Baker. *Analysing for Authorship: A Guide to the Cusum Technique.* Cardiff: U of Wales P, 1996. Pp. xii + 324. $65.

Farringdon's book on the cusum technique—a method for identifying text authorship based on statistical analysis of the author's linguistic habits—may interest Lawrence scholars because she includes a chapter on "The Back Road," the newly discovered short story attributed to Lawrence by Jonathan Rose in 1990. This chapter expands Farringdon's 1992 ***DHLR*** (24.1) article arguing against Rose's claim, discussing more fully the Lawrence text samples chosen for comparison with "The Back Road," and explaining the implications of the graphs showing that Lawrence could not have been the story's author. (Farringdon also adds a postscript to this chapter, pointing out that the short story is not only set in Scotland but also contains distinctively Scottish vocabulary—an unlikely usage for Lawrence.)

The chapter on Lawrence appears in a book that aims to make the cusum technique intelligible to a non-technical audience. The technique is in fact not particularly difficult, and its accuracy is supported by a wide range of

examples. Although it may seem counter-intuitive to literary scholars, the work of Farringdon and her colleagues persuasively shows that a writer's usage of small, primarily non-content words seems to be consistent over time and across genres. These habitual patterns of word usage function as a sort of linguistic fingerprint, establishing themselves even for very young writers (see the chapter on children's writing), and pervading all of an individual's measurable language use. The technique uses graphs to compare the length of sentences to the frequency of several possible linguistic habits, including the frequency of words with only two or three letters, and the frequency of words that begin with a vowel.

The first part of Farringdon's book introduces and attempts to explain the method, ending with the Lawrence chapter as the method's first major literary application. The friendliest part of this introductory section is in chapter two, when Farringdon begins to walk the novice reader through an analysis of a sample of the reader's own text. Sadly, she abandons these simple instructions halfway through the process (before actually helping the reader generate any of the cusum graphs), devoting the rest of the chapter to a general description of the remaining stages. The least friendly aspect of this first section is Farringdon's occasional failure to define her terms for the lay audience. Farringdon also has the frustrating habit of using boldface type and bullets to emphasize her points, which is reduced to the textual equivalent of attempting to persuade by raising one's voice on the occasions in which it is unaccompanied by additional explanations or logical support. Overall, the text is not as welcoming to the lay reader as it might have been, and is in fact somewhat less adapted to the literary audience than the original piece which appeared in the ***DLHR.***

In the second half of the book, Farringdon discusses an impressive range of examples of cusum analysis, ranging from literary examples, to children's texts, to legal applications. She shows that differences in age and genre—including written versus spoken language—do not disturb the homogeneity of an author's characteristic language habits, and she also shows that language use is demonstrably homogenous even for speakers of English as a foreign language or for translations. Literary scholars will probably be most interested in the literary examples, in which she uses sample texts from Muriel Spark and Twain's *Huckleberry Finn* (among others) to show that deliberate, clearly recognizable differences in style or dialect nonetheless do not affect the homogeneity of an author's basic language habits.

Farringdon's colleagues contribute the last two chapters of the book. Her husband, Michael Farringdon, responds to several critics of the cusum technique, and while he sounds a bit defensive in spots, he does persuasively answer most of the method's detractors. The final chapter, contributed by the cusum technique's original developer, A.Q. Morton, is a technical account of the history of the development of the cusum technique. Unfortunately, Morton has made almost no effort to keep this section intelligible for the non-expert audience.

The method is easy to use, since most of the analysis is done by a computer program and thus requires no special expertise, and literary scholars could probably find the technique useful in a broad range of situations. The text sample does need some minor shaping before being fed to the computer program (sentences that are unusually long, unusually short, or that contain long lists of nouns can appear as anomalies on the cusum graphs). Overall, the method deserves a wider audience than Farringdon's book is likely to reach, given its weaknesses in audience adaptation. Most readers will probably finish even a cursory examination of the book with a basic sense that the method works, along with a sense of its possible applications. Persevering readers (no matter how non-technical) will finish with a fairly clear understanding of the cusum technique, despite some frustration along the way. But a simpler, friendlier exposition would probably have gained more converts.

Kathryn Summers
University of North Carolina at Greensboro