D. H. LAWRENCE AND PAINTING

ABSTRACT

D. H. LAWRENCE AND PAINTING

by

William Hart

Department of English

Master of Arts

D. H. LAWRENCE AND PAINTING is a study of the activities of Lawrence as a painter. It relates the biographical background, from Lawrence's childhood interest in painting, until the final dispersal of the paintings after his death. It presents Lawrence's theory of consciousness, and the theory of painting which arose from it and which guided Lawrence in the creation of his pictures. It examines the paintings individually, presenting related passages from the writings of Lawrence, and it considers the influence which other artists had on Lawrence the painter. Finally, on the basis of assembled facts, it estimates the importance of the paintings within the context of the works of D. H. Lawrence.

D. H. LAWRENCE AND PAINTING

by

William Hart

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Department of English
McGill University
Montreal

July 1970

Even an artist knows that his work was never in his mind,
he could never have thought it before it happened.
A strange ache possessed him, and he entered the struggle,
and out of the struggle with his material, in the spell of the urge
his work took place, it stood up and saluted his mind.

--D. H. Lawrence, "The Work of Creation," Last Poems

PREFACE

Throughout his life, D. H. Lawrence had a strong interest in painting. He spent a surprising amount of time in studying, teaching, and practising the visual arts. In his last years, painting was perhaps as important to him as writing.

The paintings of D. H. Lawrence, however, have received little scholarly attention. Critics of the fine arts have not thought them important enough to merit study, while literary scholars have passed over them in a few pages, concentrating on the written works of Lawrence. Because of this neglect, there are many common misconceptions about the career of Lawrence as a painter, some of them repeated by his foremost biographers; and the importance of the paintings within the works of Lawrence is not generally realized.

Aside from brief references, only two studies have attempted to fill the gap in scholarship. The first is a memoir by Philip Trotter, printed in Edward Nehls' D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography. Trotter was the husband of Dorothy Warren, who exhibited the paintings in 1929; he presents an invaluable eyewitness account of the exhibit and ensuing events. However, his knowledge and understanding of Lawrence the artist is limited, and at times his personal involvement in the events he describes is a handicap: he is more interested in presenting his own point of view than that of Lawrence. The other work, Paintings of D. H. Lawrence, reproduces all the pictures exhibited in 1929, as well as many others; however, it offers little background material, and few comments on the paintings themselves.

The present study attempts to collate all the material on the activities of D. H. Lawrence as a painter, relying most on what he himself wrote. It relates the biographical background, from Lawrence's childhood interest in painting, until the final dispersal of the paintings after his death. It presents Lawrence's theory of consciousness, and the theory of painting which arose from it and which guided Lawrence in the creation of his pictures. It examines the paintings individually, noting related passages from the writings of Lawrence, and it considers the influence of other artists on Lawrence the painter. Finally, on the basis of assembled facts, it estimates the importance of the paintings within the context of the works of D. H. Lawrence.

This is the first systematic investigation of the subject. In many cases, there have been no previous evaluations of individual paintings. The relation of the paintings to the writings of Lawrence has been largely overlooked, as has at least one important influence on the paintings--that of the Etruscans. In the absence of other critical works on the paintings, this must be regarded as a tentative first treatment.

Except for brief references, this study deals only with the twenty-five paintings in the original exhibit of 1929. These are the bulk of the original paintings by Lawrence; the others known to exist resemble the pictures exhibited, but are less interesting. Unfortunately, for this investigation, the paintings are known only from reproductions in the 1929 and 1964 books of paintings. Lawrence often criticized the quality of the reproductions in the 1929 publication. In the period between 1929 and 1964, many of the paintings were lost; thus a large number of the reproductions in the 1964 book of paintings are based on those of the 1929 book. Those

same reproductions which Lawrence considered such feeble reflections of his works are now, in many cases, the only extant records of his works.

Because he wrote so quickly and so much, there are many contradictions in the writings of Lawrence. They also vary greatly in quality. Some writings he laboured over, concentrating his full artistic vision; others he dashed off to earn quick money, in these works often reducing his vision to simplistic terms. Despite conflicting statements, there is an underlying unity in all the writings of Lawrence. To avoid apparent contradictions, however, quotations are mainly from works Lawrence wrote during the last years of his life--works concerned directly with painting, and contemporary with the paintings of Lawrence.

Lawrence is often criticized for his "literary approach" to painting. That charge applies equally to this study. It considers the paintings only in the context of the works of D. H. Lawrence. It does not attempt to assess their worth as independent works of art. That is the task of a student of the fine arts; hopefully, this study would be of help. However, it does attempt to prove the words of Herbert Read, that "any complete understanding of Lawrence as a writer is not possible unless one takes into account his work as a painter."[1]

---

[1] Herbert Read, "Lawrence as a Painter," Paintings of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Mervyn Levy (New York, 1964), p. 60.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	ii
CHAPTER ONE: LAWRENCE'S CAREER AS A PAINTER	1
CHAPTER TWO: THE THEORY BEHIND THE PAINTINGS	18
CHAPTER THREE: THE PAINTINGS	34
CHAPTER FOUR: PAINTERS WHO INFLUENCED LAWRENCE	63
CONCLUSION	73
APPENDIX A: CHRONOLOGY	77
APPENDIX B: LIST OF CONTEMPORARY ARTICLES ABOUT THE 1929 EXHIBIT	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY	84

CHAPTER ONE: LAWRENCE'S CAREER AS A PAINTER

"All my life," wrote D. H. Lawrence, "I have from time to time gone back to paint, because it gave me a form of delight that words can never give."[1] Lawrence was always interested in painting; art was a favourite subject of his as a schoolboy, and again as a young teacher.[2] He once planned to write a history of Italian painting for children.[3] Throughout his life, he studied and practised the visual arts.

According to his sister Ada, Lawrence "began to paint before he began to write articles and novels"--"when he was fifteen or sixteen."[4] His formal training was slight: "I never went to an art school, I have had only one real lesson in painting in all my life,"[5] the instructor being "Mr Parkinson, the designer at a Langley Mill pottery factory."[6]

Aside from this, and drawing lessons in school, Lawrence taught himself to paint by copying other pictures. His models were the works of Corot, Brangwyn, Greiffenhagen, the English water-colour artists, and Italians of the early Renaissance such as Fra Angelico, Lorenzetti, and

---

[1] D. H. Lawrence, "Making Pictures," Assorted Articles (London, 1930), pp. 203-204.

[2] See Dorothy Brett, Lawrence and Brett, a Friendship (Philadelphia, 1933), p. 277.

[3] See The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Harry T. Moore, 2 vols. (New York, 1962), II, 654-660.

[4] Ada Lawrence and G. Stuart Gelder, Young Lorenzo: Early Life of D. H. Lawrence (Florence, 1931), pp. 8, 65.

[5] "Making Pictures," p. 198.

[6] Young Lorenzo, p. 66. In The Intelligent Heart, p. 54, Harry T. Moore notes that Parkinson was a relative of Lord Leighton.

Carpaccio.[7] At first he worked from reproductions in magazines, but for his twenty-first birthday, the Chambers family gave him a series of English water-colours, which he used to copy.[8] Evidently he kept up the habit, for years later, in New Mexico, Knud Merrild noted, "A constant item in Lawrence's travelling outfit was a small portfolio of coloured prints, chiefly of Renaissance and primitive Italian paintings. Although he did not care to possess things, here was something he seemed to treasure very much."[9]

Throughout his life, then, Lawrence painted. "He had always daubed away in spare moments: today, in places Lawrence stayed in England, America, and Italy, people show mild little water-colours and say, 'Here's something Lawrence did while he was here. . . .'"[10] But the pictures that he produced were mostly copies, and in any case, he attached no importance to this pastime. "Everything that can possibly be painted has been painted," he was fond of asserting, "every brushstroke that can possibly be laid on canvas has been laid on. The visual arts are at a dead end."[11] At his first meeting with Knud Merrild, "'It bores me to look at paintings,' he said. 'Why do you have to paint? There are enough paintings in the world, the art of painting is dead.'"[12]

---

[7] See Young Lorenzo, p. 66; "Making Pictures," pp. 202, 204.

[8] See "Making Pictures," p. 199; also Jessie Chambers ("E. T."), D. H. Lawrence: A Personal Record, 2nd ed. (London, 1965), p. 134.

[9] Knud Merrild, With D. H. Lawrence in New Mexico (London, 1964), p. 213. Originally issued in 1938 under the title A Poet and Two Painters.

[10] Harry T. Moore, The Intelligent Heart (New York, 1954), p. 54.

[11] "Making Pictures," p. 194.

[12] Merrild, p. 17.

Merrild observes, "To me he seemed like a boy hopelessly in love, always denouncing his love."[13] Both he and Dorothy Brett note Lawrence's habit of interfering with paintings they had begun.[14] Merrild recounts one occasion on which Lawrence snatched the paintbrush from his hand:

> I had to engage in a bodily struggle to get my brush back. He wouldn't let go of it. I finally recovered it and told him:
>
> "If you have to paint pictures, paint your own. Just say so, I will give you material and brushes for it. But I won't allow you to spoil my pictures."
>
> The prospect of him painting a picture elevated him and he said "perhaps he would." And he started to ask me technical questions. But that is as far as it went. He never got started on any pictures, while at Del Monte.[15]

Merrild is wrong; Lawrence did occasionally paint while in America.[16] However, it was not until the fall of 1926, after his final return to Europe, that he began to paint seriously. His last novel, The Plumed Serpent, had been his most grandiose in conception and his least successful in execution. His health had been permanently impaired by illness in Mexico, in 1925. In these circumstances, he began to turn away from the strenuous, and currently unrewarding, work of novel-making.

In December of 1925, Lawrence wrote Brett from Italy, "These colds one gets go away very irregularly and leave one disinclined to literature. I feel at present I should love to throw my pen in the sea forever."[17] In a letter the following February he declared, "I am really awfully sick of writing."[18] "I'm tired of straining with the world," he told Catherine

---

[13] Merrild, p. 209.

[14] See Brett, pp. 245, 255.

[15] Merrild, p. 232.

[16] See Brett, pp. 198, 221, 245.

[17] Letter to Brett, ?17 December 1925, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 870.

[18] Letter to Brett, 2 February 1926, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 886.

Carswell in March 1926,[19] and in July he wrote Brett, "I am not doing any work at all: feel sufficiently disgusted with myself with having done so much and undermining my health, with so little return. Pity one has to write at all."[20] In August of that year, Lawrence visited England for the last time in his life. Shortly after his return to Italy, he informed his literary agents that they should not expect more novels from him: "I shall try just to do short stories and smaller things."[21] On 18 October 1926, he told Brett, "I do very little work of any sort."[22]

While in England, on the Lincolnshire coast, Lawrence had felt his interest in painting revive. Struck by the "great sweeping sands that take the light, and little people that somehow seem lost in the light, and green sandhills," he had declared, "I'd paint, if I'd got paints, and could do it."[23]

Within a month of his return to Italy, the opportunity presented itself. In a letter dated 28 October 1926, Lawrence recorded the visit of Aldous and Maria Huxley to the Villa Mirenda;[24] it was on this occasion that Maria Huxley gave Lawrence "four rather large canvasses, one of which she had busted."[25] There were on hand at the Mirenda paints and brushes,

---

[19] Letter to C. Carswell, 2 March 1926, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 892.

[20] Letter to Brett, 29 July 1926, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 929.

[21] Letter to Nancy Pearn, 9 Oct. 1926, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 939.

[22] Letters, ed. Moore, II, 943.

[23] Letter to Brett, 26 August 1926, The Letters of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Aldous Huxley (London, 1932), p. 668.

[24] Letter to Gertrude Cooper, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 944.

[25] "Making Pictures," p. 195.

left over from house-painting.[26] Lawrence quickly set to work, observed by his wife Frieda:

> Mixing his paints himself, boldly and joyfully, Lawrence began to paint. I watched him for hours, absorbed, especially when he began a new one, when he would mix his paints on a piece of glass, paint with a rag and his fingers, and his palm and his brushes. "Try your toes next," I would say. Occasionally . . . he would call me, and I would have to hold out an arm or a leg for him to draw, or tell him what I thought of his painting.
>
> He enjoyed his painting . . . with what intensity he went for it![27]

Two weeks after their visit, Lawrence wrote the Huxleys, "I've already painted a picture on one of the canvases."[28] This was A Holy Family; other paintings soon appeared in regular succession.

"I have started painting, quite seriously, on my own," Lawrence told Brett on 24 November 1926. "It's rather fun, discovering one can paint one's own ideas and one's own feelings--and a change from writing."[29] By January of 1927, he felt confident enough to declare, "Painting is more fun and less soul-work than writing. I may end as an R. A."[30] To his sister-in-law Else he wrote,

> Something has happened to me about letters--in fact all writing. I seem to be losing my will-to-write altogether. . . . I spend much more time painting--have already done three, nearly four, fairly large pictures. I wonder what you'll say to them when you'll see them. Painting is more fun than writing, much more

---

[26] "Making Pictures," p. 195.

[27] Frieda Lawrence, "Not I, But the Wind . . ." (New York, 1934), pp. 191, 193.

[28] Letter to Maria and Aldous Huxley, 11 November 1926, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 945.

[29] Letters, ed. Moore, II, 949.

[30] Letter to Nancy Pearn, 9 Jan. 1927, Letters, ed. Huxley, p. 679.

of a game, and costs the soul far, far less.[31]

Catherine Carswell observed,

> There was a shy but eager note in every mention by Lawrence of his pictures which I never found in any reference to his novels, though there was something like it in the case of certain poems. In painting he was at once more playful and more exposed than in the writing of prose. He had tremendously enjoyed the making of his pictures, and at the same time he felt that he was expressing by means of them something both personal and fundamental to himself. But he had kept very quiet about it.[32]

By spring of 1927, the idea had occurred to Lawrence of exhibiting his pictures, but he was reluctant to do so.[33] His special attachment to the paintings made him hesitate to show or sell them to a public which was generally unfavourable to his work. Visitors to the Mirenda had made him aware of the highly controversial nature of the paintings. He told Brett, "My pictures, which seem to me absolutely innocent, I feel people can't even look at them. They glance, and look quickly away."[34] To the Brewsters he wrote,

> It's quite amusing to paint--if only one didn't have the feeling of other people looking on. That spoils it again. People keep coming--and they want to see one's pictures--and they don't like them, they don't really want to take the trouble of really looking at them, or anything; they stand there half alive and make the whole thing seem like lukewarm fish soup.[35]

---

[31] Letter to Dr Else Jaffe-Richthofen, 10 January 1927, in "Not I, But the Wind . . .", p. 220.

[32] Catherine Carswell, The Savage Pilgrimage (London, 1932), p. 272.

[33] See letter to E. H. Brewster, 28 May 1927, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 980.

[34] Letter to Brett, 8 March 1927, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 969.

[35] Letter to E. and A. Brewster, 13 April 1928, in D. H. Lawrence, Reminiscences and Correspondence, by Earl and Achsah Brewster (London, 1934), p. 168.

For over a year, the idea of an exhibit remained dormant, while Lawrence continued his work. In the spring of 1928, however, Dorothy Brett, on her own initiative, began to make arrangements for a showing of the paintings in New York. At the same time, Frieda's daughter, Barbara Weekley, mentioned the paintings to the owner of a West End London gallery, Dorothy Warren; Lawrence had met her during the Great War at Garsington, the home of Lady Ottoline Morrell. Dorothy Warren expressed an interest in exhibiting the paintings. Lawrence wavered a bit, but at last it was arranged to show the pictures at the Warren Gallery in London, in October 1928, with tentative plans for an exhibit in New York immediately following, at the gallery of Alfred Stieglitz.

"I am showing them in London," Lawrence explained to Stieglitz, "because friends wanted me to--and we are giving up the Italian Villa--and--vanity, I suppose. Or mischief. More arrows in the air, and let's hope one won't fall in my own eye, like Harold at Hastings."[36] His misgivings soon proved prophetic.

The publication of Lady Chatterley's Lover disrupted the plans for the exhibition. Lawrence had begun to paint and to write the novel, originally conceived as a short fiction, at the same time. He finished the book early in 1928, but could find no reputable publisher for it, unless he allowed it to be bowdlerized. This he would not do. He decided to publish the book himself, in Florence, with the help of Giuseppe Orioli. From Florence, copies were mailed to subscribers in England and America. The novel first appeared in June 1928; its notoriety quickly spread, and

---

[36] Letter to A. Stieglitz, 12 Sept. 1928, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1089-90.

the authorities began to move against it. On 25 August Lawrence wrote Dorothy Warren, "So many people seem mortally offended by Lady Chatterley that perhaps a picture show might only carry the offence further. Not that I care about offending them. But you may."[37]

It soon became obvious to Lawrence that a showing in New York was now impossible:

> There is such a fracas and an alarm in America over my novel, such a panic, that I must postpone any thought of showing my pictures there. I'm sure the Customs in New York would destroy them! So that's off. I wouldn't risk sending the pictures across the Atlantic this year, not for anything.[38]

Dorothy Warren was willing to proceed with the London exhibit; Lawrence left the final decision to her:

> This leaves you free to do as you like in England, as regards the time of your show. Some of my 'friends' write that this is the very wrong moment to show pictures of mine in London, it will provide an opportunity for all my enemies, that it will do me a lot of damage, and do your gallery a lot of damage, etc., etc. I don't give much for such Job's Comforters myself. Nor do I tremble at the thought of my 'enemies,' dear Lord! But you think it over and do as you really think best.[39]

The show was put off, first to November, then until early in 1929. Meanwhile, Lawrence had arranged for the publication of a book of reproductions of his pictures. From mid-January on, the paintings were in the hands of the printers, and unavailable for exhibition. Delays in reproduction postponed the date of publication, and consequently of exhibition, until late spring of 1929.

---

[37] Letter to D. Warren, in D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography, ed. Edward Nehls, 3 vols. (Madison, Wisconsin, 1959), III, 237.

[38] Letter to D. Warren, 10 Sept. 1928, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1088.

[39] Ibid.

The delays were partly the result of official harassment. During the winter, Lawrence was living in Bandol, France. In January he mailed to his agents in London manuscripts of his poems, Pansies, and of the introduction which he had written to the planned book of paintings. The postal authorities intercepted this material. "The essay on painting is my original manuscript," Lawrence wrote his agents. "I have no copy. . . . I can't have it lost."[40] It was soon released, although the authorities held on to the Pansies until February.

This was not the only problem. In February Lawrence wrote to Aldous Huxley, "The printers, terrified of Jix, are refusing to reproduce some of my pictures."[41] As the date of publication approached, fears of police action grew:

> I shouldn't be surprised if Stephensen [the publisher] suddenly issues the book this week or next. You see, since the great scare of Jix and suppression, all publishers are terrified of the police --lest they come in and confiscate the whole edition. That would be a terrible loss in the case of my books of pictures, as it has cost about £2000 to produce.[42]

The show at last opened on Friday, 14 June 1929; the book, The Paintings of D. H. Lawrence, appeared at the same time. Lawrence, in fragile health, could not travel to London for the opening. His wife Frieda went alone:

Lawrence wanted me to go to London to be there for the exhibition

---

[40] Letter to Curtis Brown, 24 Jan. 1929, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1119.

[41] Letter to Aldous Huxley, ? Feb. 1929, Letters, ed. Huxley, p. 788. "Jix" was the nickname for Sir William Joynson-Hicks, then Home Secretary; he was noted for his rigorous prosecution of literature which he considered obscene--e. g. Lady Chatterley.

[42] Letter to Ada Lawrence Clarke, 2 June 1929, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1160.

> of his paintings. A gay flag with his name was flying outside the Warren Gallery when I went there. His pictures looked a little wild and overwhelming in the elegant, delicate, rooms of the galleries. But never could I have dreamed that a few pictures could raise such a storm.[43]

The reviews were generally unfavourable, treating the paintings either as the work of a novelist straying from his proper medium, or as obscenities, or both. A very few critics praised the pictures. The first review of the exhibition to appear was that of Paul Konody, in The Observer, 16 June; he called the show "an outrage upon decency."[44] This first comment set the tone for all subsequent ones; it also put the popular press on the scent of a scandal. Led by the Daily Express, the newspapers mounted a campaign against the exhibition, demanding police action.

Lawrence, in transit from Mallorca to Italy, had little news from London and was unaware of the public reaction. On 24 June he wrote to Dorothy Warren, "I am glad the show is a success."[45]

In one way it was, for alerted by the sensational press coverage, between twelve and thirteen thousand people visited the exhibition in the three weeks it was scheduled to run. Most, however, came in search not of art but of scandal. Philip Trotter, husband of Dorothy Warren, noted, "The odious word obscene, with its phonetic quality of a furtive but penetrating whisper, was an auditory presence in the Gallery, dominating and constant."[46]

On the evening of 4 July, there was a party at the Gallery in

---

[43] "Not I, But the Wind . . .", pp. 198-199.

[44] Reprinted in part in Nehls, III, 336.

[45] Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1162.

[46] Solicited memoir printed in Nehls, III, 340.

honour of Frieda; the exhibition was to close on the sixth. However, on the afternoon of 5 July, the police raided the gallery, evidently acting on the complaint of a common informer.[47] They impounded thirteen of the twenty-five paintings, and four copies of the book of reproductions. During the raid, they also seized a book of pencil drawings of William Blake, but returned it before leaving the gallery, having learned, in the interim, the significance of Blake in English arts and letters. A French translation of The Hunting of the Snark was briefly suspect, until Dorothy Warren informed the police that it was a children's book, written by an English clergyman--Lewis Carroll. A portfolio of drawings by the German Expressionist artist, George Grosz, did not escape so easily; it was impounded along with the works of Lawrence.[48]

Throughout the proceedings, the gallery remained open to the public. Shortly after the raid began, the Aga Khan arrived in formal dress, having just come from the garden party at Buckingham Palace, "the other outstanding event of the 5th."[49] While he admired the paintings, the police interrupted their labours, and, at his request, displayed the works which they had already seized.[50]

The police selected all the pictures showing pubic hair, evidently the criterion by which they judged a work obscene. They also seized Leda, Lawrence's version of the Classical myth, perhaps interpreting the painting as a depiction of bestiality. As owners of the gallery, Dorothy Warren and Philip Trotter were charged under the Obscenities Act of 1857, and required

---

[47] Trotter, in Nehls, III, 348.

[48] Ibid., III, 345-347.

[49] Ibid., III, 345.

[50] Ibid.

to show cause why the impounded works should not be destroyed. A hearing was set for 8 August at the Marlborough Street police court.

Of twenty-five paintings, twelve remained on exhibit. Next morning the number dwindled to eleven when, nervous from the raid, the Trotters withdrew A Holy Family, fearing that viewers might find it sacrilegious.[51]

Harry T. Moore observes, "Apparently the seizure of the paintings in 1929 marked the first invocation of the [1857 Obscenities] Act in relation to an art gallery."[52] Shortly after the raid, Geoffrey Scott wrote, "The lawyers say that the action is entirely without precedent. The methods employed are those devised for the exculpation of the indecent postcard trade, and no such raid has previously been executed on the work of a serious man shown at a serious gallery."[53]

"Bit of a blow about the pictures," Lawrence wrote on 9 July.[54] Although he tried not to take the matter seriously, he found he could not work: "I am so infinitely bored by a world of crasses, I am neither writing nor painting."[55] To his friend Orioli he wrote, "At present I can do nothing: except write a few stinging Pansies which this time are Nettles.

---

[51] Trotter, in Nehls, III, 331.

[52] "D. H. Lawrence and the Censor-Morons," in Sex, Literature, and Censorship, by D. H. Lawrence, ed. Harry T. Moore (New York, 1953), p. 23.

[53] Letter from Geoffrey Scott to Arnold Bennett, 17 July 1929, in Nehls, III, 361. Scott was an author and a friend of the Trotters; he helped to muster support for Lawrence in the period following the raid--hence the letter to Bennett.

[54] Letter to Charles Lahr, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1163.

[55] Letter to John Cournos, 28 July 1929, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1170.

I shall call them nettles."[56] He added, "Let's hope they sting the arses of all the Meads and Persians of shiny London."[57] When, however, it appeared to him that the Trotters wished to make a stand on principle, risking the destruction of his paintings, he protested vigorously:

> The law, of course, must be altered--it is blatantly obvious. Why burn my pictures to prove it? There is something sacred to me about my pictures, and I will not have them burnt, for all the liberty of England. I am an Englishman, and I do my bit for the liberty of England. But I am most of all a man, and my first creed is that my manhood and my sincere utterance shall be inviolate and beyond nationality or any other limitation. To admit that my pictures should be burned, in order to change an English law, would be to admit that sacrifice of life to circumstance which I most strongly disbelieve in. No, at all costs or any cost, I don't want my pictures burnt. No more crucifixions, no more martyrdoms, no more autos da fe, as long as time lasts, if I can prevent it. Every crucifixion starts a most deadly chain of Karma, every martyr is a Laocoön snake to tangle up the human family. Away with such things.[58]

In the time between raid and hearing, the Trotters looked for support in their fight against the censors. Their task was complicated by the fact that Lawrence, in his introduction to the book of paintings, had ridiculed the ideas of prominent members of the London art world, among them Clive Bell and Roger Fry. Many people who would otherwise have been eager to help were alienated by these attacks, and demurred when asked for their support. However, Sir William Rothenstein, Principal of the Royal College of Art, lent his reputation to the cause.[59] Augustus John, Colin Agnew,

---

[56] Letter to Giuseppe Orioli, 2 August 1929, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1173.

[57] Letter to G. Orioli, 7 August 1929, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1174. Mead was the name of the magistrate who heard the painting case.

[58] Letter to D. Warren, 14 July 1929, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1164.

[59] Nehls, III, 725, n. 335.

Dr Tancred Borenius, Glyn Philpot, and Sir William Orpen agreed to testify for the defence.[60] A petition circulated, protesting the police raid; among those who signed were Lytton Strachey, Roger Fry, Leonard and Virginia Woolf, Clive and Vanessa Bell, Maynard Keynes, Jacob Epstein, Viscount Allenby, and Nancy Mitford.[61]

Meanwhile the exhibition remained open. Lawrence's sister Ada agreed to supply paintings which Lawrence had done in his youth, to fill the gaps left on the walls of the gallery by the raid. Accordingly, on 28 July, a showing of "More Paintings by D. H. Lawrence" opened at the Warren Gallery.[62] The exhibit continued until the gallery was closed for repairs in September.

The case at last came to a hearing on 8 August at the Marlborough Street police court. Presiding magistrate was Frederick Mead, eighty-two years old; prosecuting attorney was Herbert G. Muskett, who had successfully prosecuted The Rainbow in 1915.[63] The defence tried to establish the aesthetic value of the seized paintings, but Mr Mead was inclined to accept the assertion of the prosecution that they were obscene. "It is utterly immaterial whether they are works of art," he ruled. "That is a collateral question which I have not to decide. The most splendidly painted picture in the Universe might be obscene."[64]

Eventually a compromise was reached: the paintings were returned to the Trotters on condition that they not be exhibited. The four painting

---

[60] Trotter, in Nehls, III, 364.

[61] Ibid., III, 369.

[62] Ibid., III, 371.

[63] Ibid., III, 354.

[64] Ibid., III, 382-383.

books were destroyed, and the Trotters required to pay £5.5.0 costs.[65]

After the return of the paintings, it was discovered that one of them had been damaged while in police custody. Someone had carefully cut out the penis of the sleeping gardener in Boccaccio Story--a form of censorship which was certainly to the point.[66]

On 10 August Lawrence wrote, "I had telegrams to say: Pictures to be returned, books to be burned. Let them burn their own balls, the fools!"[67] He was enraged by the treatment he had received from his native land: "What hypocrisy and poltroonery, and how I detest and despise my England. I had rather be a German or anything than belong to such a nation of craven, cowardly hypocrites. My curse on them!"[68] He told Catherine Carswell, "The police-case business bores and disgusts me and makes me feel I never want to send another inch of work to England, either paint or pen."[69]

Aggravation from the affair weakened his precarious health: "I am very sick about it altogether, and a little weary of the outward world and all its messes."[70] To Brett he wrote, "The fuss over the pictures and the burning of the four books made me very sick--I am so weary of falseness and

---

[65] Trotter, in Nehls, III, 387. [66] Ibid., III, 351.

[67] Letter to Giuseppe Orioli, 10 August 1929, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1176.

[68] Letter to Dr Else Jaffe-Richthofen, 13 August 1929, "Not I, But the Wind . . .", p. 277.

[69] Letter to Catherine Carswell, 12 August 1929, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1177.

[70] Letter to Mrs Maria Cristina Chambers, 23 August 1929, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1184.

hypocrisy in the world."[71] He told his agents, "The thought of the Great British Public puts me off work entirely--either painting or writing. I cannot work for that G.B.P., I feel sick at the thought."[72] He poured his rage into the Nettles.

After several months, Lawrence recovered his serenity, but he did not go back to painting. "I don't paint a stroke--quite gone out of me," he wrote Brett.[73] "I've not touched a brush since we were in Spain [April to June, 1929]: have been very low."[74]

He was probably too weak to paint, for his health was now failing rapidly. On 2 March 1930, Lawrence died at Vence, in southern France.

After his death, the paintings were sent to Frieda in Vence. The Aga Khan had visited Lawrence in his last days, and had evidently suggested a Paris exhibition.[75] Now he offered to buy the paintings from Frieda, but they could not agree on a price. In 1931, the paintings were exhibited in Vence. Frieda brought them with her to New Mexico, but American customs allowed the pictures to enter the United States only on condition that they never be shown publicly.[76]

Thirteen of the twenty-five paintings in the original exhibit at

---

[71] Letter to Brett, 9 Sept. 1929, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1192.

[72] Letter to Laurence E. Pollinger, 29 Sept. 1929, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1203.

[73] Letter to Brett, 12 Dec. 1929, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1222.

[74] Letter to Brett, 8 Jan. 1930, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1231.

[75] See letter to E. Brewster, ?27 Feb. 1930, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1246.

[76] Warren Roberts, A Bibliography of D. H. Lawrence (London, 1963), pp. 111-112.

the Warren Gallery can no longer be located, among them A Holy Family, Boccaccio Story, Singing of Swans, Throwing Back the Apple, Finding of Moses, and Contadini.[77] North Sea, which Lawrence gave to Aldous and Maria Huxley, was "probably destroyed in the fire which devastated the writer's Californian home some years ago."[78]

Frieda kept many of the most important works. After she died, her third husband sold these paintings to Mr Saki Karavas, owner of the La Fonda Hotel in Taos. Until Mr Karavas finds someone willing to pay the fifteen thousand dollars which he is asking for each canvas, the paintings are on exhibit in his private office. Admission: one dollar.[79]

---

[77] According to Paintings of D. H. Lawrence (1964).

[78] Ibid., p. 103.

[79] Peter Collier, "The Man Who Died," Ramparts, VI (January 1968), 14.

CHAPTER TWO: THE THEORY BEHIND THE PAINTINGS

The pictures that, in 1926, rapidly began to cover the bare walls of the Villa Mirenda arose from a coherent theory of painting, which Lawrence expressed in various of his works. This theory in turn had its origin in Lawrence's theory of consciousness.

> Each thing, living or unliving, streams in its own odd, intertwining flux, and nothing, not even man nor the God of man, nor anything that man has thought or felt or known, is fixed or abiding. All moves. And nothing is true, or good, or right, except in its own living relatedness to its own circumambient universe: to the things that are in the stream with it.[1]

Lawrence recognized the relativity not only of matter but of consciousness itself. He realized that there are different modes of consciousness, and that the consciousness of man has evolved over the aeons.

Lawrence postulated two basic modes of consciousness: the spontaneous and the voluntary. The spontaneous consciousness

> takes rise . . . in the blood, in the corpuscles, somewhere very primitive and pre-nerve and pre-brain. Just as energy generates in the electron. . . . All the cells of our body are conscious. And all the time they give off a stream of consciousness which flows along the nerves and keeps us spontaneously alive. While the flow streams through us, from the blood to the heart, the bowels, the viscera, then along the sympathetic system of nerves into our spontaneous minds, making us breathe, and see, and move, and be aware, and <u>do</u> things spontaneously, while this flow streams as a flame streams ceaselessly, we are lit up, we glow, we live.[2]

The brain merely registers this consciousness.

The spontaneous or sympathetic consciousness Lawrence also called

---

[1] D. H. Lawrence, "Art and Morality," <u>Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence</u>, ed. Edward D. McDonald (London, 1936), p. 525.

[2] D. H. Lawrence, "Introduction to Pictures," <u>Phoenix</u>, p. 767.

man's "vital sanity,"[3] his soul, his intuitive, phallic, or blood consciousness. "We may negatively call it [the] unconscious. But it is a poor way of putting it."[4] This is the original state of consciousness, the "old Adam" from which the present state evolved.[5] It is integral, comprehensive, and therefore non-moral; for morality exists only by the exclusion of certain forms of behaviour, and the spontaneous consciousness excludes nothing.[6]

The basis of this form of consciousness is the organic principle of life. In the spontaneous state, man perceived the entire cosmos as alive, interrelated, and perceived himself above all in living connection with that cosmos: "All was alive; the whole universe lived; and the business of man was himself to live amid it all."[7]

Touch is the dominant sense in this state; hence Lawrence associated with the spontaneous consciousness shadow and darkness, for in the dark, knowledge is tactile rather than visual. He wrote,

> It must have been a wonderful world, that old world where everything appeared alive and shining in the dusk of contact with all things, not merely as an isolated individual thing played upon by daylight; where each thing . . . was related emotionally or vitally to strange other things, one thing springing from another.[8]

From this primal state emerged the voluntary consciousness, the "human spirit," the "self-aware-of-itself," self-consciousness, the ego, mental, cerebral.[9] It is our rational, analytic mind, "which we don't yet

---

[3] "Introduction to Pictures," p. 766. [4] Ibid., p. 767.

[5] Ibid., p. 768. [6] Ibid., p. 765.

[7] D. H. Lawrence, Etruscan Places (New York, 1957), p. 83.

[8] Ibid., pp. 112-113. [9] "Introduction to Pictures," pp. 766-767.

know how to handle."[10] In this state, the sense of sight is dominant; hence Lawrence associated with the voluntary consciousness the full light of day, by which vision is clearest.

The basis of this form of consciousness is the mechanical principle, which is contrary to life itself: "The profound attempt of man to harmonize himself with nature, and hold his own and come to flower in the great seething of life, changed . . . into a desire to resist nature, to produce a mental cunning and a mechanical force that would outwit Nature and chain her down."[11] Man now perceived himself as separate from the cosmos. Instead of a vast, living organism of which he was a part, the cosmos was to him simply material to bend to his will.

This view was the result of a form of consciousness that is partial rather than integral. The spontaneous consciousness is total and all-encompassing, but the voluntary consciousness is fragmentary, selective, and exclusive; consequently, it is also moral. In Christian terms, the emergence of the voluntary consciousness is the fall from innocence, into good and evil.[12]

"The moment the self-aware-of-itself comes into being," wrote Lawrence, "it begins egoistically to assert itself. It cuts immediately at the wholeness of the pristine consciousness, the old Adam, and wounds it."[13] The justification for the ego's asserting itself over the spontaneous consciousness is the idea that

the body, the pristine consciousness, the great sympathetic

---

[10] "Introduction to Pictures," p. 766.

[11] Etruscan Places, p. 123.

[12] "Introduction to Pictures," p. 768.

[13] Ibid., p. 769.

> life-flow, the steady flame of the old Adam is bad, and must be conquered. Every religion taught the conquest: science took up the battle, tooth and nail: culture fights in the same cause: and only art sometimes--or always--exhibits an internecine conflict and betrays its own battle-cry.[14]

The voluntary consciousness seeks to conquer not only the life of the external world, but also the inner life of man. Lawrence concluded, "We are the sad results of a four-thousand-year effort to break the Old Adam, to domesticate him utterly. He is to a large extent broken and domesticated."[15]

Thus the emergence of the ego from the spontaneous consciousness creates divisions within the psyche which inevitably lead to strife. Lawrence wrote, "There is a fundamental antagonism between the mental cognitive mode and the naïve or physical or sexual mode of consciousness."[16] He suggested that external conflicts are projections of this internal strife: "The external conflict of war, or of industrial competition, is only a reflection of the war that goes on inside each human being, the war of the self-conscious ego against the spontaneous old Adam."[17]

The necessity is to restrain the rampaging ego, to bring it under control, and to establish a balance with the intuitive consciousness, so as to regain the primal integrity.

One way to do so is by creativity, by use of the imagination. Lawrence wrote,

Any creative act occupies the whole consciousness of a man. This

---

[14] "Introduction to Pictures," p. 769. [15] Ibid., p. 770.

[16] Letter to Dr Trigant Burrow, 3 Aug. 1927, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 994.

[17] "Introduction to Pictures," p. 769.

> is true of the great discoveries of science as well as of art. The truly great discoveries of science and real works of art are made by the whole consciousness of man working together in unison and oneness: instinct, intuition, mind, intellect all fused into one complete consciousness, and grasping what we may call a complete truth, or a complete vision, a complete revelation in sound. A discovery, artistic or otherwise, may be more or less intuitional, more or less mental; but intuition will have entered into it, and mind will have entered too. The whole consciousness is concerned in every case.--And a painting requires the activity of the whole imagination, for it is made of imagery, and the imagination is that form of complete consciousness in which predominates the intuitive awareness of forms, images, the physical awareness.[18]

Again,

> The imagination is a kindled state of consciousness in which the intuitive awareness predominates. . . . The imagination is a more powerful and more comprehensive flow of consciousness than our ordinary flow. In the flow of the imagination we know in full, mentally and physically at once, in a greater, enkindled awareness. At the maximum of our imagination we are religious.[19]

The imaginative state, which Lawrence also called "visionary awareness,"[20] thus transcends the present division of the human psyche, and returns man to the state of primal wholeness. The works of the imagination have the same comprehensive nature; and in order to be appreciated, they require the audience also to adopt a comprehensive point of view: "The same applies to the genuine appreciation of a work of art, or the grasp of a scientific law, as to the production of the same. The whole consciousness is occupied, not merely the mind alone or merely the body."[21] As Lawrence saw it, imaginative art serves a high purpose: it is a way to achieve a new, primal unity, both for artist and audience.

This imaginative art, arising from the entire consciousness,

---

[18] D. H. Lawrence, "Introduction to these Paintings," Phoenix, p. 573.

[19] Ibid., p. 559.

[20] "Making Pictures," p. 202.

[21] "Introduction to these Paintings," pp. 573-574.

Lawrence considered the only valid form of art. He despised those who would turn art into an intellectual exercise, the product of the ego alone.

However, painting is a visual art--and the visual is that sense identified with the ego, the voluntary consciousness. Hence a history of painting is also largely a history of the growth of the voluntary consciousness in man.

Lawrence examined the relation of ego and eye in his essay "Art and Morality:"

> This is the habit we have formed: of visualizing <u>everything</u>. . . . This has been the development of the conscious ego in man, through several thousand years: since Greece first broke the spell of "darkness." Man has learnt to see himself. . . . Previously, even in Egypt, men had not learnt to see straight. . . . Like men in a dark room, they only felt their own existence surging in the darkness.[22]

Egyptian civilization dated from a time before the emergence of the ego. Its art was the creation of the spontaneous consciousness, and therefore tactile rather than visual in its impact. This tactile quality has survived in primitive African art. Lawrence wrote, "Egypt had a wonderful relation to a vast living universe, only dimly visual in its reality. The dim eye-vision and the powerful blood-feeling of the Negro African, even today, gives us strange images, which our eyes can hardly see, but which we know are surpassing."[23]

As the ego asserted itself over the spontaneous consciousness, the eye began to dominate the other senses, and vision became gradually more photographic. Man began to see as the Kodak sees, long before the Kodak was invented. Art came to be the production of the ego alone.

---

[22]"Art and Morality," p. 523. [23]<u>Ibid</u>., p. 525.

In ancient times, the change occurred first in Greece. The old Aegean civilization of Crete and Mycenae had been an outgrowth of Egypt; its art was of the same nature as Egyptian art. After 1000 B.C., this old civilization gradually gave way to a new, specifically Greek culture, that of the city states, the Periclean Age, of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, of Hellenism: the first culture of the voluntary consciousness.[24] From Greece the new form of consciousness spread to Rome, and thence throughout the ancient world. That Classical Greek and Roman art sought ever greater optical accuracy was evidence, to Lawrence, of the increasing role of the ego in the creation of that art.

The Etruscans interested Lawrence because he saw in their culture "a last strong wave from the Aegean,"[25] a persistence of the old form of consciousness: "It is as if the current of some strong different life swept through them, different from our shallow current to-day: as if they drew their vitality from different depths that we are denied."[26] Of the paintings he saw in the Etruscan tombs at Tarquinia, he wrote, "They really have the sense of touch; the people and the creatures are all really in touch. It is one of the rarest qualities, in life as well as in art."[27] Touch, of course, is that sense identified with the spontaneous consciousness. Rome, however, the civilization of the rational ego, destroyed this last survival of the primal consciousness. For centuries the Classical ideal of art remained unchallenged.

---

[24] D. H. Lawrence, Apocalypse (New York, 1966), pp. 73-76.

[25] Ibid., p. 75.

[26] Etruscan Places, p. 82.

[27] Ibid., p. 78.

Although Lawrence spoke of "that early, glad sort of Christian art, the free touch of Gothic,"[28] he was too much the devil's advocate to approve of the Christian art of the post-classical, medieval period, with its ascetic tendencies. The very name "Dark Ages," however, must have suggested to him a partial eclipse of the ego.

The Renaissance marked the re-emergence of the rational, voluntary consciousness. Lawrence admired painters of the early Renaissance, who had rediscovered the beauty of the physical reality. To him it was no surprise that this new kind of art had originated in Tuscany: "Giotto and the early sculptors seem to have been a flowering again of the Etruscan blood."[29] But the reborn rational consciousness soon turned art into an intellectual exercise: "In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries we have the deliberate denial of intuitive awareness, and we see the results on the arts. Vision became more optical, less intuitive, and painting began to flourish. But what painting!"[30] He liked Rembrandt and Velasquez, but dismissed Hogarth, Gainsborough, and Reynolds, the foremost English artists of the eighteenth century, as painters of clothes rather than of men.[31] With the significant exception of William Blake, Lawrence judged, "The English have never painted from intuition or instinct."[32] In all European art since the Renaissance, he saw a trend, still unchecked, toward painting from the rational ego alone. Even the Impressionists, many of whom Lawrence appreciated, had engaged in a quest for pure light, the light of the ego,

---

[28] Etruscan Places, p. 180.

[29] Ibid., p. 122.

[30] "Introduction to these Paintings," p. 559.

[31] Ibid., p. 560.

[32] MS reproduced in "Not I, But the Wind . . .", p. 192.

leaving intuitive consciousness behind.[33]

One man stood against this trend--Cézanne:

> He wanted to touch the world of substance once more with the intuitive touch, to be aware of it with the intuitive awareness, and to express it in intuitive terms. That is, he wished to displace our present mode of mental-visual consciousness, the consciousness of mental concepts, and substitute a mode of consciousness that was predominantly intuitive, the awareness of touch.[34]

Lawrence wrote, "It was a revolution Cézanne began, but which nobody, apparently, has been able to carry on."[35] For other artists emulated the style and technique of Cézanne, but none painted with his intuitive awareness.

In his own time, Lawrence saw the triumph of painting of the ego. "These modern artists," he said, "who make art out of antipathy to life, always leave me feeling a little sick. It is as if they used all their skill and their effort to dress up a skeleton."[36] The Cubists and Futurists had interested him, but mainly as exponents of a vision against which he defined his own position: "The one thing about their art is that it isn't art, but ultra scientific attempts to make diagrams of certain physic or mental states."[37] He rejected the Futurist exaltation of the mechanical principle, which he associated with the rational consciousness, above organic, human life: "Instead of looking for the new human phenomenon, they will only look for the phenomena of the science of physics to be

---

[33] "Introduction to these Paintings," p. 563. [34] Ibid., p. 578.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Letter to A. Brewster, 19 June 1927, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 959.

[37] Letter to A. W. McLeod, 2 June 1914, Letters, ed. Moore, I, 280.

found in human beings."[38]

"It is an Absolute we are all after, a statement of the whole scheme," wrote Lawrence.[39] The Cubists sought to represent the whole by montage, by analyzing an object into its component parts, and reassembling them in a new and startling way. Lawrence disagreed with this technique: "In a geometric figure one has the abstractions ready stated △ so, or ○ so. But one cannot build a complete abstraction, or absolute, out of a number of small abstractions, or absolutes. Therefore one cannot make a picture out of geometric figures."[40] An artist cannot create wholeness using the techniques of the analytical, voluntary consciousness, which is itself partial.

"The modern theories of art," Lawrence concluded, "make real pictures impossible. You only get these expositions, critical ventures in paint, and fantastic negations."[41] To Alfred Stieglitz he wrote,

> Most moderns . . . are all excellent rind of the fruit, but no fruit. . . . There's the greatest lot of bunk talked about modern painting ever. If a picture is to hit deep into the senses, which is its business, it must hit down to the soul and up into the mind --that is, it has to mean something to the co-ordinating soul and the co-ordinating spirit which are central in man's consciousness: and the meaning has to come through direct sense impression.[42]

Unfortunately, few pictures implicate the entire consciousness in this way: "So many artists accomplish canvases without coming within miles of painting

---

[38] Letter to Edward Garnett, 5 June 1914, Letters, ed. Moore, I, 282.

[39] Letter to Lady Ottoline Morrell, 27 January 1915, Letters, ed. Moore, I, 308.

[40] Ibid.

[41] "Making Pictures," pp. 197-198.

[42] Letter to Alfred Stieglitz, 15 August 1928, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1076-77.

a picture."[43]

Lawrence decided, "I'm afraid I am more modern even than these artistic anarchists."[44] As to whether he could paint, he replied, "Perhaps I can't. But I verily believe I can make pictures."[45] He asserted, "I'm not so conceited as to think that my marvellous ego and unparalleled technique will make a picture. I like a picture to be a picture to the whole sensual self."[46] Of his own paintings he wrote, "They are quite simple, with no tricks: but I consider they are, what very few pictures are, organically alive and whole. All the modern smartness only succeeds in putting pictures together, it practically never makes a picture live as a whole thing."[47] He advised other artists, "Theorise, theorise all you like--but when you start to paint, shut your theoretic eyes and go for it with instinct and intuition."[48]

Living, organic unity--this above all Lawrence demanded of a work of art. "A picture lives with the life you put into it," he said.[49] He recognized the limitations of his paintings: "I know they're rolling with faults, Sladeily considered. But there's something there"[50]--a vital integrity which Lawrence felt outweighed technical deficiencies. He

---

[43] "Making Pictures," p. 199.

[44] Letter to A. Brewster, 19 June 1927, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 959.

[45] "Making Pictures," p. 199.

[46] Letter to E. Brewster, 6 Feb. 1927, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 964.

[47] Letter to D. Warren, 4 July 1928, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1066.

[48] "Making Pictures," p. 198.

[49] Ibid., p. 200.

[50] Letter to Mark Gertler, 24 May 1928, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1062.

declared, "If my pictures aren't ten times better than Roger Fry's, then he's welcome to try them to his heart's content. My pictures are alive--and the little whipper-snappers will hate them for it."[51]

The emergence of the ego had destroyed the primal unity by breaking the connections between man and the universe. The task of the artist, Lawrence wrote, is to restore these connections, "to reveal the relation between man and his circumambient universe, at the living moment."[52] He spoke of his paintings to Brewster Ghiselin, a young American who visited Lawrence in Bandol, early in 1929:

> He himself was trying to find some expression in paint for the relations of things, he told me, perhaps by means of the touching and mingling of colours flowing from different things: as the colour of the background, for example, approached any body it would diminish and take some of the colour and quality of that body.[53]

By interrelating all the elements of a picture, the painter, in his art, creates again the primal wholeness.

Men commonly assume that photographic vision is somehow "correct," the objective reality, and that any deviation from it is wrong. Lawrence attacked this assumption: "You may say, the object reflected on the retina is always photographic. It may be. I doubt it. But whatever the image on the retina may be, it is rarely, even now, the photographic image of the object which is actually taken in by the man who sees the object."[54] Again, "A man who sees, sees not as a camera does when it takes a snapshot, not

---

[51] Letter to S. S. Koteliansky, 15 Sept. 1928, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1092.

[52] "Morality and the Novel," D. H. Lawrence: Selected Literary Criticism, ed. Anthony Beal (New York, 1966), p. 108.

[53] Nehls, III, 295.

[54] "Art and Morality," p. 522.

even as a cinema-camera, taking its succession of instantaneous snaps, but in a curious rolling flood of vision, in which the image itself seethes and rolls; and only the mind picks out certain factors which shall represent the image seen."[55]

There is no one correct vision, since vision is itself relative, and varies as the state of consciousness varies. In the rational, voluntary state of consciousness, vision is optical, photographic. In the spontaneous state, vision is intuitive. In both states, man sees not the objective reality but a representation of it. Vision, whether optical or intuitive, is always symbolic. Therefore all painting, even representational painting, is of necessity symbolic.

The painter of imaginative art uses intuitive vision. Lawrence wrote, "The picture must all come out of the artist's inside, awareness of forms and figures. We can call it memory, but it is more than memory. It is the image as it lives in the consciousness, alive like a vision, but unknown."[56] Lawrence sought the intuitive perception of the wholeness of an object, rather than analytic manufacture of the effect of wholeness. He demanded not photographic fidelity, but fidelity to the inner vision, for it is the only source of living art.

Hence Lawrence disapproved of painting from external models. "It always spoils the picture," he wrote. "I can only use a model when the picture is already made; then I can look at the model to get some detail which the vision failed me with, or to modify something which I feel is unsatisfactory and I don't know why. Then a model may give a suggestion.

---

[55] Etruscan Places, p. 119.

[56] "Making Pictures," pp. 205-206.

But at the beginning, a model only spoils the picture."[57]

The proper subject for a living, organic art is the highest form of life: man. Lawrence wrote, "Landscape seems to be meant as a background to an intenser vision of life, so to my feeling painting landscape is background with the real subject left out."[58] However, Lawrence was not interested in portraiture, which is mere flattery of the ego; nor did he care to paint man in his clothing of fallen morality. He wished to show the primal man, unfallen, amoral, integral; therefore he painted nudes.

His preferred medium was oils. "Water-colour," he wrote, "will always be more of a statement than an experience"[59]--that is, confined to the plane of the rational ego. Oils, however, are broader in scope: "One can use one's elbow, and in water it's all dib-dab."[60]

Finally, if the primary quality of a picture is life, then like all living things, it will one day die. Lawrence wrote, "Pictures are like flowers, that fade away sooner or later, and die, and must be thrown in the dustbin and burnt. . . . The value of a picture lies in the aesthetic emotion it brings, exactly as if it were a flower. The aesthetic emotion dead, the picture is a piece of ugly litter."[61]

Viewed in this way, a picture can no more be possessed than a flower, or a Lawrence novel. In each case, one can own the material element, but not the thing itself. And since, being alive, a picture will

---

[57] "Making Pictures," p. 205.

[58] "Introduction to these Paintings," p. 561. [59] Ibid.

[60] Letter to Maria Huxley, ? March 1928, Letters, ed. Huxley, p. 715.

[61] "Pictures on the Walls," Assorted Articles, pp. 213-215.

one day die, leaving a mere corpse, it makes a rather poor investment--which is just the way Lawrence wanted it. "If only we could get rid of the idea of 'property' in the arts!" he cried.[62]

When Lawrence sat down to paint, his method of procedure was, of course, idiosyncratic, but faithful to these general ideas of art:

> I sat on the floor with the canvas propped against a chair--and with my house-paint brushes and colours in little casseroles, I disappeared into that canvas. It is to me the most exciting moment--when you have a blank canvas and a big brush full of wet colour, and you plunge. It is just like diving in a pond--then you start frantically to swim. . . . The knowing eye watches sharp as a needle; but the picture comes clean out of instinct, intuition and sheer physical action. Once the instinct and intuition gets into the brush-tip, the picture <u>happens</u>, if it is to be a picture at all.
>
> At least, so my first picture happened--the one I have called "A Holy Family." In a couple of hours there it all was, man, woman, child, blue shirt, red shawl, pale room--all in the rough, but, as far as I am concerned, a picture. The struggling comes later. But the picture itself comes in the first rush, or not at all. It is only when the picture has come into being that one can struggle and make it <u>grow</u> to completion.[63]

Frieda commented on the tendency of Lawrence to paint with his fingers.[64] Brett also noted this habit,[65] and Earl Brewster wrote of Lawrence's pictures, "I liked their colour, values, and design. He referred often to their tactile qualities. Instead of a brush he frequently painted with his thumb."[66]

This was probably not mere habit. Touch is the sense which Lawrence associated with the intuitive consciousness. He most admired

---

[62] "Pictures on the Walls," p. 213.

[63] "Making Pictures," pp. 196-197.

[64] See above, p. 5.

[65] See, e. g. Brett, pp. 252-255.

[66] Brewster, p. 112.

painters who had achieved a tactile quality in their works.[67] He preferred using his fingers to a brush perhaps to insure that the picture came not from the ego, but from the intuitive consciousness.

Nor was this the only idiosyncrasy of Lawrence the painter. He wrote to Brewster,

> I stick to what I told you, and put a phallus, a lingam you call it, in each one of my pictures somewhere. And I paint no picture that won't shock people's castrated social spirituality. I do this out of positive belief, that the phallus is a great sacred image: it represents a deep, deep life which has been denied in us, and still is denied.[68]

For Lawrence, the phallus was a symbol not merely of sexuality but of an entire form of consciousness, the intuitive, spontaneous consciousness. From this consciousness emerged the paintings of Lawrence.

---

[67] See above, pp. 23-26.

[68] Letter to E. Brewster, 27 Feb. 1927, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 967.

CHAPTER THREE: THE PAINTINGS

"To me," wrote Lawrence, "a picture has delight in it, or it isn't a picture."[1] The paintings which he created are imbued with a delight in life itself, in all its forms.

A Holy Family,[2] his first picture, contains many of the themes which were to occupy Lawrence in later works. In this canvas, Lawrence took a traditional Biblical subject and adapted it to his own ideas. "I call it the 'Unholy Family,'" he told the Huxleys, "because the bambino--with a nimbus--is just watching anxiously to see the young man give the semi-nude young woman un gros baiser. Molto moderno!"[3]

Conventional treatments of the subject are spiritual in tone, focussed on the child and mother, while Joseph lurks in the background. Lawrence transformed this arrangement. The centre of his picture is Joseph. He wears the colour blue, traditionally associated with Mary. Both the child and Mary look to him, while he stares confidently ahead. The paramount relationship in this family is not that of mother and child, nor even that of father and child, but that of man and wife.

It is hardly a spiritual scene. Joseph is swarthy, virile, full of power. Mary is as blonde as he is dark. Nude to the waist, she presses the hand of her husband to her breast; she is no Virgin Mother. A bowl of porridge on the table, and an open cupboard full of crockery, to the left,

---

[1] "Making Pictures," p. 206.

[2] Paintings of D. H. Lawrence (1964), Pl. 12, p. 89.

[3] Letter to Maria and Aldous Huxley, 11 November 1926, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 945.

establish a homely air. Through a round window above the head of the child, a distant tower looms; but it could also be a phallus in a halo.[4] The swelling curves of the composition heighten the effect of sensuality.

Lawrence, in this first painting, was perhaps looking back to The Plumed Serpent, his last novel. In that book, the cult of the Virgin Mother and her dead, bodiless son gives way to the worship of a living god, male, potent, who wears

> That he's stole from the Mother of God.[5]
> the sky-blue cloak

In the static pose of the figures, in the haloes, above all in its air of dormant power, A Holy Family resembles an icon of the new religion.

In his first picture, then, Lawrence turned to the Bible for his subject, but his treatment inverted religious and artistic tradition. He gave first importance to the relation of man and woman, depicting the man as dark, the woman as light. He asserted the primacy of the male. Lastly, he stressed the physical, sensual aspect of the subject. A Holy Family celebrates life in the flesh, rejoices in the phallic, spontaneous consciousness. This joy is, at bottom, religious.

All these elements reappear in later paintings of Lawrence.

The power of the male is represented indirectly in A Holy Family, by symbol. In Boccaccio Story,[6] Lawrence's next work, its representation is graphic and unblushing. This picture illustrates a tale from the

---

[4] Dorothy Warren and her husband thought the latter. It was this feature, specifically, which caused them to remove the picture from exhibition. See Trotter, in Nehls, III, 330-331, and above, p. 12.

[5] D. H. Lawrence, The Plumed Serpent (New York, 1926), p. 294.

[6] Paintings (1964), Pl. 14, p. 91.

Decameron: Masetto da Lamporecchio, a poor young man, pretends to be a deaf-mute, and thereby secures the post of gardener in a convent. Attracted by his beauty, and emboldened by his seeming inability to gossip, the nine sisters, who are all young, one by one invite him to initiate them into the pleasures of the body. Masetto gladly complies, but soon finds that he has more work than he can handle. At last he begs the abbess for respite, breaking his long silence. To keep their secret and their lover, the nuns make him steward of the convent, giving out that a miracle restored his speech; and they arrange a less taxing schedule of labours for him. Masetto lives happily with the sisters, returning in old age to his village, a rich man and the father of many clerics.[7]

Lawrence was not strictly faithful to his source. In the story, the abbess, last to discover the talents of Masetto, wanders alone in the garden one day. She comes upon the sleeping workman, worn out from his labours. The wind has disarranged his clothes, exposing the front of his body; this sight arouses the desire of the abbess, and she follows where her sisters led.[8] In the painting, all the nuns together discover the nude gardener; obviously he has not yet initiated any of them. Lawrence thus compressed the story into one dramatic incident: a confrontation of the virgin nuns and the virile gardener.

While the thirteen seized pictures were still in police custody, Philip Trotter received permission to show them to Colin Agnew, the London art dealer and connoisseur. The two men were led to a prison cell, where

---

[7] Giovanni Boccaccio, The Decameron, Third Day, First Story, tr. J. M. Rigg, intr. Edward Hutton, 2 vols. (London, 1930), I, 155-161.

[8] Ibid., I, 160.

one constable displayed the canvases, while others stood guard. Agnew admired the paintings, particularly Boccaccio Story. Trotter quotes his comments: "'All the different elements in the scene have subtly converging lines, which is what gives the composition its harmony; and the point of convergence is this dark mark here'--and he put his forefinger on the part of the gardener that had caused the picture to be seized."[9]

Agnew spoke to shock the authorities, but his comments are apt nonetheless. The lines of the furrows, of the folds in the nuns' skirts, of the gardener's sharply foreshortened thighs and torso, all draw the eye to the phallus, just as the eyes of the nuns are drawn there. This is the centre of the picture, both graphically and symbolically. The other elements carefully frame this focal point.

Boccaccio Story shows the confrontation between the pale virgins and the dark, virile gardener, between female and male. On one side are the nuns, innocent in their virginity and in their obedience to a moral code. On the other side are the man and the phallus, knowing no moral laws, not even that nudity is shameful or wrong. This is another kind of innocence, a primal innocence which does not exclude experience.

In a poem from the collection "More Pansies," Lawrence wrote,

> When men and women, when lads and girls are not thinking,
> when they are pure, which means when they are quite clean from self-consciousness
> either in anger or tenderness, or desire or sadness or wonder or mere stillness
> you may see glimpses of the gods in them.[10]

---

[9] Trotter, in Nehls, III, 350-351.

[10] "All Sorts of Gods," ll. 11-14. The text is that of The Complete Poems of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Vivian de Sola Pinto and Warren Roberts, 2 vols. (New York, 1964), II, 672. Subsequent references to the poetry of Lawrence will be to this edition.

The nuns are brides of Christ, the anti-sexual god of the spirit, yet they are strangely drawn to the sleeping gardener; for in him is a glimpse of another god, a god of the flesh, offering union in the flesh. Perhaps it is Priapus, who is also a gardener. Hence Boccaccio Story shows a confrontation between two gods, two modes of consciousness.

But there is no strife in the meeting--rather, humour. The phallus, focus of all the attention, is completely quiescent, and looks innocent, not at all evil; the painting thus centres on an anticlimax. The bright, soft colours of the picture add to the gay, light mood. Like the Decameron, Lawrence's painting is detached, impartial, showing both sides; and the outcome of the confrontation hangs deliciously in the balance.

Lady Chatterley contains an episode similar to the subject of this painting. Early in the novel, Connie goes to the house of the gamekeeper with a message about some work. She comes upon Mellors washing himself in the yard. He does not notice the intrusion, and Connie quickly backs away. Lawrence continues:

> Yet in some curious way it was a visionary experience: it had hit her in the middle of the body. She saw the clumsy breeches slipping down over the pure, delicate, white loins, the bones showing a little, and the sense of aloneness, of a creature purely alone, overwhelmed her. Perfect, white, solitary nudity of a creature that lives alone, and inwardly alone. And beyond that, a certain beauty of a pure creature. Not the stuff of beauty, not even the body of beauty, but a lambency, the warm, white flame of a single life, revealing itself in contours that one might touch: a body!
>
> Connie had received the shock of vision in her womb.[11]

The incident in the novel differs from Boccaccio Story in mood and other particulars; but the shock which passes from Mellors to Connie is the same

---

[11] D. H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover (New York, 1959), p. 62.

The nuns are brides of Christ, the anti-sexual god of the spirit, yet they are strangely drawn to the sleeping gardener; for in him is a glimpse of another god, a god of the flesh, offering union in the flesh. Perhaps it is Priapus, who is also a gardener. Hence Boccaccio Story shows a confrontation between two gods, two modes of consciousness.

But there is no strife in the meeting--rather, humour. The phallus, focus of all the attention, is completely quiescent, and looks innocent, not at all evil; the painting thus centres on an anticlimax. The bright, soft colours of the picture add to the gay, light mood. Like the Decameron, Lawrence's painting is detached, impartial, showing both sides; and the outcome of the confrontation hangs deliciously in the balance.

Lady Chatterley contains an episode similar to the subject of this painting. Early in the novel, Connie goes to the house of the gamekeeper with a message about some work. She comes upon Mellors washing himself in the yard. He does not notice the intrusion, and Connie quickly backs away. Lawrence continues:

> Yet in some curious way it was a visionary experience: it had hit her in the middle of the body. She saw the clumsy breeches slipping down over the pure, delicate, white loins, the bones showing a little, and the sense of aloneness, of a creature purely alone, overwhelmed her. Perfect, white, solitary nudity of a creature that lives alone, and inwardly alone. And beyond that, a certain beauty of a pure creature. Not the stuff of beauty, not even the body of beauty, but a lambency, the warm, white flame of a single life, revealing itself in contours that one might touch: a body!
>
> Connie had received the shock of vision in her womb.[11]

The incident in the novel differs from Boccaccio Story in mood and other particulars; but the shock which passes from Mellors to Connie is the same

---

[11] D. H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover (New York, 1959), p. 62.

as that which passes from the gardener to the nuns. It is the recognition of a male in his power, of a god, of phallic, spontaneous life.

In Boccaccio Story, male and female meet in a gentle truce; in Fight with an Amazon,[12] they meet in full battle. Herbert Read noted the resemblance of this work to Greiffenhagen's Idyll, a painting which had fascinated Lawrence in his youth.[13] The pose of the figures in Amazon is nearly identical to that in the Idyll, but reversed, in a mirror image. Similarly, the style of Amazon is the reverse of that of the Idyll. Where the earlier work is sentimental, coy, simperingly suggestive, Amazon is brutally explicit, without any sentimentality. The dark limbs of the man interweave with the light flesh of the woman, in a frankly erotic pattern. The undertone of violence is manifest in the snapping wolves. Twenty-odd years separate the two paintings; they record the transformation which the art of Lawrence underwent in that time. Yet for all the changes, the central vision remains constant: the conjunction of male and female.

Lawrence painted Red Willow Trees[14] about a month after finishing Boccaccio.[15] A minor element in the earlier picture is the line of trees in the background; these form the main subject of Red Willows. The trees have dark, slim trunks which burst into a profusion of red above, suggesting the phallus, source of life and creativity. The three male nudes echo the shape of the trees, and the figure on the left completes the structure of the largest willow; for the men possess the vital power symbolized by the

---

[12] Paintings (1964), Pl. 15, p. 91.

[13] Herbert Read, "Lawrence as a Painter," ibid., p. 63. See also Lawrence's copy of the Idyll, Pl. 9, p. 87.

[14] Paintings (1964), Pl. VII, p. 37.

[15] See Appendix A, p. 77.

trees.

In Fire Dance,[16] Lawrence used another symbol for this same male power. The torches which the two men brandish, and the fire which is the centre of their dance, again signify the phallus. The colours are lurid, the men harshly drawn, like flames. The dance is reminiscent of the dance of the Men of Quetzalcoatl, in The Plumed Serpent.[17]

Both Fire Dance and the flame-like Red Willows suggest the poem "Spiral Flame," one of the Pansies:

> there is a spiral flame-tip that can lick our little atoms into fusion
> so we roar up like bonfires of vitality
> and fuse in a broad hard flame of many men in a oneness.
>
> O pillars of flame by night, O my young men
> spinning and dancing like flamey fire-spouts in the dark ahead of the multitude!
> O ruddy god in our veins, O fiery god in our genitals![18]

Both paintings celebrate the connection between men, united in the phallic power of life.

Contadini[19] is perhaps the only picture which Lawrence painted from a model, the man being "Pietro Pini of the Villa Mirenda area."[20] Consequently, the work comes closer to portraiture than any other painting of Lawrence; but it achieves its effect as much from the torso as from the face, which is in shadow. The modelling is bold and sure: large, flat strokes, sharp contrasts of light and dark, as if the man sits in powerful

---

[16] Paintings (1964), Pl. 11, p. 89.

[17] See pp. 139-140.

[18] Complete Poems, II, 440, ll. 23-28.

[19] Paintings (1964), Pl. 28, p. 101.

[20] Harry T. Moore, "D. H. Lawrence and his Paintings," Paintings (1964), p. 33.

sunlight. The entire picture exudes a sense of power--again, that of the male, the phallus. In Red Willows and Fire Dance, Lawrence used symbolism to represent this power; in Contadini he used the technique of realism.

Accident in a Mine[21] shows not the power of men, but their powerlessness. This is a sombrely realistic painting, even in the nudity of the men. "You know the miners work in some mines naked," Lawrence told the Brewsters when he showed them the canvas.[22] But in the actuality are far-reaching implications.

A constant theme in the writings of Lawrence is the underworld. Modern civilization, he felt, kills the real life of men by enclosing them in a tomb physical, social, and psychic: physical, in the material apparatus of industrialism, rapidly destroying the natural world; social, in the distortions placed on society by the new technologies; and psychic in the modern limited form of consciousness. Accident in a Mine depicts this underworld, literally and figuratively at the same time. In the painting, ghostly figures hover about a dead body. Green, corpse-like highlights relieve the shadowy brown gloom. This is a realistic picture of an industrial accident; but it is also the calamity of contemporary life.

The escape from this underworld is the common theme of Lawrence's most ambitious pictures: Flight Back into Paradise, Resurrection, and Throwing Back the Apple.

While working on Flight Back into Paradise,[23] Lawrence wrote to Brett, "I'm just finishing a nice big canvas, Eve dodging back into

---

[21] Paintings (1964), Pl. 29, p. 102. [22] Brewster, p. 289.

[23] Paintings (1964), Pl. IX, p. 45.

Paradise, between Adam and the Angel at the gate, who are having a fight about it--and leaving the world in flames in the far corner behind her. Great fun, and of course a capo lavoro!"[24]

The painting captures a moment of stasis in the midst of strife. Eve creeps painfully forward, bound by shackles to industrial civilization, which here is represented by a colliery, with its smokestacks. Above her head hangs the fiery sword, showering sparks, but Adam holds it back as he wrestles with the guardian angel. The colours and drawing are harsh, jarring, adding to the tension of the scene.

Philip Trotter noted a connection between this picture and the poem "Paradise Re-entered," in Look! We Have Come Through![25] The poem describes a purification through physical love:

> . . . we storm the angel-guarded
> Gates of the long-discarded
> Garden, which God has hoarded
> Against our pain.
>
> Back beyond good and evil
> Return we. Even dishevel
> Your hair for the bliss-drenched revel
> On our primal loam.[26]

The painting also suggests the "Excurse" chapter of Women in Love, in which Ursula, through union with Birkin, enters "a strange element, a new heaven round about her."[27]

Both poem and passage from the novel have an autobiographical

---

[24] Letter to Brett, 9 Feb. 1927, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 965.

[25] See Trotter, in Nehls, III, 332.

[26] Complete Poems, I, 243, ll. 33-36, 41-44.

[27] D. H. Lawrence, Women in Love (New York, 1960), p. 303.

basis; this element appears in the painting as well. Harry T. Moore points out that it contains portraits of Lawrence, as Adam, and of his wife Frieda.[28]

In Flight Back into Paradise, the woman escapes from the dead world of the ego. The man achieves his liberation in Resurrection.[29]

Lawrence wrote in the Pansies,

> Shall I tell you the new word,
> the new word of the unborn day?
> It is Resurrection.
> The resurrection of the flesh.[30]

Like Flight Back into Paradise, Resurrection depicts a moment of stasis in the midst of tension and strain. Lawrence described the picture in a letter to Earl Brewster: "It's Jesus stepping up, rather grey in the face, from the tomb, with his old ma helping him from behind, and Mary Magdalen easing him up towards her bosom in front."[31]

Resurrection bears a close relation to the story on the same theme, The Man Who Died. Evidently, Lawrence tried to work the subject in paint first, with little success. He put aside the canvas, wrote the story, and then, immediately following, was able to complete the picture.[32] In the story,

Jesus gets up and feels very sick about everything, and can't

---

[28] "D. H. Lawrence and his Paintings," Paintings (1964), p. 33.

[29] Paintings (1964), Pl. VI, p. 31.

[30] "The New Word," ll. 1-4, Complete Poems, I, 513.

[31] Letter to E. Brewster, 28 May 1927, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 981.

[32] See letter to Brett, 8 March 1927, and letters to Brewster, 3 and 13 May 1927, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 969, 975, & 976. See also letter mentioned above, n. 31.

> stand the old crowd any more--so he cuts out--and as he heals up, he begins to find what an astonishing place the phenomenal world is, far more marvellous than any salvation or heaven--and thanks his stars he needn't have a 'mission' any more.[33]

From his anti-sexual gospel of the disembodied spirit, Christ turns to physical union with a woman, the priestess of Isis. In the painting, no new element is introduced into the Bible story: Christ rises from the tomb between his mother and Magdalen. But his back is to Mary, and he moves toward Magdalen--perhaps because he rejects the old life from which he has just emerged, his old relationship with woman, in favour of a sexual union, a sexual partner.

It is the autobiographical element which gives the picture its extraordinary impact. "Resurrection, indeed, seems to be a struggle between Frieda and Mabel Luhan for the risen prophet," Harry T. Moore comments.[34] This is conjecture, but the Christ of the painting is undoubtedly a self-portrait. In the Pansies, Lawrence wrote,

> A sun will rise in me,
> I shall slowly resurrect.[35]

Like Christ in The Man Who Died and Resurrection, Lawrence in his last years entered a more balanced, more comprehensive state of consciousness. But Resurrection is not only a symbolic painting of the emergence from the tomb of the ego, the voluntary consciousness; it functions on a literal plane as well. In this picture, Lawrence painted the resurrection of the body, the foiling of death. Herein lies the poignancy of the self-portrait. Jesus

---

[33] Letter to E. Brewster, 3 May 1927, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 975.

[34] "D. H. Lawrence and his Paintings," Paintings (1964), p. 33.

[35] "Sun in Me," ll. 1 & 2, Complete Poems, I, 513.

looks pitifully frail and emaciated, a faithful record of Lawrence in the last years of his life. In Resurrection even more than in The Man Who Died, Lawrence comes closest to acknowledging his fatal illness, and reveals his hope of somehow overcoming it.

Adam and Eve had fallen into the world of the ego when they tasted the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge. Now, having returned to the paradisal state, Christ, the second Adam, and his Eve repudiate the cause of their fall in Throwing Back the Apple,[36] a rough, powerful water colour. The fruit has fallen from the tree, and now lies rotting beneath it. Adam stands in the foreground, back turned, a potent, nude figure. Eve, crouching, offers him an apple, in the ancient gesture--but for a purpose other than eating; for Adam is tossing the rotten fruit of knowledge at Jehovah, the old moral god of the ego, with his long, white, beard, who dodges the shots in the background. The painting thus resembles closely the traditional scene of the temptation of Adam, but is a direct inversion of that scene; hence its force and its humourous quality.

While still working on Flight Back into Paradise, Lawrence wrote,

> I should like to do a middle picture, inside Paradise, just as she [Eve] bolts in. God Almighty astonished and indignant, and the new young God, who is just having a chat with the serpent, pleasantly amused, then the third picture, Adam and Eve under the tree of knowledge, God Almighty disappearing in a dudgeon, and the animals skipping. Probably I shall never get them done. If I say I'll do a thing, I never do it. But I'll try. . . . The triptych![37]

Lawrence did not follow his plan, yet he did complete the triptych, for Flight Back into Paradise, Resurrection, and Throwing Back the Apple form

---

[36] Paintings (1964), Pl. 26, p. 99.

[37] Letter to Brett, 9 Feb. 1927, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 965.

an imaginative whole. In these paintings, Lawrence used the Christian myths of Fall and Resurrection to embody his own vision. In so doing, he inverted the traditional interpretation of the myths, for his views were diametrically opposite to those of the orthodoxy. He defended his position in a letter to his sister-in-law Else:

> Lucifer is brighter now than tarnished Michael or shabby Gabriel. All things fall in their turn, now Michael goes down, and whispering Gabriel, and the Son of the Morning will laugh at them all. Yes, I am all for Lucifer, who is really the Morning Star. The real principle of Evil is not anti-Christ or anti-Jehovah, but anti-life. I agree with you in a sense, that I am with the anti-Christ. Only I am not anti-life.[38]

In this triptych, man and woman each achieve liberation only with the help of the other. Eve can enter Paradise only because Adam holds back the fiery sword; similarly, Christ rises from the grave not by himself, but rather supported by Magdalen and Mary. It is only in the conjunction of man and woman that either can transcend the fallen state. "Church doctrine teaches the resurrection of the body," Lawrence wrote in defence of The Man Who Died, "and if that doesn't mean the whole man, what does it mean? And if man is whole without a woman then I'm damned."[39] More explicitly, he wrote,

> The great relationship, for humanity, will always be the relation between man and woman. The relation between man and man, woman and woman, parent and child, will always be subsidiary.
>
> And the relation between man and woman will change for ever, and will for ever be the new central clue to human life. It is the relation itself which is the quick and the central clue to life, not the man, nor the woman, nor the children that result

---

[38] Letter to Dr Else Jaffe-Richthofen, 12 June 1929, "Not I, But the Wind . . .", p. 272.

[39] Letter to Laurence E. Pollinger, 7 Jan. 1929, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1115.

from the relationship, as a contingency.[40]

Among the paintings discussed above, the sexual connection is the central theme of Fight with an Amazon, and it is an important element of A Holy Family and Boccaccio Story, as well as the Resurrection triptych. This connection, in its infinite variety, is the subject of the bulk of Lawrence's paintings.

In its original conception, Fauns and Nymphs[41] dates from the same period as Resurrection and The Man Who Died. Like these two works, it rejects the traditional Christian ideal of suffering and spirituality in favour of the sexual relation, the enjoyment of physical life. Unlike these other works, Fauns and Nymphs goes beyond the framework of Christian myth in formulating its vision.

It started as another Lawrencean inversion of a Biblical theme:

> He began to paint a picture. It was going to be a crucifixion with Pan and the nymphs in the foreground. It passed through many metamorphoses and ended by being Pan and the nymphs, without the crucifixion. He was very busy over it, and exuberantly happy while he painted. . . . and he was greatly pleased with the result.[42]

In Lawrence's interpretation, the Crucifixion was the triumph of the ego; hence his reluctance to paint so distasteful a theme, even with Pan, the god of the spontaneous consciousness, jeering in the foreground. "I shan't do a crucifixion," he wrote Brett, "even with Pan to put his fingers to his nose at the primrose Jesus. Damn crosses!"[43] After changing the composition, he told Harry Crosby, "I've got a nice canvas of sun-fauns

---

[40] "Morality and the Novel," pp. 112-113.

[41] Paintings (1964), Pl. XI, p. 57.

[42] Brewster, p. 275.

[43] Letter to Brett, 24 March 1927, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 971.

and sun-nymphs laughing at the Crucifixion--but I had to paint out the Crucifixion."[44] His later plea, at the time of the police raid on the London exhibit, for "no more crucifixions, no more martyrdoms, no more autos da fe, as long as time lasts"[45] recalls Fauns and Nymphs.

The centre of the picture is Pan, the male, embracing a nymph, who peers up at him coquettishly. Three heads in an arc complete the group, and fruit-laden branches, bending overhead, frame it. Yellow light fills the background in the spot where the Cross must have stood. The figures, male and female, are dark, ruddy; the colours are all deep and luminous, adding to the air of uninhibited joy, of sensuality.

In the evolution of this picture, then, Lawrence rejected the ego, moral, Christian, with its battles and triumphs in death--in favour of the older, vital, pre-moral spontaneous consciousness. He turned from the spiritual saint to the physical, sexual relation of male and female; from the Jesus of the Cross to Pan. His was the living god.

Lawrence began Finding of Moses[46] soon after Fauns and Nymphs.[47] The subject of this painting is Biblical, but in Lawrence's treatment, it belongs to the pagan world of Fauns and Nymphs. The Moses who is the centre of the picture is hardly Moses the giver of moral laws, stern prophet of Jehovah, the god of the ego. Rather, he is the infant gift of the river, the new-born male god, being received by the women, in a world, and painting, of the spontaneous consciousness. As in Fauns and Nymphs, the colours in

---

[44] Letter to Harry Crosby, ? Aug. 1928, Letters, ed. Huxley, p. 748.

[45] See above, p. 13.

[46] Paintings (1964), Pl. 27, p. 100.

[47] See Appendix A, p. 78.

Moses are deep, vibrant, and the background glows with yellow light. The figures in the foreground are in shadow, silhouetted against the light, forms rather than articulated people. The scene is thus literally hard to see. It makes it impact through the sensuous colours and shapes--an impact that is more tactile than visual. In this way, Lawrence suggests his vision of ancient Egypt--a civilization of the tactile, spontaneous consciousness.[48]

Family on a Verandah[49] presents the sexual relation within the larger context of the family. The man and woman dominate the picture. The man squats on his heels, elbows on his knees, leaning forward, in the pose which Lawrence so often observed in the miners of Nottinghamshire. In counterpoint, the woman reclines. Together their limbs form one long, flowing curve across the canvas. The two children cling to the mother, a minor offshoot of the main relationship, echoing on a smaller scale the curve of the parents' limbs. Verandah is a later, profane version of A Holy Family. In both paintings, it is the sexual connection which gives the family its centre, its inner coherence.

In Rape of the Sabine Women,[50] which Lawrence affectionately called "A Study in Arses,"[51] the sexual relation appears in its aspect of fierce, violent passion. This painting multiplies the couple of Fight with an Amazon into a wild, uninhibited bacchanal. The nude figures fill and almost overflow the canvas, forming a complex pattern: a rhythmic, sweeping vortex of backs and buttocks. In the rear, an arm, raised in a cry of help,

---

[48] See above, p. 23.

[49] Paintings (1964), Pl. X, p. 49.

[50] Ibid., Pl. XIII, p. 65.

[51] Letter to Aldous Huxley, 2 April 1928, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1052.

is silhouetted against dark background. Only one face is visible, for the emphasis is on the mindless, impersonal contact of flesh and flesh. By its turbulent, swirling forms, Rape of the Sabines assaults the eye of the viewer, as in the canvas the men assault the women. It is a painting of a pagan world, sensual, pre-moral, unrestrained, in which the ego is unknown.

The interplay of bodies in Spring[52] is more carefree, less intense. This is a painting of boys at play, wrestling or chasing a ball. The figures are naked, except, curiously, for their shoes. Perhaps these are not shoes, but hooves; not boys, but young fauns, frolicking in the primeval springtime of the world.

The picture recalls the wrestling scene between Birkin and Gerald in Women in Love,[53] the Brüderschaft, bond between men, which parallels the union of men and women. Lawrence had painted this bond in Red Willows and Fire Dance, but unlike these earlier works, Spring has definite homosexual implications. "It might equally well be called 'That Capri Air,'" observed one reviewer of the 1929 exhibit, recommending that this picture "be avoided by sensitive people."[54] The task of Lawrence as an artist was not, however, to censor thought but rather to expand it into new, unexplored, previously tabu areas. In his attempt to paint the sexual connection in its endless variety, he excluded nothing--not even the homosexual aspect of that connection.

Lawrence most clearly expressed the sexual relation in his series

---

[52] Paintings (1964), Pl. 22, p. 96. [53] Pages 261-265.

[54] Gwen John, "Paintings by D. H. Lawrence: The Eye of a Poet's Mind," Everyman, I (27 June 1929), 27.

of paintings each focussed on one man and one woman. Fight with an Amazon is the earliest of these pictures; in The Mango Tree,[55] Lawrence returned to the theme. A couple embrace, their pose reminiscent of Amazon. The treatment recalls Fauns and Nymphs: both man and woman are dark brown, seated beneath an arching tree which frames the scene. The fruit the man plucks is not a mango from the tree overhead, but the pendulous breast of his woman. This is a painting of pagan sensuality, combining humour and passion.

Under the Haystack[56] gently evokes the love of Lawrence's youth. Harry T. Moore suggests the picture "is reminiscent--except for its (wishful?) nakedness--of the days Lawrence and Jessie Chambers, the farm girl he knew near Eastwood, spent in the fields of Nottinghamshire; the girl in the painting is unmistakably Jessie, the Miriam of Sons and Lovers."[57] The soft, rounded contours emphasize the restful pose of the lovers; the picture has the wistfulness of a reminiscence.

The Lizard[58] closely resembles Haystack in composition, but the terrain it depicts is harsh and rocky. The figures take on the quality of the background; they are modelled with sharp contrasts of light and shade, like jagged rocks. The painting is perhaps another reminiscence, this time of Lawrence's years in New Mexico; in which case the woman is probably Dorothy Brett.

In Yawning,[59] Lawrence evidently painted the moment following

---

[55] Paintings (1964), Pl. 25, p. 98. [56] Ibid., Pl. 20, p. 94.

[57] "D. H. Lawrence and his Paintings," Paintings (1964), p. 33.

[58] Paintings (1964), Pl. 19, p. 94. [59] Ibid., Pl. 18, p. 93.

fulfillment of passion. The setting is the garden of a house. In the foreground, a man and woman stretch their bodies in a pose that is both dance-like and suggestive of the coital position. To the right rear, another woman bathes in a fountain, the waters of which flow out in the direction of the yawning couple. Perhaps this is the bath of life, of sexuality, in which the couple have immersed themselves. The colours are warm, luminous pastels, the nudes finely modelled. Yawning, then, is a picture of the garden of earthly delight, at once sensual and delicate.

The dark man and pale woman of Amazon reappear in Close-Up (Kiss),[60] but this painting shows their relation in its negative aspect. Philip Trotter wrote,

> To my wife, even before Pansies reached us, the masterly composition of two unlovely heads contacted in an unfulfilled kiss is the pictorial rendering of Cold Passion, condemned in cruder terms by the gamekeeper in Lady Chatterley's Lover and delicately but cruelly in "When I went to the Film," "and caught them moaning from close-up kisses, black and white kisses that could not be felt. . . ."[61]

In other pictures--for example, Yawning--Lawrence expressed sexuality by the interaction of entire bodies. Close-Up (Kiss) contains two disembodied heads. The lips are bright red, gross, the eyes a hard blue. The couple stare at each other, evidently interested more in visual than in physical contact. This is a picture of the "sex in the head" which Lawrence so often denounced.

By contrast, the heads of the couple in North Sea[62] are the least

---

[60] Paintings (1964), Pl. 17, p. 92.

[61] Trotter, in Nehls, III, 334. See also Complete Poems, I, 444.

[62] Paintings (1964), Pl. 30, p. 103.

important parts of their anatomies. The man approaches from behind, his face in shadow as he stoops to embrace the woman. She is defined most clearly in her lower body; from her strongly modelled thighs and belly emanates a sense of power--the creative female power of fertility, based in the womb. Her head sits uneasily on its neck, and her arms dwindle away, insignificant afterthoughts; for the life animating her comes from below.

This painting owes a debt to Die Nordsee, by Heinrich Heine, a poem which influenced many of the writings of Lawrence:

> For I come, and with me there comes
> The good old time when the gods out of heaven
> Stooped in love to the daughters of men,
> And, the daughters of men embracing,
> Begot upon them
> Kings, and races of sceptre-bearers,
> And heroes famous on earth.[63]

Harry T. Moore notes this debt, and suggests that the woman in the picture is Lady Cynthia Asquith.[64] If so, the painting relates to Lawrence's stories "The Ladybird" and "Glad Ghosts," both of them portraits of Cynthia Asquith, and perhaps also to Lady Chatterley, for which she was a possible model. In "The Ladybird," Lawrence, through his hero, enunciated a creed of darkness: "The true living world of fire is dark, throbbing, darker than blood. Our luminous world that we go by is only the reverse of this."[65] The dark hero of the story rejects the fashionable loveliness of the

---

[63] Heinrich Heine, Die Nordsee, tr. John Todhunter, in Heine's Prose and Poetry, intr. Ernest Rhys (London, 1934), p. 53.

[64] "D. H. Lawrence and his Paintings," Paintings (1964), p. 33.

[65] D. H. Lawrence, "The Ladybird," Four Short Novels (New York, 1965), p. 67.

heroine: "True love is dark, a throbbing together in the darkness. . . . You, and your beauty--that is only the inside-out of you. The real you is the wild-cat invisible in the night."[66] It is this dark, inward beauty, dark love, centred in the loins, which Lawrence painted in North Sea.

At first examination, Renascence of Men[67] appears to depict the submission of woman to the power of the male. This is a theme which recurs continually in the writings of Lawrence; perhaps the closest parallel is the submission of Ursula to Birkin, in Women in Love: "Kneeling on the hearth-rug before him, she put her arms round his loins, and put her face against his thighs. . . . It was here she discovered him one of the sons of God."[68] In the picture, the kneeling figure places head on the feet of the seated man--feet being a common symbol for the male genitalia, male power.

However, the sex of the kneeling figure is in fact indeterminate. If it is male, then the painting represents not the submission of woman to man, but rather an initiation rite such as that of Cipriano in The Plumed Serpent. Before Cipriano can assume his role as the incarnation of the god Huitzilopochtli, Ramon must ceremonially "seal" him, beginning with the head and progressing down the body to the feet: "[Ramon] grasped the ankles, as one might grasp the base of a young tree as it emerges from the earth. Crouching on the earth, he gripped them in an intense grip, resting his head on the feet."[69] In the painting, it is unclear which figure is initiator, and which the initiate. Aside from any ambiguities, though, Renascence of

---

[66] "The Ladybird," p. 67.

[67] Paintings (1964), Pl. 23, p. 96.

[68] Women in Love, p. 305.

[69] The Plumed Serpent, p. 404.

Men depicts a ceremony through which the male comes to realize his full power.

In Dance Sketch,[70] the dark, brown-skinned man and pale, ivory-coloured woman reappear, in a dance with a goat, the avatar of Pan. The man throws down his head and flings up his arms; in counterpoint, the woman has head raised, arms down. She is framed between the legs of the man--within his context, his power. The overlapping bodies, with limbs outthrust, suggest a single, spinning organism, and the pool of yellow light in which they dance is like a charmed circle, a nimbus. The figures are stylized, executed in rough, rapid strokes, and one leg of the man fades away into indistinctness, thus conveying a sense of swift movement.

This painting recalls the rain dance in Lady Chatterley's Lover:

> [Connie] ran out with a wild little laugh, holding up her breasts to the heavy rain and spreading her arms, and running blurred in the rain with the eurythmic dance-movements she had learned so long ago in Dresden. It was a strange pallid figure lifting and falling, bending so the rain beat and glistened on the full haunches, swaying up again and coming belly-forward through the rain, then stooping again so that only the full loins and buttocks were offered in a kind of homage towards him [Mellors], repeating a wild obeisance.
>
> He laughed wryly, and threw off his clothes. It was too much. He jumped out, naked and white, with a little shiver, into the hard slanting rain.[71]

In painting and novel, the couple dance in a forest, the last outpost, in Lady Chatterley, of the old, phallic consciousness. In the novel, the dance ends in a chase and the act of coitus. In the painting, the dance is itself a metaphor for the sexual act, a visual expression of the union between man and woman and of their harmony with the world.

Lawrence did not directly represent the act of coitus until he

---

[70] Paintings (1964), Pl. XII, p. 61. [71] Lady Chatterley, pp. 206-207.

painted Leda,[72] one of his latest pictures. In this water colour, the transcendent nature of sexual union is manifest. It is a graphic rendering of the conjunction of two different beings that is the sexual act. The figures form a startling diagonal, sloping downward across the picture. The head of the woman, incongruously stuck on in North Sea, here disappears beyond the edge of the painting: she is reduced to body alone, without ego. The wings of the swan encompass her, and his neck curves snake-like, phallus-like, between her breasts.

Like all the paintings of Lawrence, Leda functions not only on the literal, actual level, but on the symbolic level as well.

Years earlier, Lawrence had discussed the significance of the Leda myth in "The Crown." He then conceived of the myth in negative terms: "The swan is one of the symbols of divine corruption. . . . When Leonardo and Michael Angelo represent Leda in the embrace of the swan, they are painting mankind in the clasp of the divine flux of corruption, the singing death. Mankind turned back, to cold, bygone consummations."[73]

When he returned to the myth in the Pansies, Lawrence had changed his conception of it. In the poem "Give Us Gods," he rejected traditional images of the divine--Egyptian, Classical, Christian--for another:

> Look then
> where the father of all things swims in a mist of atoms
> electrons and energies, quantums and relativities
> mists, wreathing mists,
> like a wild swan, or a goose, whose honk goes through my
> bladder.

---

[72] Paintings (1964), Pl. XVI, p. 77.

[73] D. H. Lawrence, "The Crown," in Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine, and Other Essays (Bloomington, Indiana, 1963), pp. 75-76.

> And in the dark unscientific I feel the drum-winds of his wings
> and the drip of his cold, webbed feet, mud-black
> brush over my face as he goes
> to seek the women in the dark, our women, our weird women whom he treads
> with dreams and thrusts that make them cry in their sleep.
>
> Gods, do you ask for gods?
> Where there is woman there is swan.[74]

The union of swan and woman in Leda thus is a later version of the union of the sons of God and the daughters of men.[75]

In the past, this union with the swan-god was the beginning of an entire cycle of history, the Classical era; now it will be the start of the era to follow ours, in the near future. The swan, the new incarnation of God, will end the present, fallen order, and begin a new dispensation. "There'll be babies born that are cygnets" from this union;[76]

> And when the father says: This is none of mine!
> Woman, where got you this little beast?--
> will there be a whistle of wings in the air, and an icy draught?
> will the singing of swans, high up, high up, invisible
> break the drums of his ears
> and leave him forever listening for the answer?[77]

By the sexual act painted in Leda, our fallen world will end, and a new one begin. Lawrence proclaimed, "The next day is the day of the goose, the wild swan's day."[78]

The coming of this new age, new dispensation, is the subject of

---

[74] Complete Poems, I, 438, ll. 33-44.

[75] See Die Nordsee, quoted p. 53, and Women in Love, pp. 304-305.

[76] "Give Us Gods," l. 47.

[77] "Won't It Be Strange--?" ll. 8-13, from Pansies, in Complete Poems, I, 439.

[78] "Gods," l. 24, from "Uncollected Poems," ibid., II, 841.

Singing of Swans.[79] This painting shows the time prophesied in the poem "The Triumph of the Machine," when

> mechanical man in triumph seated upon the seat of his machine
> will be driven mad from himself, and sightless, and on that day
> the machines will turn to run into one another
> traffic will tangle up in a long-drawn-out crash of collision
> and engines will rush at the solid houses, the edifice of our life
> will rock in the shock of the mad machine, and the house will come
> down.
>
> Then, far beyond the ruin, in the far, in the ultimate remote places
> the swan will lift up again his flattened, smitten head
> and look round, and rise, and on the great vaults of his wings
> will sweep round and up to greet the sun with a silky glitter of new
> day.[80]

In the painting, blonde giants are locked in bloody, internecine strife on earth. Above them, two swans hover about a red sun, hanging low in a reddish sky.

In earlier pictures, Lawrence had represented the phallic, spontaneous consciousness by a dark man. Here the blonde figures are men of the ego; hence Lawrence drew them as grotesques, for the rational consciousness of the ego distorts and degrades the human body. The red sun is both setting and rising: setting on the day of the ego, mechanical, divisive, now gone berserk and destroying itself in the battle on earth; rising on the new day of the swans, whose soaring motion counterpoints the falling downward of the men. The song of the title also has a double significance. Traditionally, swans sing only before their death, but here they sing "the swan-song of us,"[81] the men of the old, dying order, and

---

[79] Paintings (1964), Pl. 24, p. 97.

[80] ll. 30-39, from "More Pansies," in Complete Poems, II, 624-625.

[81] Ibid., l. 9.

the aubade of their own new day.

This is one of the last pictures that Lawrence painted. In it, he looked from the present, actual world, with its continual strife, to a new world beyond, free, vital, unfallen. As he did so, he inevitably looked beyond his own failing life, to the hope of life to come. For him, the singing of swans had a special significance.

Do Leda, Singing of Swans, and the related poems of Lawrence owe a debt to the works of Yeats? This is a fascinating, probably unanswerable question. Certainly, there is the possibility of a connection. Lawrence had read Yeats in his younger years; A Vision, with its section on "Dove or Swan," was published in 1925, and The Tower, containing the poem "Leda," appeared in 1928, both earlier than Lawrence's poems and paintings on the same theme. However, the few references to Yeats in the letters of Lawrence are without exception unfavourable, and there is no reference later than 1914.[82] This is likely a case of two contemporary poets having, independently of each other, an identical vision.

These, then, are the twenty-five paintings exhibited at the Warren Gallery in 1929.

"I always say, my motto is 'Art for my sake,'" Lawrence wrote.[83] His paintings, like his writings, all have an autobiographical relevance: they arose from his intense life, and express or resolve conflicts which he himself faced.

---

[82] See letters to Blanche Jennings, 20 Jan. 1909; to A. W. McLeod, 17 Dec. 1912; and to Gordon Campbell, ?19 Dec. 1914; in Letters, ed. Moore, I, 47, 168, & 302 respectively.

[83] Letter to E. Collings, 24 Dec. 1912, Letters, ed. Moore, I, 171.

Some critics have seen self-portraits in almost all the pictures of Lawrence. Harry T. Moore wrote,

> The bearded man in Resurrection, Fight with an Amazon . . . and Flight Back into Paradise is certainly Lawrence, even if the beard isn't red. . . . Fight with an Amazon and Flight Back into Paradise unmistakably show Lawrence and Frieda. But often in the paintings Lawrence seems to go back into his youth: he is the moustached young man in many of the pictures.[84]

According to Philip Trotter, however, the only self-portraits occur in Resurrection and Flight Back into Paradise.[85] The importance of the autobiographical element is thus a matter of debate.

Certainly, it is easy to overstress the personal element in the paintings. Lawrence probably used himself, his wife, and his friends as convenient models, often with no further significance to the meaning of a work.[86] Even where the autobiographical intent is indisputable, it is not essential to the understanding of the painting. The relation between Lawrence and his works was subtle, not necessarily expressed in something so obvious as portraiture.

The paintings have often been criticized for an overly literary manner and for technical deficiencies, particularly in the drawing of the human body. In reply to the first criticism, Lawrence wrote, "What's a deformed guitar and a shred of newspaper but subject-matter? . . . As for their space-composition and their mass-reaction and their arabesques, if that isn't all literary and idea-concept, what is?"[87] To him, there was

---

[84] "D. H. Lawrence and his Paintings," Paintings (1964), p. 33.

[85] See Trotter, in Nehls, III, 329-330.

[86] See, e.g., Men Bathing, in Paintings (1964), Pl. 13, p. 90.

[87] Letter to A. Stieglitz, 15 Aug. 1928, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1076-1077.

only one way to approach a work of art, whether written or pictorial: with the full imagination. Undoubtedly his experience as a writer affected the paintings, but such works as Dance Sketch, Rape of the Sabines, and Boccaccio are proof of the ability of Lawrence to make statements in purely visual terms.

The second criticism is more concrete, and easier to substantiate. Harry T. Moore wrote, "Sometimes the drawing in the pictures is inadequate, particularly of the men's and women's arms. And this isn't mere distortion for effect."[88] Lawrence was aware of his shortcomings as a draughtsman. He appreciated the advice which Earl Brewster gave him about "the hand and elbow" in Flight Back into Paradise,[89] and asked for photographs to help him with postures: "I get stuck," he confessed.[90] His weakness in drawing arms is most evident in Resurrection and North Sea.

However, Lawrence was not striving primarily for photographic accuracy in his drawings of people. When he wished, he could produce superb anatomical studies, as he demonstrated in Contadini and The Lizard. But this was not usually his intention. He treated each painting as an imaginative whole, in which all the elements interrelate. Hence his first consideration in drawing the human figure was not anatomical fidelity or the rules of perspective, but rather the position of the figure in the imaginative structure of the painting. Thus in Red Willows, the men assume the shape of the trees; in Under the Haystack, the modelling of man and

---

[88] "D. H. Lawrence and his Paintings," Paintings (1964), pp. 30 & 33.

[89] Letter to E. Brewster, 6 Feb. 1926, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 964.

[90] Letter to E. Brewster, 13 May 1927, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 976.

woman is soft, like the gentle landscape behind them, while in The Lizard, the modelling is as harsh and jagged as the rocky terrain of the background. In North Sea and Resurrection, Lawrence incorporated the weakly drawn arms into the symbolic schemes of the paintings, using even his deficiencies to achieve the effect he wanted.

From A Holy Family to Singing of Swans, a steady development is discernible in the paintings of Lawrence--but not towards optical accuracy. The earliest pictures are set pieces, static icons. Later works have greater fluidity: Lawrence was more at ease in handling the human figure, and had learned to represent movement. At the same time, there is a consistent trend in the paintings toward greater sexual explicitness, culminating in Leda.

It is the theme of the sexual connection which unites the pictures. Lawrence expressed this connection in many ways: as an abiding link at the centre of a family, and as the fleeting, impersonal union of Rape of the Sabines; in its negative aspect in North Sea, in its homosexual aspect in Spring, in passion, in completion, in repose; as a means of recovering the primal wholeness, of achieving liberation from the present fallen world, as the way in which the divine enters human life in Leda, as a symbol for reunion of the warring elements in the psyche, as mystical marriage. Throughout his life, this image of the sexual relation was central to the vision of Lawrence. In his written works, it found its greatest expression in Lady Chatterley's Lover. During the same period in which he composed this novel, Lawrence explored in paint the sexual relation, showing its endless variety and endless relevance.

CHAPTER FOUR: PAINTERS WHO INFLUENCED LAWRENCE

From his readings and travels, Lawrence acquired a wide knowledge of painting, both that of his own age, and that of other eras, other cultures. He thus came in contact with many, varied works, any of which might have influenced his paintings.

Lawrence had learned to paint by copying pictures he admired. His original paintings owe a debt to the artists he copied in earlier years. In "Making Pictures," Lawrence named many of these artists. He had begun by copying the English water-colourists, "from Paul Sandby and Peter de Wint and Girtin, up to Frank Brangwyn and the impressionists like Brabazon."[1] From them, he learned a technical facility evident in the ten water colours included in the 1929 exhibit.

These were not the only painters to attract Lawrence. "I have copied Peter de Hooch, and Vandyck," he wrote, "and others that I forget. Yet none of them gave me the deep thrill of the Italians"--Fra Angelico, Lorenzetti, Carpaccio, Piero di Cosimo, Giotto.[2] The Italians of the early Renaissance took delight in the physical world, the natural forms of life--a delight not yet codified into the rules of later painters. This rejoicing in the physical reality informs Lawrence's own paintings. It is perhaps significant that during most of the time he was painting, Lawrence lived just outside Florence, and was able to observe directly the great works of the early Italian Renaissance.

In "Making Pictures," Lawrence mentioned only those artists whose

---

[1] "Making Pictures," p. 203.

[2] Ibid., pp. 204-205.

works he had copied; but there were others who influenced him. Some of these influences can be discovered by examining the fiction of Lawrence, for his art-interests shaped not only his painting but his writing as well.

The Pre-Raphaelite influence pervades Lawrence's first novel, The White Peacock, and appears again in The Trespasser and, to a lesser degree, in Sons and Lovers and The Rainbow. These works all antedate the paintings by many years, but the early Pre-Raphaelite influence shaped the artistic vision of Lawrence, and though he refined it through the years, he never changed that vision. Fight with an Amazon is a link between this early interest and the paintings, for it is a later version of Greiffenhagen's Idyll, which Lawrence copied in his youth, and mentioned in The White Peacock.

Like the Pre-Raphaelites, Lawrence admired Italian painting of the early Renaissance, and turned away from later, codified art. Like them, he strove to depict physical life, reaching the transcendent through the actual, painting religious scenes of surprising naturalism. However, Lawrence rejected the sentimentality and spirituality of the Pre-Raphaelites. They perhaps inspired his interest in Italian painting, but unlike them, Lawrence based his interest on first hand observation of the pictures. The debt of Lawrence to the Pre-Raphaelites is beyond doubt; but they seem to have influenced the basic vision of Lawrence, and only indirectly the paintings which arose from that vision.

"Probably the most joyous moment in the whole history of painting,"

---

[3] See above, p. 39, and The White Peacock (London, 1950), pp. 42-43.

Lawrence wrote, "was the moment when the incipient impressionists discovered light, and with it, colour."[4] The Impressionist influence is evident in Sons and Lovers, in which the Lawrence persona is a painter. Describing one of his works, Paul Morel says, "There is scarcely any shadow in it; it's more shimmery, as if I'd painted the shimmering protoplasm in the leaves and everywhere, and not the stiffness of the shape. That seems dead to me. Only this shimmeriness is the real living. The shape is a dead crust. The shimmer is inside really."[5] In his essay on Lawrence, Jack Lindsay commented, "The latter statement could not have been made without an awareness of the Impressionist achievement."[6] Lawrence in his paintings was indebted to the Impressionists in his use of colour, and the inner vitality for which he strove suggests the "shimmer inside" of Paul Morel's work.

However, another passage in Sons and Lovers describes more closely what Lawrence sought in his pictures: "He loved to paint large figures, full of light, but not merely made up of lights and cast shadows, like the impressionists; rather definite figures that had a certain luminous quality, like some of Michael Angelo's people."[7] Lawrence was suspicious of the Impressionist quest for pure light. The matrix of his art was the body, the solid, physical reality. He preferred the painters who had returned from the Impressionist quest to this reality--painters such as the later

---

[4] "Introduction to these Paintings," p. 563.

[5] D. H. Lawrence, Sons and Lovers (New York, 1958), p. 152.

[6] Jack Lindsay, "The Impact of Modernism on Lawrence," Paintings (1964), p. 35.

[7] Sons and Lovers, p. 301.

Renoir, who "didn't try to get away from the body."[8] In Lady Chatterley he wrote, "Renoir said he painted his pictures with his penis . . . he did too, lovely pictures!"[9]--meaning that the art of Renoir arose from the phallic, physical consciousness. Renoir influenced Lawrence particularly in his treatment of the nude.

Gauguin and Matisse, among the Post-Impressionists, are often mentioned as influences on the paintings of Lawrence. A debt to Gauguin is evident in Fauns and Nymphs and Finding of Moses, both vibrant pictures reminiscent of the French artist's Tahitian works, while Red Willows and Dance Sketch have a Matisse-like quality. Singing of Swans is strangely suggestive of Van Gogh, in its turbulent, wildly tumbling shapes and in its apocalyptic vision.

However, the artist most often cited as having influenced Lawrence the painter is Cézanne, probably because of the lavish praise Lawrence gave him in the "Introduction to these Paintings." The pictures Contadini and, to a lesser extent, North Sea, are indebted to Cézanne in the modelling of the figures. Further, in an article on the paintings of Lawrence, one critic wrote,

> There is evidence that his imagination was captivated by Cézanne's Women Bathers series, and especially that enchanting, ecstatic picture which Cézanne titled The Battle of Love. This remarkable canvas, once owned by Renoir, belongs to the genre of the Venetian bacchanal, and it is a great visionary fantasy of the modern love problem. It reveals much concerning Cézanne's personal anxiety about women, and there is little doubt that Lawrence found in this vision the expression of a kindred spirit. Actually Lawrence borrows the motif for a number of his own paintings.[10]

---

[8] "Introduction to these Paintings," p. 562. [9] Page 38.

[10] Herbert Crehan, "Lady Chatterley's Painter," Art News, LV (Feb. 1957), 63.

Rape of the Sabines and Spring recall The Battle of Love in theme and composition; and Cézanne's treatment of the sexual relation perhaps encouraged Lawrence to attempt his own series of paintings on that subject. Most important, Lawrence emulated Cézanne's approach to painting, striving to paint not from the intellect but from the entire consciousness, to represent the physical reality in its wholeness, without clichés. Cézanne thus played an important role in the development of the artistic vision of Lawrence.

The Rainbow and Women in Love show Lawrence in contact with contemporary movements in European art, trying to sort out his own position. Futurism and Cubism had a deep effect on him, but he did not accept the ideas of these movements; rather, in reacting against them, he formulated his own attitudes.[11] The position he eventually worked out was very close to that of the Expressionists. The Expressionist influence is apparent in the later writings of Lawrence, and Herbert Read comments, "When, in the autumn of 1926, he found that he was self-confident enough to embark on his own original compositions, he became a typical expressionist, like Nolde or Soutine."[12] The resemblance to the Expressionists is without doubt conscious and intentional; strangely, however, Lawrence wrote not one word about the art movement which was closest to him in time and in vision. He can be called an Expressionist only on the basis of internal evidence.

Perhaps the most important influence on the paintings of Lawrence was that not of contemporary artists, but of artists at the greatest remove

---

[11] See above, pp. 26-28.

[12] "Lawrence as a Painter," Paintings (1964), p. 64.

from him in time: the Etruscan tomb-painters. Lawrence became interested in the Etruscans in the spring of 1926, shortly before moving to the Villa Mirenda. "The Etruscan things appeal very much to my imagination," he told Richard Aldington. "They are so curiously natural."[13] Planning to write a book on them, he began to study the Etruscans, making use of the large Etruscan collection at the Archaeological Museum in Florence. In the fall of 1926, he began to paint, and in March and April of 1927, with his friend Brewster, Lawrence went on the walking trip which produced Etruscan Places. Immediately before and during the time in which he painted, then, Lawrence was studying Etruscan art. The effect on his paintings was deep and widespread.

Before his Etruscan tour, Lawrence had vowed to include a phallus in each of his paintings.[14] He saw plentiful examples of this symbol in the tombs at Cerveteri: "Here it is, big and little, standing by the doors, or inserted, quite small, into the rock: the phallic stone!"[15] In the tomb-paintings at Tarquinia, Lawrence found much to emulate: the clear, flat, bright colours, the "nakedness [which] is its own clothing, more easy than drapery,"[16] the recurring motif of the dance, of celebration. He borrowed from the Etruscans the convention of painting men dark, ruddy, and women pale-skinned. Partly, he explained, this convention was realistic, for men went naked in the sun, while women remained covered. Partly it was symbolic, for "vermilion is the colour of [man's] sacred or potent or god body."[17]

---

[13] Letter to R. Aldington, 18 April 1926, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 901.

[14] See above, p. 33.

[15] Etruscan Places, p. 27.

[16] Ibid., p. 82.

[17] Ibid., pp. 71-73.

In his painting Jaguar Leaping at a Man,[18] Lawrence drew on another convention of Etruscan art: the representation of the predator attacking his prey, of the struggle between the active and passive principles of life.

The motif of the sexual relation, of man and woman together, is charcteristic of Etruscan art. At Tarquinia, Lawrence saw many paintings of this relation, some symbolic, some realistic, some startlingly explicit. In one tomb, he saw un po' di pornografico--a graphic rendering of the act of intercourse, both heterosexual and homosexual.[19] He observed,

> Even the two bits of 'pornografico' in the Tomb of the Bull are not two little dirty drawings. . . . The drawings have the same naive wonder in them as the rest, the same archaic innocence, accepting life, knowing all about it, and feeling the meaning. . . . The two little pictures have a symbolic meaning, quite distinct from a moral meaning--or an immoral.[20]

These Etruscan representations of the sexual relation clearly influenced Lawrence's paintings on the same theme, and encouraged his development toward greater sexual explicitness.

The symbols of Etruscan art deeply affected Lawrence, but the way in which the Etruscans used the symbols affected him even more. "The strange potency and beauty of these Etruscan things arise, it seems to me, from the profundity of the symbolic meaning the artist was more or less aware of," Lawrence wrote.[21] Again,

> It is very much the symbolism of all the ancient world. But here it is not exact and scientific, as in Egypt. It is simple and rudimentary, and the artist plays with it is as a child with fairy stories. Nevertheless, it is the symbolic element which rouses the deeper emotion, and gives the peculiarly satisfying quality

---

[18] Paintings (1964), Pl. XV, p. 73.

[19] Etruscan Places, pp. 106-107.

[20] Ibid., p. 115.

[21] Ibid., pp. 109-110.

to the dancing figures and the creatures.[22]

Behind the art of the Etruscans, Lawrence saw an intense life, of which the old symbolism was still an integral part. Drawing on direct, profound, intuitive, living knowledge, the tomb-painter handled the symbols with fluidity, depicting their many nuances and aspects, never exhausting the largely unconscious meaning. In his painting and his writing, Lawrence emulated this use of living symbol.

There remains Blake, with whom Lawrence has often been compared. He himself saw "a suggestion of Blake sometimes" in his paintings;[23] and he declared,

> Blake is the only painter of imaginative pictures, apart from landscape, that England has produced. And unfortunately there is so little Blake, and even in that little the symbolism is often artificially imposed. Nevertheless, Blake paints with real intuitional awareness and solid instinctive feeling. He dares handle the human body, even if he sometimes makes it a mere ideograph. And no other Englishman has even dared handle it with alive imagination.[24]

As this passage shows, there are real differences between the two artists. Blake placed a much greater reliance on the intellect, the mental powers. He used symbols in a formal and systematic way wholly foreign to Lawrence.

Yet despite differences, there is an extraordinary similarity between Blake and Lawrence. Both men lived through a cataclysmic period in European history. Both found themselves in revolt against their own

---

[22] Etruscan Places, pp. 95-96.

[23] Letter to Lady Ottoline Morrell, 3 April 1929, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1140.

[24] "Introduction to these Paintings," p. 560.

age. Both were called mad by contemporaries. Both tried their talents at the two arts, writing and painting.

In his art, Blake relied on imaginative, inner vision, rather than external models. Long before Lawrence, he condemned painters such as Reynolds, who painted the outer reality without the inner life. He fought the repressive sexual attitudes of his time, and was one of the first artists to speak against European industrialization. A constant theme in his art is the union of man and woman, through which one can return to the original, integral state. He used the Christian myth to embody his vision, but inverted the traditional interpretation of that myth, preaching resurrection in the flesh.

Lawrence probably did not have the opportunity of seeing Blake's Prophetic Books in their original format, with the illustrations. His knowledge of Blake must have been based on the paintings he saw in London museums, and perhaps more on his reading of the poetry. Throwing Back the Apple, of Lawrence's paintings, most clearly owes a debt to Blake. But there is a more important connection between the two artists. Blake is one of a long line of English rebel-prophets--a line which goes back to Wyclif. It is to this tradition that Lawrence, in his deepest mind, belonged. He had absorbed the tradition in the Nonconformist upbringing of his childhood; throughout his life, it remained with him, more potent for being, largely, unconscious.

In terms of his own age, then, Lawrence was an Expressionist. In terms of his nation, he was an artist-prophet in the Blakean tradition. In terms of European culture, he painted the holiness of the physical world, in a tradition which began in the archaic Mediterranean civilization,

persisted in the Etruscans, reappeared in the Tuscan painters of the early Renaissance, in the art of Cézanne, and finally in the art of Lawrence.

CONCLUSION

Beyond the relations of individual paintings to writings of Lawrence, noted above, there is a general relation of all the paintings to the later writings, and especially to Lady Chatterley's Lover. Lawrence began to paint and to write the novel at almost exactly the same time. He started to paint in the last days of October or first days of November, 1926. Lady Chatterley is first mentioned in a joint letter, with Frieda, to her son Montague Weekley, dated 31 October 1926: "Lawrence goes into the woods to write, he is writing a short long story, always breaking new ground, the curious class feeling this time or rather the soul against the body, no I don't explain it well, the animal part."[1]

Jack Lindsay speculated, "I think he took up the brush in that final phase with much the same impulse that sent him back to the English scene, to Lady Chatterley and Pansies: a desire to regain his roots after going too dangerously far in fantasy in The Plumed Serpent."[2]

Lady Chatterley and the paintings were the first fruits of a dramatic reversal in Lawrence. Previously his "flow" had been away from Europe, from England, from human contacts, from society, from love, from tenderness. Now, though his basic vision did not change, the flow suddenly reversed itself.

There were many reasons for the reversal: the actual return to Europe in 1925, Lawrence's awareness of his impending death, the establishment of a better relationship with Frieda. Most important,

---

[1] Letters, ed. Moore, II, 944.

[2] "The Impact of Modernism on Lawrence," Paintings (1964), p. 53.

Lawrence recovered the inner peace which he had lost in the Great War. Although he never fought on the battlefield, he did fight within his own psyche--and continued fighting long after the Armistice. Now at last he achieved a balance and serenity, a detachment which had been lacking in him since The Rainbow.

In The Plumed Serpent, Lawrence had tried to bring about a cultural revolution by sheer will, and had failed dismally. In Lady Chatterley, he gave up his messianic attitude. He was no closer to approving of contemporary civilization, but he had lost all illusions of his power to change it. He returned to his roots geographically--to the country of his youth which is the setting for Lady Chatterley--and psychically--to the sexual connection. In The Plumed Serpent, he had sought redemption in strange countries, strange gods. In Lady Chatterley, he found God where he had begun: in one of the most basic, simple, common human acts.

In this last novel, man and woman achieve their escape from the underworld of industrial society with the help of each other, by means of the sexual act, the sexual relation. This relation is the centre of the novel, as of most of the paintings. Like the paintings, Lady Chatterley explores the sexual connection in its many different aspects. Like the paintings, it became more sexually explicit as it progressed, with each new draft. In the novel, as in his pictures, Lawrence celebrated the body, the spontaneous flowering of the physical reality, of life, which is the incarnation of God. These motifs preoccupied Lawrence in all his later works.

In Etruscan Places, Lawrence wrote,

> Brute force crushes many plants. Yet the plants rise again. The Pyramids will not last a moment compared with the daisy. And before Buddha or Jesus spoke the nightingale sang, and long after the words of Jesus and Buddha are gone into oblivion the nightingale still will sing. Because it is neither preaching nor teaching nor commanding nor urging. It is just singing. And in the beginning was not a Word, but a chirrup.[3]

This new-found faith in the persistence of life affected the art of Lawrence; he stopped trying to force a message, and allowed his art to speak for itself, implicitly. He did this by evolving a much more fluid use of symbol, compacting many levels of meaning together, and playing with them, giving them subtle gradations. For example, Lady Chatterley is a work of extraordinary realism; it derives much of its impact from the unprecedented accuracy and detail of the sexual descriptions. Yet it has other levels of meaning, of ever deeper and wider significance: it is partly a fertility rite, partly a recasting of the Persephone myth, partly a purification through sex, partly a mystical Cosmic Marriage.

"The true symbol defies all explanation, so does the true myth," Lawrence wrote in Apocalypse. "You can give meanings to either--you will never explain them away. Because symbol and myth do not effect us only mentally, they move the deep emotional centres every time."[4] It is this fluid, intuitive, living symbolism which gives the later works of Lawrence their depth. His art interests helped him to formulate this use of symbol,[5] and his paintings were a testing ground for it.

In defence of Lady Chatterley, Lawrence wrote,

I believe in the living extending consciousness of man. I believe

---

[3] Etruscan Places, p. 53.

[4] Apocalypse, pp. 183-184.

[5] See above, pp. 69-70.

> the consciousness of man has now to embrace the emotions and passions of sex, and the deep effects of human physical contact. This is the glimmering edge of our awareness and our field of understanding, in the endless business of knowing ourselves.[6]

The paintings are a neglected Lawrencean exploration of the sexual relation which stands at the centre of human life, but on the frontier of human understanding. Lawrence devoted much time to his painting in later years. The fracas arising from the London exhibit, in his own words, sickened him and possibly shortened his life; it is also revealing of the relationship between Lawrence and his public, between the rebel-artist and the society for which he created his art. The paintings relate closely to some of the most important works of Lawrence, illuminating those works from a new angle. Finally, through his interest in painting, Lawrence came to formulate the aesthetic which was the basis of his later writings.

Some of the paintings can perhaps stand as independent works of art. The appeal of Boccaccio Story, for example, or Rape of the Sabines, or Dance Sketch is real, without reference to the literary fame of their creator. However, the importance of the paintings within the canon of Lawrence's work is beyond doubt. They illuminate some of his greatest writing, and stand as evidence that, up to the end of his life, the genius of Lawrence kept growing and flowering in new ways.

---

[6] Letter to Morris L. Ernst, 10 Nov. 1928, Letters, ed. Moore, II, 1099.

APPENDIX A: CHRONOLOGY

This chronology includes the twenty-five paintings in the exhibit which opened at the Warren Gallery in June 1929, as well as any other original paintings by Lawrence mentioned in the text of the thesis. Paintings not exhibited are clearly identified as such. The thirteen works impounded by the police are marked with an asterix (*). The dating in many cases is tentative, and cannot be definitely established.

1925	January	Lawrence finishes The Plumed Serpent, at Oaxaca, Mexico.
	February	He falls ill at Oaxaca.
	April	He returns to his ranch in New Mexico to recuperate.
	September	The Lawrences return to Europe.
	November	They settle at Spotorno, Italy. "Art and Morality" appears in Calendar of Modern Letters.
	December	"Morality and the Novel" appears in Calendar of Modern Letters.
1926	January	The Plumed Serpent is published.
	May	The Lawrences move to the Villa Mirenda, Scandicci, near Florence.
	August to September	Lawrence visits England for the last time in his life.
	October	Early in October, the Lawrences return to the Villa Mirenda. Near the end of the month, Aldous and Maria Huxley visit them, bringing a present of canvases. Lawrence begins to write Lady Chatterley's Lover.
	November	By 11 Nov., Lawrence painted A Holy Family. Oil. Present location unknown.
	December	Boccaccio Story.* Oil. Present location unknown. Fight with an Amazon.* Oil.
1927	January	Red Willow Trees. Oil. ? Men Bathing. Oil. Not exhibited.
	February	Flight Back into Paradise. Oil.
	March	Resurrection begun. Oil. Finished in May. Fauns and Nymphs begun. Oil. Altered in Nov. Finished in April 1928.

1927	late March to April	Lawrence goes on a walking tour of Etruscan tombs with Earl Brewster.
	May	Lawrence writes The Escaped Cock (later title: The Man Who Died, then finishes Resurrection.
	summer	Lawrence working on Etruscan Places (published 1932).
	October	Throwing Back the Apple. Water colour. Present location unknown.
	November	Jaguar Leaping at a Man. Oil. Not exhibited.
1928	January	Lawrence completes the final version of Lady Chatterley.
	February	The Mango Tree.* Water colour. Present location unknown.
	March	Fire Dance.* Water colour. Yawning.* Water colour. The Lizard. Water colour. Present location unknown. Under the Haystack. Water colour. Present location unknown.
	April	Rape of the Sabine Women. Oil. Fauns and Nymphs finished. Finding of Moses. Oil. Present location unknown. Family on a Verandah.* Oil.
	June	The Lawrences go to Switzerland for the summer, giving up the Villa Mirenda. The oil Close-Up (Kiss) must have been painted before this move. Lady Chatterley is published.
	August	Contadini.* Oil. Present location unknown. Accident in a Mine.* Oil. Present location unknown. North Sea.* Oil. Present location unknown.
	November	The Lawrences settle in Bandol, France, for the winter.
1929	January	Leda.* Water colour. Renascence of Men. Water colour. Present location unknown. Spring.* Water colour. Present location unknown. Summer Dawn. Oil. Not exhibited, although reproduced in The Paintings of D. H. Lawrence (1929). ? Dance Sketch.* Oil.
	February	Singing of Swans.* Water colour. Present location unknown.

1929 April to June — The Lawrences travel in Spain.

June — On 14 June, the exhibition of Lawrence's paintings opens at the Warren Gallery, London. Simultaneously, The Paintings of D. H. Lawrence is published. The first press notice appears on 16 June; it attacks the paintings as obscene. Alerted by this review, the popular newspapers mount a campaign against the exhibition, demanding police action. Thousands of people jam the gallery, attracted by the sensational press coverage. Lawrence, travelling from Spain to Italy, is unaware of the situation.

July — On 5 July, the police raid the exhibition, impounding thirteen of the paintings. Dorothy Warren and her husband are charged with displaying obscene material for purposes of sale or gain, and ordered to show cause why the paintings should not be destroyed. The Warren Gallery remains open; on 28 July it announces a new exhibit, "More Paintings by D. H. Lawrence," consisting of eleven works from the original exhibition and pictures Lawrence painted in his youth, supplied by his sister Ada.
"Making Pictures" appears in The Studio and Creative Art.
"Pornography and Obscenity" appears in This Quarter, in Paris.
My Skirmish with Jolly Roger is published in Paris and New York.
The expurgated Pansies is published in London.
Lawrence begins to write "More Pansies" (published in Last Poems, 1932) and Nettles (published 1930).
The Lawrences go to Germany.

August — On 8 August, the exhibition case is heard at Marlborough Street police court. The paintings are returned to the Trotters on condition that they not be exhibited.
The unexpurgated Pansies is published in London.

September — The Lawrence exhibition ends when the Warren Gallery closes for repairs.
The Escaped Cock is published in Paris.
Lawrence is writing Last Poems.
The Lawrences return to Bandol.

November — "Pornography and Obscenity" is published separately in London, and sells briskly.
Lawrence is writing Apocalypse (published 1931).

December — "Pictures on the Walls" appears in Vanity Fair (therein titled "Dead Pictures on the Walls").
Lawrence's health is failing rapidly.

1930	February	Lawrence enters a sanatorium at Vence, in southern France.
	March	On 2 March, Lawrence dies of tuberculosis.

APPENDIX B: AN ANNOTATED LIST OF CONTEMPORARY ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS CONCERNING THE 1929 EXHIBIT AND ATTENDANT EVENTS

The source for most of the items in this list is Nehls' D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography. In many cases, complete bibliographical information is not available. The list is arranged chronologically.

The Daily News [London], 24 January 1929. Article about coming exhibit.

Konody, Paul, review of exhibit, The Observer [London], 16 June 1929. Reprinted in part in Nehls, III, 336.
This was the first review of the Lawrence exhibit to appear. It attacked the pictures as obscene, thus setting the tone for later critical reaction, and alerting the popular press.

"D. H. Lawrence as Painter." Anon. rev., The Daily Express [London], 17 June 1929. Reprinted in Nehls, III, 338-339.
A vicious attack on the exhibition. Began the campaign of the popular newspapers, led by the Express, against the show.

"Our London Art Critic," "D. H. Lawrence's Paintings: A Novelist as Artist," The Scotsman [Edinburgh], 17 June 1929. Quoted in Nehls, III, 329, 334.

"Indecent Pictures." General news article (anon.), The Morning Post [London], 18 June 1929, p. 11e.

Rutter, Frank, review of exhibit, The Sunday Times [London], 23 June 1929. "A kind but rather colourless notice" (Nehls, III, 334).

Herbert, Evelyn, "From the Pen to the Brush: Rude Force of Mr Lawrence," Western Mail [Cardiff], 26 June 1929. Quoted in Nehls, III, 334-335.

"A Disgraceful Exhibition." Anon. news article, The Daily Telegraph [London], 27 June 1929, leader page. Reprinted in part in Nehls, III, 339.
The first article to call for action by the authorities against the exhibition.

John, Gwen, "Paintings by D. H. Lawrence: The Eye of a Poet's Mind," Everyman, I (27 June 1929), 27.
An intelligent and appreciative, though not uncritical, review.

Furst, H., "Mr D. H. Lawrence's Paintings and his Book at the Warren Gallery," Apollo, X (July 1929), 67.
Dismisses out of hand the ideas and paintings of Lawrence, while calling him "a brilliant writer."

McIntyre, R., "Exhibition at the Warren Gallery," Art Digest, III (July 1929), 15.

The Morning Post, 6 July 1929, p. 11c. News article.

"Paintings seized by London police as indecent," The New York Times, 6 July 1929, 4:4.

Stone, F. G., "D. H. Lawrence and Art," The New Leader [London], 7 July 1929.
A virulent attack, protested by S. Hilton, 20 July.

"Exhibition of paintings, London," The New York Times, 7 July 1929, VIII, 10:1.

The Morning Post, 8 July 1929, p. 12b. News article.

"Pictures seized by police," The Times, 8 July 1929, p. 13b.

"Censored Painter on Shocking Pictures," The Daily Express, 11 July 1929.
Also printed in The Nottingham Evening Post of the same date, under the title "Seized Pictures: Mr Lawrence Replies to Home Secretary."
Reprinted in Nehls, III, 373-374.
Extracts from "Pornography and Obscenity," then making its first appearance.

The Morning Post, 12 July 1929, p. 4b. News article.

Anonymous, "Censoring Art," The Bazaar [London], CXXI (13 July 1929), 9.
Congratulates police for raiding exhibition.

"From Our Own Correspondent," "Artist of Ideas," The Glasgow Bulletin, 15 July 1929. Quoted in Nehls, III, 375.
This review praises Lawrence's paintings.

The Times, 15 July 1929, p. 11d. News article.

The Times, 19 July 1929, p. 12e. News article.

"Art for Dirt's Sake," John Bull [London], XLVI (20 July 1929), 8.
A burlesque trial of Lawrence, rendering the verdict that "any further filth from Florence shall be immediately consigned to the nearest public incinerator" (Nehls, III, 374).

McIntyre, R., "The Exhibition at the Warren Gallery," Architectural Review, LXVI (August 1929), 393.
Treats the paintings as the creations of a novelist straying from his only proper medium.

Earp, T. W., "The Paintings of D. H. Lawrence," Creative Art, V (August 1929), 598, and The Studio, XCVIII (August 1929), 598.
Praises Lawrence's novels, but suggests he knows nothing of painting.

"Magistrate Orders Prints of D. H. Lawrence's Paintings to be Destroyed," The Daily Express, 8 August 1929.

The Evening Standard [London], 8 August 1929. Report on court hearing.

The Star [London], 8 August 1929. Report on the hearing.

The Daily Sketch [London], 9 August 1929. Report on the hearing.

"Magistrate, after hearing, orders pictures returned but forbids their exhibition; 4 books ordered confiscated," The New York Times, 9 August 1929, 6:7.

"Summons heard," The Times, 9 August 1929, p. 9d.

Statham, A. J., "'News' Man's Notebook: D. H. Lawrence's Pictures: Mr A. J. Statham's Opinion," The Evening News, 16 August 1929. Reprinted in Nehls, III, 372.
A highly sympathetic article, dismissing the allegation that Lawrence could not paint.

Earp, T. W., "Mr Lawrence on Painting," The New Statesman, XXXIII (17 August 1929), 578.
An extremely critical and patronizing review which, with the earlier article in Creative Art, prompted Lawrence to retaliate in his satirical poem "Thomas Earp," from "More Pansies."

G. S. G., "D. H. Lawrence and his Art," The Nottingham Journal, 28 August 1929. Reprinted in Nehls, III, 391-393.
An interview with Lawrence's sister Ada.

Hopkins, William Edward, "The Lawrence Pictures: Notts. Artist Defended by An Old Friend," The Nottingham Journal, 29 August 1929. Reprinted in Nehls, III, 394-395.

West, Rebecca, "A Letter from Abroad," The Bookman [New York], LXX (Sept. 1929), 89-91.
"Mr Lawrence seems to have very pink friends," concludes Miss West after seeing his pictures. A rather flippant review which praises Lawrence as a genius and belittles all his thought and works.

Fletcher, Stuart, "D. H. Lawrence's Pictures," Sackbut, Oct. 1929.

Huxley, Aldous, "The Censor," Vanity Fair, Nov. 1929.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Works of D. H. Lawrence

Aaron's Rod. New York, 1961.

Apocalypse. New York, 1966.

Assorted Articles. London, 1930.

The Boy in the Bush. London, 1963.

The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Harry T. Moore. 2 vols. New York and London, 1962.

The Complete Poems of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Vivian de Sola Pinto and Warren Roberts. 2 vols. New York, 1964.

The Complete Short Stories. 3 vols. New York, 1961.

D. H. Lawrence: Selected Literary Criticism, ed. Anthony Beal. New York, 1966.

Etruscan Places. New York, 1957.

Four Short Novels. New York, 1965.

Kangaroo. New York, 1960.

Lady Chatterley's Lover. New York, 1959.

The Letters of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Aldous Huxley. London, 1932.

The Lost Girl. New York, 1968.

The Paintings of D. H. Lawrence. London, 1929.

Paintings of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Mervyn Levy. New York, 1964.

Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Edward D. McDonald. London, 1936.

The Rainbow. New York, 1961.

Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine and Other Essays. Bloomington, Indiana, 1963.

St. Mawr and The Man Who Died. New York, n. d.

Sons and Lovers. New York, 1958.

The Trespasser. London, 1960.

The White Peacock. London, 1950.

Women in Love. New York, 1960.

II. General Works

Aldington, Richard, Portrait of a Genius, But . . . London, 1950.

Boccaccio, Giovanni, The Decameron, Third Day, First Story, tr. J. M. Rigg, intr. Edward Hutton. 2 vols. (London, 1930), I, 155-161.

Brett, Dorothy, Lawrence and Brett, a Friendship. Philadelphia, 1933.

Brewster, Earl and Achsah, D. H. Lawrence: Reminiscences and Correspondence. London, 1934.

Carswell, Catherine, The Savage Pilgrimage. London, 1932.

Chambers, Jessie ("E. T."), D. H. Lawrence: A Personal Record. 2nd ed. London, 1965.

Collier, Peter, "The Man Who Died," Ramparts, VI (January 1968), 13-14.

Crehan, Herbert, "Lady Chatterley's Painter," Art News, LV (February 1957), 38-41, 63, 64, 66.

Fabes, Gilbert H., D. H. Lawrence: His First Editions, Points and Values. London, 1933.

Heine, Heinrich, Die Nordsee, tr. John Todhunter, in Heine's Prose and Poetry, intr. Ernest Rhys. London, 1934.

Huxley, Aldous, Point Counter Point. London, 1928.

----------, "To the Puritan All Things Are Impure," Music at Night and Other Essays (London, 1931), pp. 173-183.

John, Gwen, "Paintings by D. H. Lawrence: The Eye of a Poet's Mind," Everyman, I (27 June 1929), 27.

Lawrence, Ada, and G. Stuart Gelder, Young Lorenzo: Early Life of D. H. Lawrence. Florence, 1931.

Lawrence, Frieda, "Not I, But the Wind . . ." New York, 1934.

Lindsay, Jack, "The Impact of Modernism on Lawrence," Paintings of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Mervyn Levy (New York, 1964), pp. 35-53.

Luhan, Mabel Dodge, Lorenzo in Taos. London, 1933.

Merrild, Knud, A Poet and Two Painters. London, 1938. Re-issued in 1964 under the title With D. H. Lawrence in New Mexico.

Moore, Harry T., "D. H. Lawrence and his Paintings," Paintings of D. H. Lawrence (1964), pp. 17-34.

----------, and Warren Roberts, D. H. Lawrence and his World. New York, 1966.

----------, "D. H. Lawrence and the Censor-Morons," Sex, Literature, and Censorship, ed. H. T. Moore. New York, 1953.

----------, The Intelligent Heart. New York, 1954.

Nehls, Edward, ed., D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography. 3 vols. (Madison, Wisconsin, 1959), III, passim.

Read, Herbert, "Lawrence as a Painter," Paintings of D. H. Lawrence (1964), pp. 55-64.

Roberts, Warren, A Bibliography of D. H. Lawrence. London, 1963.

Sagar, Keith, The Art of D. H. Lawrence. Cambridge, Eng., 1966.