

THE QUEST FOR FREEDOM :
A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE MAJOR NOVELS
OF D. H. LAWRENCE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL
FOR THE DEGREE OF PH.D. IN ENGLISH

১৯৯৯

B Y

NIROD CHANDRA SUTRADHAR

Supervisor

DR. G. N. RAY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL
2000

149333

- 2 JAN 2003

FOR MY LATE PARENTS

Contents

	<i>Pages</i>
<i>Preface & Acknowledgements</i>	
Chapter I : Introduction	1
Chapter II : The White Peacock	36
Chapter III : Sons and Lovers	<u>54</u>
Chapter IV : The Rainbow	76
Chapter V : Women in Love	99
Chapter VI : The Lost Girl	121
Chapter VII : Lady Chatterley's Lover	135
Chapter VIII : D.H. Lawrence and Feminism	150
Chapter IX : Postmodern Lawrence	177
<i>Conclusion</i>	191
<i>Select Bibliography</i>	196

: : : : : :

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is primarily concerned with David Herbert Lawrence, the seeker of freedom. It explores Lawrence's immediate impulse for his quest which takes off from the universal plight of the urban middle-class individual rendered split, intellectualized and atrophied. Lawrence has undertaken the messianic task of disrupting the prevalent tradition of writing that contented itself in portraying this individual as entrapped in his own self-image and consciousness. He delivers the message of how to break out^{of} this 'cage' that represents the split, mechanical and insulated modern life on the one hand and the prison-house of language on the other. And his way is "to get back to some universal positive and loving principle which united imagination and nature instead of splitting them in two".

This study explores D.H.Lawrence, the vitalist, who has the requisites of an 'organic intellectual', capable of redirecting man's attention to the base which he tends to negate for his love of superstructural fantasies and abstractions. He rightly diagnoses that man's malaise in the present age consists in his lopsided living and conceptualization of life. He opposes it by his persuasive stance as a vitalist and suggests its transcendence through a restoration of the 'spontaneous wholeness of the organic being' of men. For Lawrence, there is no above or beyond. Values are created outright in the act of living. Therefore, the first important thing in his project is the individual and the question of his organic wholeness. Relatedly the second is the man-woman relationship, based on instinctual rather than abstracted, romantic ideas, the

third being the individual's creative relationship with the 'circumambient universe'. Such an individual of his conception rises above all kinds of false abstraction. He "innocently feels himself altogether within the great continuum of the universe" to reshape and revitalize a world gone awry.

The nucleus of Lawrence's project, therefore, is the man-woman relationship of which Lawrence thought deeply and thought long in his nonfictional writings, and no wonder, it also constitutes the very central theme of all his major novels. For him, neither man nor woman is pure male or pure female but an amalgam of both. The flesh is the female and the spirit is the male in man. His creative impulse comes from the flesh, the female part of life, the source of which is woman, the mysterious spring of creative energy. It is imperative in life to fulfil the demands of both flesh and spirit, and the possible process is the process of reconciliation with the help of the 'Holy Ghost'. This is the state of perfect freedom in life.

This reconciliation is achieved through love that is sensual, a 'baptism of fire in passion'. It takes place through silent physical communion and, therefore, is beyond the possibility of any falsification. Lawrence, therefore, rejects the 'old conscious stable ego' of the individual enshrined in the earlier social novels. His search for freedom leads him to body forth the vital, organic being, hitherto repressed by moral and sexual taboos.

The purpose of this study is also concerned with Lawrence, the novelist. His choice of the vocation of a novelist is only a necessary dimension in his quest for freedom. As an organic form, the novel has the required fluidity and polyphony which

never get ossified in his hands but prove equal to the need through his treatment of the complexity and multiplicity of the vital and organic being of the individual that he thematizes. He was enthusiastic of the capability of the inner form of the novel to represent 'the whole life trembling' in its complexities and possibilities. This sense of freedom is all the more noticeable when the Lawrentian mode of writing is compared to the common classic realist tradition of writing which in its concern for coherence and causality in narrative structure remains rigidly logocentric and totalizing. Lawrence's understanding of reality, to be precise, is never unitary or rigid. Reality appears to him as a process, opposites held in unity but active in tension. An element of indeterminacy, therefore, is always present in the configurations that reality would take. His novels are, therefore, the most dialogical ones through their elements of confusions, disruptions and self-reflexivity and hence as art form more free and autonomous. In other words, despite some ruling ideas on the part of the novelist, his texts grow polyvocal and rich in complexity. It is itself a kind of artistic freedom from abstractions of whatever kind.

Although Lawrence speaks in terms of a balance in the man-woman relationship which would lead to a balance of faculties in an individual, there has been a mixed feeling about his treatment of women in the novels. Some have gone to the extent of calling him a male-chauvinist, although the recent years have witnessed a turn towards sympathetic appreciations of his position both as a thinker and as an artist. Finally, about a century later, Lawrence studies have become 'more complex, more unstable, more unfinished' as the range and sophistication of attention paid to him increases. Lawrence is now celebrated as a cultural figure rather than merely as a writer. The

reader's response, now enormously enriched in terms of a new understanding of ideology and discourse is more open and creative. A post-modern study discovers in him a non-totalitarian, non-metaphysical and open-ended possibility of the liberation of the human mind.

Six of his major novels, viz. *The White Peacock*, *Sons and Lovers*, *The Rainbow*, *Women in Love*, *The Lost Girl* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, are explored here from the above standpoint with two additional chapters on feminism and Post-modern Lawrence.

I gratefully acknowledge my literary indebtedness to my guide Prof. Girindra Narayan Ray, Department of English, University of North Bengal, for his sincere and valuable guidance at every stage of this dissertation. I confess that but for his proper guidance this project would have been an utter impossibility. My debt to such scholars as H.T.Moore, F.R. Leavis, R.Aldington, K. Sagar, Graham Hough, is extensive and I gladly acknowledge this. I also owe my particular debt to those scholars who have enriched the history of Lawrence criticism. The staff of Grantha Bhavan, University of North Bengal, the National Library, Calcutta, the British Council, Calcutta, the North Bengal State Library, Cooch Behar, have offered me much help in locating and collecting the extracts reproduced in the dissertation. I should like to thank all the teachers of the English Department of the University of North Bengal, who helped me in very many ways in the preparation of this thesis.

Finally, I am overwhelmed the way many of my friends and well-wishers

encouraged and inspired me to complete the work. They are too numerous to be mentioned individually. My wife and children helped me by vicariously being part of this ordeal of mine. My love for all of them.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION : D.H. LAWRENCE : THE THOUGHT ADVENTURER

That D.H. Lawrence emphasized the freedom of the individual is not an idea altogether new. What is distinct and innovative is his conception of it. Freedom, says Lawrence, is a state of life 'when the sense and spirit and mind are consummated into pure unison' (Lawrence : *Phoenix*, 680). It is a perfect condition of dynamic balance between the apparently contradictory aspects of life, namely, personal and social, sensual and mental, intuitive and intellectual and so on. The understanding of life as an organic whole where the unity of the opposites sustains a pure equilibrium in conflict is the first and foremost condition for freedom. And this reconciliation of the opposites envisions a third force, the reconciler, the 'Holy Ghost'. It is a process of integration that Lawrence struggled to present in an age of split and spiritual impoverishment. D.H.Lawrence emerged as an apostle of naturalism, a vitalist, who thought in terms of bringing back the conception of 'the whole man', alive; the conception of 'the spontaneous organic being'.

D.H.Lawrence was conscious, though vaguely of this third force, as early as the first novel, *The White Peacock*. Here he introduces Annable 'a third force between nature and culture' (Kermode; 1973, 13). He 'has to be there... he makes a sort of balance' (E.T.; 1965, 117). In *Sons and Lovers*, Lawrence presented Paul, the protagonist of the novel, as a third force, the reconciler between father and mother, between animalism and idealism. But till then, D.H.Lawrence formulated no conscious metaphysical outlook in his art. From his mother's death, the crucial

stage of his life began. He gave up Louis Burrow with whom he had been engaged in the last weeks of his mother's death in December, 1910. He saw his Croydon friend, Helen Corke, for the last time; bade farewell to Jessie Chambers in the spring of 1912; met Frieda Weekley and left England with her on 3 May in that year. Those critical experiences caused Lawrence's break with the past. The nature of his engagement with fiction was also rapidly changing. In January, 1913, he had written a preface to *Sons and Lovers* which happened to acquire a metaphysical tinge. It is his first metaphysical announcement, an obscure sermon with quasi-biblical tone. But it matters much in the later development of his metaphysics.

Father, says Lawrence, is the flesh and son, the Word and the Spirit is begotten by the Holy Spirit. Father is forever 'unquestioned and unutterable', the lawgiver. Adam, the first Christ, was the flesh made Word. We are of the Word. Within the Word, the flesh is held. The son has usurped the Father and the Father withdraws from us leaving the Word in ruins. The reason is that we have exchanged the physical for mental consciousness. The woman is the Flesh; she produces man and the Father which is the Flesh. She is the door for ingoing and outcoming. Through her we go back to the Father. She stands for 'God', the Father, the Almighty, the unknowable creator. In the woman, lies the eternal continuance and from the man comes the exclamation of joy and astonishment and a new self-revelation of that which is woman to man. Every woman demands her man after his exhaustive day's work to be reborn of her. If this is violated, if her man denies her, then she turns to her son who can "never be received into her for his confirmation

and renewal and so wastes himself away in flesh" ('Original Foreward to *Sons and Lovers*' in Salgado Gamini, (ed.) 1969,p.37). The old son lover was Oedipus and the new one is legion. This is Lawrence's philosophy of Trinity that resembles the Occult Philosophy of Male, Female and the Holy Spirit :

There is in God, a Divine Masculinity by which He creates, a Divine Femininity, by which He conceives; and a Divine proceeding of the masculinity into Femininity, by which he ultimatizes. This is the truth which is concealed within the formulae of father, son and Holy Spirit. The eternal Masculinity is The Divine love. The eternal Femininity is the Divine Truth. The eternal proceeding of the Two-in-One is the Divine Ability. (Whitehead, 184).

This kind of apocalyptic theology, the scheme of the Female (mother) as law and Flesh, the male (son) as logos and the Holy Ghost (Holy Spirit) as the reconciler came to obsess him and greatly affected his later fictions. Henceforth Lawrence was different not only as an artist but also as a thought adventurer. The coming of Frieda in his life and her love for him changed him much affecting both his views on life and art. Woman, the source of Flesh, now preoccupied him. He said that 'a woman that I love sort of keeps me in direct communication with the unknown in which otherwise I am a bit lost'. (Lawrence : *Letters* (ed.) H.T. Moore, 179. Hereafter by page number). Her love provides a remedy for contemporary human malady. A few days before sending the 'Preface to *Sons and Lovers*' to Garnett, Lawrence wrote to Ernest Collins about his philosophy of 'blood knowledge' that indicates a new direction in his writing after *Sons and Lovers*'. This letter contains another attack to the Word, intellect and mind, with further elucidation of the preface and affirmation

of the Flesh:

My great religion is a belief in the blood, the flesh, as being wiser than the intellect. We can go wrong in our minds. But what our blood feels and believes and says, is always true. ...All I want is to answer to my blood, direct without fribbling intervention of mind, or moral or what not. I conceive a man's body as a kind of flame, like a candle flame, forever upright and yet flowing : and the intellect is just the light that is shed on to the things around we ought to look at ourselves and say 'My God', I am myself!'(180)

Lawrence was now altogether serious. The problem he faced lies in the establishment of a new relation or the readjustment of the old one, between man and woman. He declared that 'the source of all life and knowledge is in man and woman and the source of all living is in the interchange and the meeting and mingling of these two : man life and woman life, man knowledge and woman knowledge, man being and woman being'(280). He thought of 'the regeneration of England through a readjustment between men and women and by making free and healthy of this sex'(204). This meant for him also the liberation of sex from the cultural and mental aspirations of the good woman or from all those taboos that make man slave of the Word, of morality. His desiderated readjustment between nature and culture would start with a genuine response to and cognition of the 'blood knowledge'. In a letter to Edward Garnett, while discussing 'The Wedding Ring', he again declared the supremacy of the Law, of the Flesh and attacked the Word, the old stable ego, saying that 'but somehow - that which is physic-nonhuman, in humanity is more interesting to me than the old fashioned human element' (281). He forbade Garnett to look for the old stable ego in his novel and declared that 'there is another ego according to

whose action the individual is unrecognisable' (282). He said, 'Diamond, what ! This is carbon. And my diamond might be coal or soot and my theme is carbon'(282). In *The Rainbow*, he had envisaged a similar idea and had gone deeper into the unfathomable core of life. Here he evolved a process of 'dehumanizing' the human character, of presenting the nature and behaviour pattern of the very stuff of which human being is constituted, showing them in complex relationships with the human and non-human universe at a living moment. Catherine Carswell also refers to this new attitude when she says that Lawrence repudiated 'character' entirely and retained only the merest crust of outward form sufficient for telling a story. (Catherine Carswell, 1932, 71).

But Lawrence's metaphysics needed further and systematic development. He planned a little book on Hardy. Then the war began and he was shocked. So the Hardy Study was taken up 'out of sheer rage'. The rage was quite evident, as he said that "...it will be about anything but Thomas Hardy. I am afraid - queer stuff - but not bad' (Lawrence, *Letters*, 290). He wrote it as an answer to the great need, in the military and cultural crisis of 1914, to protect the human race from the ghastliness and hideous stupidity of war. For Lawrence, the final aim of every living thing, creature or being is 'the full achievement of itself' (Lawrence, *Phoenix* 403, Hereafter by page number). Life demands a possible plenitude for its fulfilment which is distinct for distinct beings. But instead, we go in for the wrong kind of cabbage-like self-preservation, rotten and rotting inside. The fulfilment of life, like the flowering of the poppies, depends on the degree of self-liberation from the

bondage of old self-preservative custom. The movement for women suffrage, for making more laws to protect women - are only further steps for self-preservation which implies self-degradation. Man needs the courage to let go the securities and to risk himself in a forward venture of life, as Lawrence himself learnt from Frieda to let go his own old preservative bonds. The war has shown man his strength to throw away his life, a terrible wastage of life. The only positive value of the war is that it has shown man the necessity for another war 'for the freedom of the bonds of our cowardice and sluggish greed of security and well-being; it is a fight to regain ourselves out of the grip of our own caution' (407). Repetitive work brings on mechanical boredom, from which we should be free as much as from the money-urge. Only the creative work which is performed with pleasure and satisfaction can provide us with the taste for the freedom of self.

The knowledge about life and individuality must come, from man's own self : 'If he have that which is not his own, it is a burden, he is not himself' (433). This knowledge of distinct individuality, Lawrence observes, comes at the age of twenty or thirty, when the anguish of desire to meet the female is fulfilled. And the process is the process of love, that is sexual. In sexual communion, both man and woman become fulfilled; it is a process of unification in difference. The woman is the reservoir, symbolizing stasis, and the man is the stream symbolizing motion. The man-woman relationship is a stationary state of stasis in motion. In Lawrence's opinion, the woman is the axle and the man is the hub; their relation is a frictionless whole, 'a duality that is sheerly one'. Man is not pure male but dominantly so, and

so also is the woman. Man should be re-vitalized by sexual communion with woman, and his instability should be stabilized by her. Sex is neither frictional nor a matter of relief equivalent to eating or drinking. It is a process of leaping up into the unknown : 'Life consists of the dual form of the will-to-motion and the will-to-Inertia, and everything we see and know and are, is the resultant of these two Wills'.(447) The reconciliation of these two Wills of man and woman creates a third thing that stands between Law and Love, as the 'Holy Ghost'. In the Jews, the female, that is, 'the Will-to-Inertia' was dominant; so they rushed towards degeneracy. In Europe, since the Renaissance, the northern race has sought the consummation through love and has denied the Father. Now it is time to unite Law and Love, Father and Son with the help of the 'Holy Ghost'. The Christian love is spiritual and so is one-sided and denies the Father, the flesh. But true love is dual; it is both sexual and spiritual and can fulfil both flesh and spirit. Lawrence says that since, by the Law, we are all one flesh, so love is only a closer vision of the Law. A more comprehensive interpretation : "Think not I come to destroy the Law, or the Prophets : I come not to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law, till all be fulfilled"(466). The phallic marriage serves the dual purpose. It exhausts and enriches both man and woman : 'The female at the same time exhausts and invigorates the male and the male at the same time exhausts and invigorates the female'(500). Law and Love, although contradictory, are complementary to each other. The perfect balance between Law and Love, between male and female, is

achieved in the 'Holy Ghost', 'which is beyond us but with us'. And this is the moment of perfect freedom of both man being and woman being, the moment of the flowering of life like the flowering of the poppies.

The inter-war years were the arid years for Lawrence. London seemed to him 'a hoary ponderous inferno' (Letters, 339). People were like prisoners 'with a strange abstractness, submissiveness and an isolation' (357). It was an age of 'decline and fall'(384). In 1915, Lawrence was obsessed by the idea of freedom - individual, social and political. He planned to 'gather together about twenty souls and sail away from this world of war and squalor and found a little colony'(307), his Rananim where they would be free to live by the best they know. On March 1, he wrote to Lady Ottoline Morell about his idea of integrated life and free-living :

To live, we must all unite, and bring all the knowledge into a coherent whole, we must all set to for the joining together of the multifarious parts, we must knit all words together into a great new utterance, we must cast all personalities into the melting pot, and give a new Humanity its birth It is not honour nor personal satisfaction, it is the incorporation in the great impulse whereby a great people shall come into being, a free race as well as a race of free individuals.(325)

D.H.Lawrence wished fulfilment of all desires in the flesh not in heaven but on earth. He gave a call to start a solid basis of freedom of actual living and a revolution to set free our bodies because 'there never was a free soul in a chained body'(317) and now that 'the shell, the form of life, is a prison to the life'(320), we either 'have to break the shell, the form, the whole frame, or we have got to turn to this inward activity of setting house in order and drawing up a list before we

die'(320). Similar ideas were developed more systematically and elaborately in 'The Crown'. Lawrence began it in March, 1915, gave it up temporarily, but resumed it in April and finished it in May, that year. It was rewritten between June and September. Three of its six chapters were published in Middleton Murry's short-lived review, *The Signature*. The whole thing was eventually included in the '*Reflection on the Death of a Porcupine*'.

D.H.Lawrence allegorically begins the article with a fight between the lion and the Unicorn. They are fighting for the Crown, the greatest prize, but the fight is never-ending, without any cessation or victory. The lion represents the dark intuitive nature and the Unicorn, the enlightened conscious one. Man is born in the womb of darkness, but then the mind is created within the flesh. A perfect union in opposition between the dark and the light, the unconscious and the conscious aspects forges the integrity of life. Triumph of either demolishes both : 'But who triumphs perishes' (Lawrence, *Phoenix II*, 371, hereafter by page number). The pure interrelation in opposition between flesh and spirit, their consummation through one another creates a third thing, the blossoming of life or the state of integrated free living. By way of that consummation of the spirit through the flesh, man comes to the very dark source of his life, and the way is necessarily the way of the blood, the physical. So the fulfilment comes through sexual communion between man and woman. Woman is 'the gate to the dark eternity of power, the creator's power'(377). In the sexual consummation, for the time being, man's subjective consciousness melts out into the eternal darkness of primal creative power, his sense of not-being dominates him,

and finally he is re-created, re-born into another new being, free and fresh : 'I am not, and at last I am'(378). And 'the crown is upon the consummation itself, not upon the triumph of one over another, neither in love nor in power'(381). For love is not a goal of life, but a progression towards the goal. It is relative, not absolute, for absolute love is a bondage. It is 'the hastening gravitation of spirit towards spirit and body towards body in the joy of creation'(24). But the goal of life is a state 'balanced in perfection in the midst of time and space'(26), yet 'transcendental, absolved from time and space'(26).

In 'The Crown', one theme is more positively stressed than before. It is the flux of corruption. At that period, Lawrence was disgusted with the living process that gave way to corruption and dissolution. Destruction outruns the process of creation, the two have fallen apart : 'Our every activity is the activity of disintegration, of corruption, of dissolution whether it be our scientific research, our social activity... our art... Everything alike contributes to the flux of death, to corruption, and liberates the static data of consciousness'(392). All absolutes are for Lawrence, prison walls. The "Laws" which science has invented, 'like conservation of energy, indestructibility of matter, gravitation, the will-to-live, survival of the fittest... the earth goes round the sun'(397), and so on are prison walls. In them, says Lawrence, lies the germ of our suicide or degeneracy for the lack of their proper relation to life. The beginning and the end, the death and the life, the day and the night are now fallen asunder. Our consciousness and civilization are held together only by a sort of evil rind, the forward movement to a new epoch

seems blocked. Lawrence here tries to search a way out of that situation, beginning with corruption itself : 'In corruption there is divinity.... In the soft and shiny voluptuousness of decay, in the marshy chill heat of reptiles, there is the sign of Godhead' (402) and 'corruption will at last break down for us the deadened forms, and release us into the infinity' (403). If we have our fill of destruction, then we shall again turn to creation. In life both creation and corruption go together; one fulfils the other. The blossoming of the poppies depends on the sucking of its nutrient from the heart of dark marsh. In life, we are balanced between flux of creation and flux of corruption. Our bodies are always being composed and decomposed and the nature of our fulfilment is dual. Through the fulfilment of corruption in creation, of death in life, we are 'at last born into open sky, we shall have a whole new universe to grow up into dawning aeons.... unfathomable' (404).

From 1916 to the end of the war, Lawrence remained frustrated and harassed by the political turmoil. He felt as if he were more helplessly enslaved than ever before by the foul social and political world. He became desperate and his struggle to be free was more violent and his verdict, more drastic : 'This world of ours has got to collapse now in violence and injustice and destruction' (Lawrence : *Letters*, 424. Hereafter by page number). It was to him like a 'sinking ship'. He vowed to reject this foul world : 'I will stand outside this time, I will live my life, and, if possible, be happy, though the whole world slides in horror down into the bottomless pit.... I will save myself, ... living in the greatest truth, not submitting to

the falsehood of these personal times'(424). Lawrence became more aggressive towards society and people : 'All my work is a shot at their very innermost strength'(428), 'with noiseless bullets that explode in their souls'(428). He began to hate democracy, that he previously had praised, and opposed it now for higher reality. But where is that world in which he could get that higher reality and be free?

His reply is : 'At present my real world is the world of my inner soul, which reflects on to the novel'(453). And it is the *Women in Love*, 'so end-of-the-world.'^o But it is, it must be, the beginning of a new world too, (482), 'a new heaven and a new earth'(477). Lawrence placed individual liberty above national interest : 'I do esteem individual liberty above everything. What is a nation for, but to secure the maximum of liberty to every individual?'(462). He felt that England as a nation had failed to sustain this personal freedom and he himself was a victim of that failure and had suffered much by the military harassments in the war period. He appealed to the people to break with the old reforms : 'socialists, Fabians - they are all our disease, not our hope. We want a clean sweep, and a new start' (491). And this new start would begin 'by establishing of pure relationship which makes heaven, wherein we are immortal, like the angels, and mortal like men, both' (467). This pure relationship would be, besides that of man-woman love relationship, the eternal 'friendship between man and man ... sworn, pledged, as eternal as the marriage bond' (565), and each would be complementary to the other. Lawrence's next two articles : 'The Reality of Peace' (1917) and 'The Education of the People' (1918) reflect the same desperate attitude but systematically in different ways. The former

continues the argument initiated in 'The Crown' but more artistically.

In 'The Reality of Peace', Lawrence emphasizes the proper understanding of both creative and corrupt sides of life. In his opinion, 'we, ourselves, are the living stream of seething corruption ... as well as the bright river of life' (Lawrence : *Phoenix*, 676, Hereafter by page number). Both the issues of creation and corruption come from the body : 'within our bowels flows the slow stream of corruption'(677) and 'within our veins flows the stream of life, towards the issue of pure creation'(677). In this sense man is the source of both and he need not be ashamed of the corrupt side of life. Lawrence suggests us to 'go down into ourselves, enter the hell of corruption and putrescence, and rise again, not fouled, but fulfilled and free' (677). The condition of man's inner freedom depends on his understanding that he is not only angel or devil but more than that, a full, undiminished being complete beyond both angel and devil. Creation and corruption, both are aspects of life; they, with their dynamic balance, constitute the 'systole-diastole of the physical universe'(678). Through this understanding, man can transcend the two desires, 'the desire of life and the desire of death'(680), and can comprehend fully, 'flesh and blood and bone and mind and soul and spirit (as) one rose of unison'(680), that is, his own self, whole and integrated, All things that emerges pure in man from the matrix of chaos is the rose of pure understanding. With the help of this understanding, man has to learn that death and life, and darkness and light are adjusted into a perfect equilibrium in life. It is an understanding, sensual and non-

mental : 'Understanding is not necessarily mental. It is of the senses and the spirit'(682)..

Lawrence criticizes social men for violating their deep urge, as he thought, to retain integrity in life. They are, in Lawrence's opinion, debased; they do not try to understand death in life, to encompass deadness in living activities and finally, fail to retain their singleness like stars. Lawrence's cry was to 'release me from the debased social body ... (to) let me be myself'(687). Lawrence's suggestion to achieve peace in life lies in the understanding that man is not the only creature of disintegration and of creation, but above both, he is the 'rose of perfect being'(690), 'beyond all dark and light'(690). Day and night, dark and light, creation and corruption - all are aspects of life, that stands in opposition to each other. But each of them can be understood with the help of its opposite. Their unification in dynamic balance, when achieved in life through the understanding, makes life perfect and free. The process lies in the love-hate relationship between man and woman. These two opposite poles, male in man and female in woman when united give rise to a new heaven on earth, 'a new heaven and a new earth, the heaven and earth of the perfect rose' (693).

Although the argument of 'The Reality of Peace' is somewhat similar to his argument in 'The Crown', here Lawrence laid more stress on the process of understanding, the Lawrentian understanding. In the 'Education of the People', Lawrence distinctly presented this process of understanding about life, its development through education along with his own scheme of Education. The

prevalent system of education, in Lawrence's opinion, is a failure because it cannot ensure the youths a prospect of choosing a free living of their liking according to their nature. For man, 'nature is his destiny'(602), and fulfilment of life is deeply related to his or her nature'. The goal of life lies not in the equality of man but in his singularity : 'one is one and all alone and ever more shall be so'(603). Education or for that matter growing up, Lawrence says, is a process of learning to escape the automatism of ideas and to live direct from the spontaneous, vital centre of oneself :

We've got to try to educate them to that point where at last there will be a perfect correspondence between the spontaneous, yearning, impulsive-desirous soul and the automatic *mind* which runs on little wheels of ideas' (605)

But the process of their understanding should be 'living understanding-not intellectual understanding' (607). Lawrence here differentiates these two types of understandings. Intellectual understanding is mechanical, it belongs to the technical activities. It is a process of scientific understanding of matter, dead or inert, a process towards generalization, life-denying. But the living understanding is vital and belongs to the masters of life. It is a process of understanding the creative mystery of life and of acquiring the implicit knowledge that 'life is unfathomable and unsearchable in its motives having no ascribable goal save the bringing forth of an ever-changing, ever-unfolding creation' (608). Here Lawrence plainly rejects the thought and understanding that is logical in its form. He follows the Bergsonian idea, whom he read early in 1913, that 'the categories of thought-unity, multiplicity, mechanical causality, intelligent finality etc. are too narrow and above all too

rigid to apply to life' (Bergson, 1964, P-X). Like Bergson, Lawrence could realize that the most living thought becomes frigid in the formula that expresses it, that the words turn against the idea and the idea kills the spirit. Our most ardent enthusiasm as soon as it is externalized into words is so naturally congealed into the cold calculation of interest and vanity, both individual and social, that we doubt our sincerity or deny goodness and love. That is why Lawrence's understanding is 'unfathomable and unsearchable', a paradox in itself, a process of knowing the unknowable.

The goal of education would be to create a pure individual with his 'integral separateness as the stars at night' (Lawrence, *Phoenix*, 634; Hereafter by page number). Birth is a process of breaking off all the navel connections of the mother's womb, a process of isolation from the great womb of darkness into another single being - new. For Lawrence, breaking off from the old dogmas about love, wealth, mechanical knowledge and coming out as a free individual, both in action and in being, is a second birth occasioning the purity of singleness as much as the solitary integrity :

'We shall realize at last that the highest reality for every living creature is in its purity of singleness and its perfect solitary integrity, and that everything else should be but a means to the end. All communion, all love, and all communication, which is all consciousness, are but a means to the perfected singleness of the individual being'(637)

The last word of education is that :

'marriage and deathless friendship, both should be inviolable and sacred : two great creative passions, separate, apart, but complementary : the one pivotal, the other adventurous : the one marriage, the centre of human life; and the other, the leap ahead'(665).

D.H.Lawrence's next two prominent works of nonfiction are *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* (1921) and *Fantasia of the Unconscious* (1922). They are in a sense a further development of his "Preface to *Sons and Lovers*". Here Lawrence observes that the significance of sexual or physical relationship is not only reduced but also misunderstood by the modern civilization which in its own turn, 'is achieved only at the expense of distorting our sexuality' (Kermode, 1973, 87; Hereafter by page number). It is a view that Lawrence shares with Reich and Freud. But while Reich's solution to the problem is 'orgastic and antipatriarchal and anti-authoritarian'(87), and Freud's solution is founded on heuristic method of science, Lawrence tries to solve it in a process which is anti-scientific, patriarchal and is based on occult terms. He operates a soft primitivism, whereas Freud operated for a hard one. Lawrence argues that the horrors of Freudian unconscious are propagated by mental intervention of sex, which is a perverse 'half lie' (Lawrence, Letters, 475). Although Lawrence brings in that essay, the complex 'navel-centered psychology of the baby, "negatively polarised" by "the great ganglion of the spinal system" which works for "sundering separation"'(Kermode, 88), he never goes far from his basic idea that emphasizes 'the need for self realization, the need to break away from the ruinous tyranny of idealism'(Kermode,88).

Fantasia more speculatively develops this argument. Lawrence, in this book, tries to recapture a science older than the dead mechanistic modern variety to rediscover the lost myth and symbol and 'to smatter out the first terms of a forgotten knowledge' (Kermode, 1973, 88). But his main interest is again on the individual and his wholeness which is identified with the 'Holy Ghost', the reconciler of the mother and the father in him. The mother, for Lawrence, enforces the sympathetic relation with the universal and the father, separateness. The father will 'spank', for 'the vibration of the spanking acts directly upon the spinal nervous system... the spanker transfers his wrath to the great will-centres in the child and these will-centres react intensely, are vivified and educated' (Lawrence, *Fantasia*, 88). It is a process of breaking up the sympathetic plexus, the source of which is the mother. The mother or woman no longer 'act(s) from an idea' (*Fantasia*, 121; Hereafter by page number). Eve did it and so we lost our paradise and got our sex into our head. As a consequence 'the whole man-woman game has become just a hell'(122), and now we have either 'to pass on and leave room for another race or to get rid of that disease called 'mental consciousness' or 'self-conscious idealism' or 'love'(122). The polarity of the sexes should be strictly maintained, and the way is intuitive, not mental. In Chapter XIII of the *Fantasia*, Lawrence argues that the universe is organic and every object in it maintains its own natural course with strict discipline. So we have to maintain strictly the day and night consciousness, the man-woman relationship, and have to understand that woman's business is at night and by day she is to sit half in fear. Although, there is a great deal of rubbish in the *Fantasia*, its

value lies neither in its recommendations about education nor in the subjection of woman but in 'tormenting insistence on every man's responsibility to his own uniqueness, on the possibility to his regeneration, on finding his own vital relation to the world' (Kermode, 1973, 90-91).

During the war, mostly in Cornwall, Lawrence had been reading the American novelists and Whitman. Between August 1917 and February 1919, he wrote a dozen of essays on these themes eight of which were published in the *English Review*. He revised them drastically in Sicily (1920) and again in New Mexico in 1922-23, to produce the version published in 1923 as *Studies in Classic American Literature*. These essays are the result of five years of persistent work : 'They contain a whole *weltanschauung* -- new, if old -- even a new science of psychology -- pure science' (Lawrence; *Letters*, p.596).

The book begins with a question : 'What was the American artist and what was he seeking in his departure from Europe ? And it is the freedom of the self from the institutions of European society, from Church and state, and from the identity which these imposed upon the individual. The Americans, Lawrence felt, were right in emphasizing the importance of freedom, but were wrong in their understanding of it. They failed to see how much of the old European self they carried with them to the new world. Lawrence here searched for a true natural America infested with beasts and flowers and with men of primitive physical vitality like the Red Indians under the overdeveloped palefaced America. He lays more stress on the importance of human nature and contradicts the Hegelian view that the nature of man is an

historical issue and that there is nothing in man which might not be changed by a change in his social and economic relations. Lawrence argues that there is a human nature which can provide the basis for judging the kind of self that any society must strive to create. He could not accept that man or society, by an act of choice, can determine the future of man and flatly rejected the existentialist view of Sartre that there is no such thing as human nature and that each man invents his own in his freely chosen projects. When Lawrence declared in a letter that his theme is 'carbon', he at once accepted that human nature for its most part lies in the dark unknown territory, and fulfilment of life comes according to one's own nature.

Lawrence criticized Benjamin Franklin for his incapacity to understand the self as a whole. Franklin assumed that he could provide a complete definition of man and postulated a fixed nature in man which determines his fulfilment. But his idea of the totality of human nature, Lawrence thought, is only a part, the known part of the whole man. It ignores the unknown self that 'cannot be expressed because it cannot be known in the first place' (Aidan Burns : 1980, 9, Hereafter by page number). Lawrence said that, 'I must act from my whole self but my known self is only a part of this totality'(11). Any attempt to acquire knowledge about this 'unknown self', is, in Lawrence's opinion, to enlarge the boundary of the meaning of the word 'knowledge' that was used univocally in 'the sense of the scientist and mathematician'(11), over logocentrism towards sensualism. Lawrence's idea of 'blood consciousness', the sensual understanding, antithetic to that scientific understanding is a process that goes beyond the known self. This knowledge comes

through sex or sexual love, for, 'it is an encounter whose *raison d'être* is the expansion of human consciousness through the living expression of the unknown self'(12). But Franklin undermined the place of sex in human nature in a repulsive way advising to 'rarely use the ventry but for health and offspring, never to dullness, weakness, or the injury of your own or another's peace or reputation'(Franklin : *The Autobiography* 1818, quoted from A.Burns, 11-12). This kind of attitude of Franklin illuminates his own incapacity to understand the dark side of human nature. But Crevecoeur, Lawrence observes, is rich in sensual understanding. He places man with his divinely given nature against the natural background. Nature and man in his works, together provide the ingredients for an ideal partnership. The darker side of human nature appears frequently in his writing that produces a tension between his idealism and art. Fenimore Cooper's *The Deer Slayer* provides Lawrence with a new understanding about human relationship. In this novel, the relationship between Natty Bumppo and Chingachgook, the white man and the red man, who by nature stand in stubborn opposition, opens up a new dimension of human relationship to Lawrence :

'A stark, stripped human relationship of two men, deeper than the deeps of sex. Deeper than property, deeper than fatherhood, deeper than marriage, deeper than love' (Lawrence : *Studies*, 61).

All our traditional concept of relationships like love, marriage, sex, and so on fall short in that case. Lawrence suggests that there are dimensions of the self that underlie language. Language, as an idealized version of social communication, fails to provide with a true image of the self, but the idealized image that society imposes

on him. The acceptance of the old categories of human relationship implies the acceptance of the old dead form of life. This insight helps Lawrence 'to break free from the false set of concepts.... (to) open a path to the dark forest in the soul and put him once again in contact with the deeper resources of life' (Burns, A. : 1980, 16. Hereafter by page number). In his study of Hawthorne, Lawrence recognizes that physical consciousness is as much essential to life as the spiritual consciousness, to retain integrity in life. The spiritual consciousness becomes fake if it dominates over the physical side, and the integrity of life is violated. Man's spiritualism comes to a test in his real sexual contact with a woman and 'a spiritual relation between them based on their known selves will always be threatened'(20). In sexual communion, woman appeals her man beyond the cosy concept of himself as a spiritual being to the dark forest in his soul. In that encounter, his belief as a spiritual being is undermined. So in carrying on the old spiritual European Self with them, the Americans, Lawrence observes, insinuate towards a new dimension of life that 'good and evil are both necessary and therefore in a higher sense *good* for the growth of a new self more sensitively adjusted to those unknown dimensions of human nature'(20).

In Melville, Lawrence found a similarity of his own view about primitivism. Melville was attracted by the idea of the noble savage but found in the end wholly inadequate. Lawrence also tried to see over our horizon towards the primitive life to enlarge our concept of life. But 'there can be no going back' (Lawrence; *Studies*,

129) for Lawrence because the regression to the life of the savage is an antithesis to the definition of the purpose of human life as the extension of consciousness. Lawrence's preference to the primitive life and rejection of mental life, his fascination with the Etruscans, with the Indians, and in England, with gypsies and gamekeepers and above all his own wandering in rural Italy, Sicily and Mexico, suggest his ceaseless search for an alternative to the *cul-de-sac* into which our modern culture has condemned us.

To be precise, the ambiguities of American fiction arose out of the conflict between two different concepts of man, spiritual and physical. This gave birth to two moralities, one of the author and another of the tale. The author's morality is old European morality, according to which the soul is superior to the body. But against the author's conscious intention, the morality of the tale rebels and is bent on the destruction of the old spiritual morality. Lawrence discovered in Whitman, an end of this conflict between body and soul. Whitman^t located the soul into the body, and the soul once more becomes the *anima* of the body, the first principle of life in living things : 'Whitman divests the soul of its thin spirituality and plants it firmly in the flesh, in the limbs, in the lips and in the belly' (Lawrence : *Studies*, 162-63). Lawrence admires him for his taking the body seriously. A similar view is expressed by Nietzsche when he says that we must start with the body and 'inaugurate culture in the right place - not in the soul the right place is the body, demeanour, diet, physiology : the rest follows' (Nietzsche : 1889, 101). Like Nietzsche, Lawrence was dismayed at the ways in which the individual becomes a

slave of ideas and society is stultified in its growth by a fixed conception of the self or of right. For Lawrence, as for Nietzsche, the future of the self is open. Lawrence's realization is that it is neither the spirit nor the body to which he can subject himself. He can subject himself only to the 'Holy Ghost', the reconciler. Precisely, Lawrence maintains in the *Studies* that man must never lead his life by reference to a blueprint such as the one provided by Franklin in his system of maxims. Any attempt to situate the self within a system of concepts can subvert its freedom. Lawrence suspects all philosophical abstractions of man, because such abstractions can present only a truncated view of man. Lawrence trusts only the novel, 'the bright book of life'. Only in the novel, he says, can we perceive the whole man alive with darker side of his nature that always eludes our effort to capture it in words.

The *Studies* is Lawrence's major nonfictional work of the second period. During that period, Lawrence being obsessed by the leadership idea, wrote most of *Kangaroo* and the first draft of *The Plumed Serpent*, then called *Quetzalcoatl* in 1923 and after drastic revision in the next year, he completed its final version now entitled *The Plumed Serpent*. In February, 1925, he suffered from fatal illness and left Mexico for good in the following autumn. He stayed in England for a short time and then also left it in October that year. Apart from a few weeks in the late summer of 1926, he never returned to his country and continued to wander, living in Majorca, Tuscany and Provence and then settled for almost two years in the Villa Mirinda near Florence. During these last five years of his life, Lawrence, though in the worst of his health, remained artistically prolific. At that period, apart from fiction, he

wrote the travel book *Etruscan Places*, and essays like, 'Apropos to Lady Chatterley's Lover', 'Pornography and Obscenity' and the unfinished *Apocalypse*. This period shows a sharp change of Lawrence's attitude to life and art. He rejected the leadership idea that had obsessed him in the after-war period and turned again back to his familiar theme of love and sex. He now began to reinvigorate the old pre-Christian religion based on physical communion and phallic knowledge. For him now, 'the phallus is a great sacred image' which 'represents a deep, deep life which has been denied in us'. (Lawrence, *Letters*, 967). In a letter to Witter Bynner on 13 March, he confessed that :

The hero is obsolete and the leader of man is a back number. After all at the back of the hero is the militant ideal : leader-cum-follower relationship is a bore. And the new relationship will be some sort of tenderness, sensitive, between man and man, and man and woman, and not the one up one down, lead on I follow, *ich dien* sort of business.... I feel one still has to fight for the phallic reality, as against the non-phallic cerebration unrealities. I suppose the phallic consciousness is part of the whole consciousness... To me it's a vital part' (Lawrence, *Letters*, 1045-46).

In *Etruscan Places*, Lawrence recreates imaginatively the lost civilization of Tuscany, dominated by the emblem of phallus and womb. It had been, in his opinion, a culture deeper and more beautiful than the Romans who conquered it. What Lawrence has discovered in the Red Indians, a blood-centered civilization, is also present in Italy, where people are 'always kept in touch physically with the mysteries' (Lawrence, *Etruscan Places*, III).

During the war years, Lawrence read works on Occult symbolism and

Theosophy. He asked Lady Ottoline Morell in January 1916, to send him the Homeric Hymns and Orphic religions (*Letters*, 416). Later on, he did some quite extensive reading in Apocalyptic scholarship. He met Frederick Carter, a wellknown Occultist who was writing a book entitled *The Dragon of the Apocalypse*. Lawrence read the first draft in Mexico, and afterwards wrote the preface for Carter's book, a much longer introduction which was published posthumously as the unfinished *Apocalypse*. Here Lawrence interpreted the astrological scheme of Revelation, too fundamental for rational explanation or scientific description. Lawrence said that St. John's book was a 'revelation of Initiation experience, a manual of esoteric lore derived from the ancient pagans, corrupted by later Jewish and Christian editors' (Lawrence, *Apocalypse*, C.U.P., 4). Lawrence believed in the existence of true and ancient knowledge which Christianity has repressed with the doctrine of spiritual salvation. He observed that 'the religious system of the pagan world did what Christianity has never tried to do. They gave a true correspondence between the material cosmos and the human soul In them science and religion were in accord' (Lawrence, *Phoenix-II*, 227). He wished a fresh start away from intellect with the polarity downwards and wanted 'sceptre, not the logos' (*Letters*, 745), the end of the domination of the logos, the Word, and to restore a balance between the spiritual and the sensual planes for existence that Christianity with its emphasis on the spirit and the mind has destroyed. In his opinion 'what man passionately wants is his living wholeness and his living unison' (Lawrence, *Apocalypse*; 149). Only

through recognition of the duality inherent in the cosmos and in man's being and by transcending it, can that living wholeness be achieved. And this is for man the state of freedom achieved with the help of the 'Holy Ghost'.

Apocalypse is a searching examination of our civilization and a radical criticism of Christianity and scientific technology. But it is also a revelation of Lawrence's belief in man's power to create 'a new heaven and a new earth'. In this book, Lawrence condemns nearly all our contemporary ways of life and searches for the causes of our malaise in the failure of Christian and democratic ideals. *Apocalypse* recognizes the need to give homage to the natural power and greatness of a man 'who transmits the life of the universe' (Lawrence, *Letters*, 994). The same belief was expressed by Blake when in *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, he said that 'the worship of God is : Honouring his gifts in other men, each according to his genius, and loving the greatest men best; those who envy or calumniate great men hate God; for there is no other God' (Blake : *Complete Writings* (ed) Geoffrey Keynes, 158). Lawrence's view of man as an incarnation of God is strikingly similar to the view of Tolstoy, the great Russian novelist, who in his revolutionary book *War and Peace*, made Pierre, one of the protagonists, to think that :

'.... life is everything. Life is God. Everything changes place and moves, and this movement is god. And while there is life, there is the joyful awareness of the divinity. To love life is to love God' (Victor Shklovsky : *Lev Tolstoy*, p.330)

Lawrence believes that man needs to regain the imaginative and spiritual

values which alone can restore the sense of living connection and wholeness, lost in our scientific and materialistic age. The *Apocalypse* embodies Lawrence's final vision of man and the cosmos and is his last testament of belief 'in the symbolic value of art as the way to creative integration' (*Apocalypse*, 24).

Lawrence tries to give shape to this speculation in his last novel, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, a phallic novel, but not pornographic. It is his drastic attempt 'to make the sex relation valid and precious, instead of shameful' (*Letters* 972), a shock therapy, 'a bit of a revolution in itself - a bit of a bomb' (*Letters*, 104). But in order to heal man from the disease of 'the cerebral sex-consciousness' and to provide 'the phallic consciousness', Lawrence has to defend his stand with further elucidation of this speculation in his two essays: 'Pornography and Obscenity' (1929) and 'A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover' (1930). In the 'Pornography and Obscenity', Lawrence contradicts the prevalent view that 'sex appeal in art is pornography' (Lawrence : *Phoenix* 174, Hereafter by page number), and says that sex is 'a very powerful, beneficial and necessary stimulus in life ... (a) warm natural flow like a form of sunshine' (174). 'Pornography', he says 'is the attempt to insult sex, to do dirt on it'(175). The sex functions and the excrementory functions in the body work very close together. But they are quite different. Sex is a creative flow but excrementory function is de-creative and disintegrative. Modern man has lost his power of proper identification and differentiation. The two streams have become identical for him due to his psychic deterioration, and sex has become a dirt to him. We should be free in our understanding about sex for, the suppression of sex as 'a

dirty little secret' will kill the dynamic sex altogether. The urge of life that is within man always surpasses his conscious individuality. We have to understand that 'each individual has sex, and is pivoted on sex'(187).

Lawrence's next article 'A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover', an expansion of 'My Skirmish With Jolly Roger' (1929) is a kind of desperate attempt to justify his unconventional phallic novel. But, simultaneously it conveys much of Lawrence's mature thought and ideas about sex and marriage. He desired 'men and women to be able to think sex, fully, completely, honestly and cleanly' (Lawrence : *A Propos of Lady Chatterby's Lover and Other Essays*, Pen, 1961, 89, Hereafter by page number). It is not that Lawrence wanted more sexual activities; he wanted a 'full conscious realization of sex' (89), and 'a proper reverence for sex' (90). He advocated proper sexual education not only for those who are ignorant of sex but also for those who are advanced and 'play with the toys of life, sex being one of the chief toys'(91). We now live, in his opinion, in a world of fake sexual emotion and love is a counterfeit feeling today that 'at last maddens, or else kills, sex, the deepest sex in the individual'(97). But sex, argues Lawrence, remains always pure. What is obscene is the 'antisexual defiance' or the counterfeit sex. Marriage brings one wholeness and integrity. It has religious sanctions in all ages and is a sacred ritual. But marriage should be basically and permanently phallic. He says :

The phallus is a column of blood that fills the valley of blood of a woman. The great river of male blood touches to its depths the great river of female blood - yet neither breaks its bounds. It is the deepest of all communions, as all the religions, in practice, know.

And it is one of the greatest mysteries, in fact, the greatest, as almost every initiation shows, showing the supreme achievement of the mystic marriage'(112).

D.H.Lawrence has also much to say about art and art-form, especially the novel and his views are deeply held views, reinforcing those of life and living. As early as 1912, he defended the construction of *Sons and Lovers*, protesting against the conventional idea of art-form and remonstrated saying that 'they want me to have *their* pernicious ossiferous skin-and-grief form, and I won't' (Lawrence : *Letters*, 172. Hereafter by page number). This kind of critical attitude to traditional art-form implies not only his greater understanding about art-form but also its deeper significance to the form of life, he presented in his art. He forbade us to look for the development of his novel following the lines of certain characters. But the characters, he says, fall 'into the form of some other rhythmic form, as when one draws a fiddle-bow across a fine tray delicately sanded, the sand takes lines unknown'(282). This is an idea of the form of the novel, quite life-like, unknown and unprecedented. That is why, Lawrence contradicted Arnold Bennett when he complained against him, for the lack of form in his novel, and said :

'Tell Arnold Bennett that all rules of construction hold good only for novels which are copies of other novels. A book which is not a copy of other books has its own construction, and what he calls faults, he being an old imitator, I call characteristics. I shall repeat till I am grey-'(399).

Lawrence's idea of art-form is dynamic, 'a revelation of two principles of Law and Love in a state of conflict, yet reconciled' (Lawrence : *Phoenix*, 477). Just

as these two must always meet under fresh conditions, so form must also be always different. He argues that 'each work of art has its own form which has no relation to any other form' (*Phoenix*, 477), and that the criterion of a good or a bad novel lies as much in its degree to represent life in its livingness and integrity as in its 'struggling for freedom from dead categories and restrictive judgements' (James, H. : *Art of Fiction*, 16).

Lawrence wished to be a pirate or a highwayman to shoot those social men with noiseless bullets that would explode in their souls. 'All my work is a shot at their innermost strength' (Lawrence : *Letters* 428), he says and perhaps this was one of the reasons for the disapproviation of some of his novels. Lawrence, by the declaration that 'one must be an outlaw these days, not a teacher or a preacher' (*Letters*, 433), was at once detached as a novelist from the previous generation. He simply rejected the idea that 'a novel is a novel, as a pudding is a pudding and that our only business with it could be to swallow it' (James : *Art of Fiction*, 35). A book, to Lawrence, should be either a bandit or a rebel that would either shock the readers out of their false self-consciousness or shoot them :

'...after all the world is not a stage ... nor a theatre ! nor a showhouse of any sort. And art especially novels, are not little theatres where the reader sits aloft and watches - like a god with a twenty-lira ticket and sighs, commiserates, condons and smiles... And that's what my books are not and never will be. ... But whoever reads me will be in the thick of the scrimmage, and if he does not like it - if he wants a safe seat in the audience - let him read somebody else' (Lawrence : *Letters*, 827).

It is a belief, antithetical to Arnold Bennett's view that multitudes read fiction just to pass away time ; but similar to the opinion of Butler, the literary 'bad boy', who said that 'social education is a humbug and moral and religious ideas have no foundation' (Long M.J.,: 1977, 590). Lawrence was dissatisfied with the prevalent trends of novel. In the 'Surgery for the Novel or a Bomb', he said that both serious and popular novels need 'some sort of surgical operation' (*Phoenix*, 518); for the former is centered on 'self-consciousness' with an 'application of the author's discoveries of their (readers') reactions', almost a post-mortem behaviour; and the latter produces 'a funny sort of self', 'purely emotional and self-analytical'. Philosophy and fiction parted company and as a consequence the novel suffered to be sloppy and philosophy abstract and dry. 'The two should come together again - in the novel'(52) claims Lawrence. Every novel must have at its depth some theory of being, some metaphysic. But the metaphysic must always subserve the artistic purpose beyond the artist's consciousness. It is an idea not far from Henry James, who said as follows :

The story and the novel, the idea and the form are the needle and the thread and I never heard of a guild of tailors who recommended the use of the thread without the needle or the needle without the thread' (James: *Art of Fiction*,49).

Lawrence observes that art has become optical, an 'objective reality', complete in itself and man has become what he sees; 'he makes himself in his own image''due to the development of his conscious ego' (Lawrence : *Phoenix*, 523. Hereafter by page number) - a truncated view about life, not vitally related to the

flux of time and space, thus dead. Lawrence says that nothing is true or good or right except in its own living relatedness to its own 'circumambient universe', and the form of art is a process of recognizing that relationship in the creative flux. The purpose of art, Lawrence argues, is to 'reveal the relation between man and his circumambient universe, at the living moment'(527). In this sense, Lawrence is truly a philosopher artist who attributes to art the great function of creating harmony, interrelatedness. Indeed, the novel for him is the highest example of interrelatedness that man has ever discovered. It is the one 'bright book of life' (535). As a tremulation, it can make 'the whole man alive and tremble'(535), more than 'poetry, philosophy, science or any other book-tremulation can do'(535). They all deal with different bits of man, not with the man in his organic wholeness. That is why he declared :

'I am a novelist. And being a novelist I consider myself superior to the saint, the scientist, the philosopher, and the poet, who are all great masters of different bits of man alive, but never get the whole hog'(535).

Only in the novel are all things given a full play giving us the impression that life itself and not its inert safety, is the reason for living. Keith Sagar acknowledges this attitude of Lawrence to both life and art when he says that at bottom Lawrence is 'not concerned with art' but 'concerned with life and makes art servant of life' (K.Sagar, 1966,p.2). Lawrence's view that the novel is like life, a living thing an organic whole, is a further confirmation of Henry James' definition of the novel that 'a novel is a living thing, all one and continuous, like any other organism and in

portion as it lives will it be found that in each part there is something of other parts.' (James : *Art of Fiction*, 44). This idea of the novel resembles Coleridge's notion of the 'intuitive growth of the work of art from seed' (*Art of Fiction*, 16). Clearly Lawrence forbade us to care for the didactic statement in a novel for it may be simply wrong. He called upon us to listen 'to the low, calling cries of the characters, as they wander in the dark woods of their destiny' (Lawrence : *Phoenix*, 760). The right message might be there. It echoes what he has said in the *Studies in Classic American Literature* : 'trust the tale not the teller', evincing a process of dissociation of art from the artist, of art becoming an objective entity with which the readers may have to struggle or 'scrimmage'.

In what follows, I propose to interpret the major novels of D.H.Lawrence. I would carry with me his message as a philosopher, but would at the same time try to discover the artist that he supremely is. His novels constitute the other proper site for the study of his odyssey for human freedom. Here meanings are produced and reproduced through the fictionality of the texts which are more free than have hitherto been thought of. They deliver insights not always identical with the author's conscious preaching. We would however try to establish as far as possible a correspondence between them. Of the Chapters that follow six will be devoted to his six major novels : *The White Peacock*, *Sons and Lovers*, *The Rainbow*, *Women in Love*, *The Lost Girl* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. The seventh chapter will explore Lawrence's treatment of his women characters and what the feminist critics think of him, while the penultimate one will explore post-modern views and ideas about

Lawrence and his supremacy as an artist. Lastly, necessary attempt has been made to demonstrate that Lawrence as an artist has succeeded in delivering his message of freedom and delivered it most powerfully.

: : : : : :

Chapter II

THE WHITE PEACOCK

D.H.Lawrence began *The White Peacock*, his first novel as a romance entitled 'Laetitia' at Easter 1906. He was then living at home and teaching in Eastwood. He took up the task of fiction writing in a light mood, in a bid to escape the dull monotony of his life. Writing on 4 May 1908, when he began to attend Nottingham University College, he recalled his boredom in 1906 saying : 'it was imperative that I should do something, so I began to write a novel' (Letters, Vol.I, C.U.P.,p.49). He completed the first version in June, 1907. It portrays with sentimental melodrama 'the strained relationship between a hysterical young wife Lettie and her passive husband George, and the lurking threat and attraction of her ex-lover Leslie who has made her pregnant and then jilted her'(Robertson, Andrew, Introduction of *The W.P.*, C.U.P., 1983 XVII). This version appeared to Jessie Chambers, Lawrence's first girl-friend, unimpressive, 'story-bookish and unreal' and Lawrence, however, was not quite pleased with the first version of *The White Peacock*. He set to rewrite it. Now what matters most is that the novel's gradual development from the first version, then called 'Laetitia' to the final version called *The White Peacock*, depicts really Lawrence's own development as a writer, the gradual unfolding of his understanding about life – a real self-progress. And different versions of the novel may be called the different layers of his understanding about life.

The second version, written between July 1907 and April 1908, was a great development upon the previous one; the story was radically altered and 'the characters became more like flesh and blood', except Cyril, who remained unchanged, 'old

maidish'. In the present version, Lawrence had his eyes fixed on George. Also, he introduced a new character, Annable, apparently an unpolished brute, who comes closer to a typical Lawrentian hero, embodying his dark philosophy of life. To a repeated inquiry of Jessie, about Annable's appearance, Lawrence replied : 'He has to be there. Don't you see why ? He makes a sort of balance. Otherwise it's too much one thing, too much me' (E.T., p.117). But Lawrence, still uncertain about artistic perfection of the new version, wished 'the ointment of somebody's sincere criticism' (E.T.50) and Jessie was to him valueless as a critic for 'she approves much'. So, through Alice Dax, Lawrence invited Blanche Jennings 'to criticise some of the writings of mine that purports to be a novel' (E.T. 43). Her remark about the book partly dissatisfied Lawrence, but he accepted her judgement. On 3 August he replied :

Your remark on 'Laetitia' is exceedingly just. If you think it worth trouble, I will write the thing again, and stop up the mouth of Cyril - I will kick him out - I hate the fellow - I will give Lettie a few rough shakings. I will keep Alice all the way through' (E.T.,pp.68-69).

In the next version, he cut down Cyril's comments and continued Alice's important role in Part III of the novel. But all these are concerned mainly with thematic addition and alteration. His girl-friends could not critically comment on its technical defects, its prolixity and its flowery style.

Meanwhile, Lawrence left Eastwood for a teaching job at Croydon in October,1908. The new situation at Croydon created new problems to him but not without providing with a new insight into life. His continuous struggle for self-adjustment, his hard striving to tame the 'wild school-children' and above all his

endeavour to be self-possessed in that situation equipped him with a new understanding about life and art. He now thought about writing a serious thing not merely a means to overcome the boredom of life he had experienced earlier. At that transitional phase, however, he chanced upon *Eugenie Grandet*, a novel by Balzac. The novel provided him with a new understanding of life and also the way to express it, a technique entirely new to him, more purposeful and effective to represent life. To him, the book seemed to be a perfect novel and he said : 'It is wonderfully concentrated; there is nothing superfluous, nothing out of place. Can you find a touch of melodrama, or caricature, or flippancy ? It is all in tremendous earnestness, more serious than all the profundities of German thinkers, or affecting than all English bathos' (Lett, C.U.P., Vol.I,91). This critical response to Balzac enabled Lawrence to detect his own faults :

I have nearly read 'Laetitia'. It bores me mightily in parts. You can none of you find one essence of its failure; it is that I have dragged in conversation to explain matters that two lines of ordinary prose would have accomplished far better; I must cut out my pages of talk and replace them with a few paragraphs of plain description and narrative... (Lett, 92).

The next stage of development in writing of the novel now retitled 'Netheremere' in 1909, is confirmed by Arthur Macleod, the only man on the staff of Davidson Road School. In this version, Lawrence radically changed the construction of the novel bringing in the qualities and techniques he had so much admired in Balzac. With his newly awakened interest in a new type of language and style, comparatively less rhapsodic and less flowery, he tried to portray his characters in a new descriptive method instead of relying on dialogue. Here although Cyril is made into a more distant narrator,

he remained opinionated and moralistic. George and Lettie, each having married safely in keeping with their social ranks rather than their instincts, found life hollow. The novel 'shifts from romantic illusion to startling disillusionment' (Intro. *The W.P. C.U.P.* XXIV). In Jessie's opinion, this version was an immense stride forward from the first conception. But her serious comment that : 'he struck me as a figure of sinister prophecy. It seems to me not without significance that in this first novel Lawrence should portray no fewer than three men whose lives come to complete frustration'; contributes to Lawrence's later role as a dark prophet. The published version of 'Netheremere' was retitled as *The White Peacock*.

D.H.Lawrence was initially inspired by George Eliot's mode of novel writing. Out of his frequent studies of George Eliot, he developed a conception that 'the usual plan is to take two couples and develop their relationships' (E.T. 97). But 'anyhow, I don't want a plot, I should be bored with it. I shall try two couples for a start' (E.T. pp.97-8). Indeed, he seemed to have found himself through his close study of George Eliot. H.M.Daleski, while analysing her influence on Lawrence, says that in *The White Peacock*, the action is set in motion by the dynamics of a triangle, not coupling. Lettie Beardsall is attracted by George, though she is involved with Leslie Tempest. Lawrence, in Daleski's opinion, followed the pattern laid down by George Eliot in her *The Mill on the Floss*, for three reasons : firstly 'it exemplified the simple but effective method of organizing a novel', secondly, 'it offered a tangible means of realizing the aim he wished to set for himself as a novelist, and thirdly, 'it spoke to his own deepest experience as a young man' (Meyers, J. (ed), 1985, 57). But Daleski has overemphasized Eliot's

influence on Lawrence. He has gone so far as to identify *The White Peacock* as a slavish imitation of *The Mill on the Floss* :

'The signs of her influences are stamped everywhere in his first novel, where we might expect to see them most innocently displayed - to a degree that *The White Peacock* may be read as Lawrence's rewriting of *The Mill on the Floss*' (Meyers, J. (ed); 1985, 53).

Such a radical opinion implies that Daleski has tried either to disapprove of Lawrence's talent as a writer or to accord him less significance than he deserves. Lawrence's criticism of *The Mill on the Floss* is that George Eliot did not solve the problem she had raised through Maggie, but drowned her in order to evade the conflict and that she had 'gone and spoilt half way through'. Lawrence could not forgive the marriage of vital Maggie Tulliver to crippled Philip and said; 'it was wrong, wrong. She could never have made her do it' (E.T., pp.97-8). This criticism of George Eliot issued from a new insight about life itself which was at work as he was writing his first novel. *The White Peacock*, therefore, remains strictly Lawrentian, both in theme and style, free from any kind of outer influences. It adumbrates all of Lawrence's preoccupations which he would explore and resolve in all his later *oeuvre*.

The main plot of the novel centres on Littie Beardsall, a timid woman. She fails to deal properly with the vicissitudes of both love and life and finally loses her spontaneous manner and personal autonomy. She is victimized by social circumstances for which she cannot shirk responsibility. She has to suffer a split personality because of her desperate craze for high social status and ultimate success in this venture. She ties the knot with Leslie Tempest, an aristocrat coal merchant. But, ironically she finds it so

difficult to love him, pushing aside from her mind George Saxton whom she did really love from the core of her heart. Thus she was divided in herself, failing to act in tune with her inner urge and impulse. She profited in the bargain a divided self, a split personality.

In the triangular love relationship, Lettie's true lover is George, the son of the soil. He is 'stoutly built, brown eyed with naturally fair skin burned dark and freckled in patches' (*The White Peacock*, 41, Hereafter by page number). George Sax(t)on is a representative of primitive rural England, as his surname implies. There is an unsympathetic primitive vigour in him. While visiting Felley Mill with his friend Cyril Beardsall, he catches hold of one of the flying bees, teases it and finally crushes it between the fingers as a game. Again, on another occasion, both Lettie and Cyril release the injured cat, Mickie Ben from the trap and give it warm milk to drink. But George kills it by drowning, an act of unsentimental primitivism that compels his sister Emily to say that there is something too loathsome about him which fills her with disgust. True to his nature, George is a man of action. He feels at home in nature. He is physically more active than vocal and keeps himself aloof from verbal humbug. This personal distinction leads Lettie to think about George that he is 'either asleep or stupid'(58). Also this primitive fervour in him attracts Lettie and she deliberately engages herself to the task of arousing his interest towards her through physical intimacy. She plays the piano, sings love songs to him, and sitting very close to him, she catches 'the swelling of his arms, as he moved them', 'the rise and fall of his breast' and 'the white flesh of his throat'. Their love relation begins to develop through physical urge where words and

speeches scarcely matter, a Lawrentian conception of love that we would see more developed in his later novels. But, in the present novel, the love relationship between George and Lettie is sketchily drawn and Lawrence does not attain the depth and complexity that it demands.

Lettie wants George as her lover, but is reluctant to accept him as she finds him, an unsophisticated, unrefined primitive fellow. George should be refined in taste and raised in status. Lettie loves him but hates his status and position. Occasionally she makes sarcastic comments about his simple life-style and primitive vigour. But in spite of her dissatisfaction with his lifestyle, she gradually comes closer to him. She appears to be mesmerised by his physical charm and yet holds herself back :

‘Their eyes met in the briefest flash of glance, then both turned their faces aside. Thus averted, one from the other, they made talk. At last she rose, gathered the books together, and carried them off. At the door she turned. She must steal another keen moment’(73).

In the idyllic scene, one of the finest scenes in the book, George’s rhythmic physical grace tempts Lettie to come closer and to touch him :

“Do you know” she said suddenly, “your arms tempt me to touch them. They are such a fine brown colour, and they look so hard”. He held out one arm to her. She hesitated, then she swiftly put her finger tips on the smooth brown muscle, and drew them along. ...She looked at him, full at physical beauty, as if he were some great firm bud of life’(94).

It is an intimate moment between George and Lettie. Here, Lettie’s love for George symbolically represents her love for natural rural England, for George is a representative of primitive, rural and agricultural England. The decline of agricultural England implies George’s decline. Lawrence, here, presents two prominent causes for George’s decline :

firstly, he is rejected by Lettie whom he thinks to be an inseparable partner of his life, his source of creative power', and secondly, the decline of agricultural England. While writing this novel, Lawrence was acutely conscious of the ruinous impact of industrialization on agriculture. He provides a brief account of this damaging effect of the flourishing industrialism on agriculture. The contemporary landowners considered agriculture an unprofitable business, and began to reap more profit from rich coal mines. Lawrence's hint at this agrarian problem is further confirmed by Haggard's report about South Nottinghamshire :

'The general position was one of chronic depression and farmers as a whole were on a lower level than they used to be. Both rents and selling values had fallen about forty percent. ... In conclusion, Mr. Brett said that he did not take a favourable view of the prospects of Nottinghamshire land and those who cultivated it, as the agricultural interests there were going steadily down the hill' (Haggard, 1902, *Rural England*, Vol. II, pp.258-59)

This historical change from the agricultural England to the industrial one affects the simple farming lifestyle. For the first time in his life, George begins to feel insecure about his daily needs because farming is 'running wild and unprofitable' (113). It is a threat to his free living. But what can he do? The answer comes from Lettie :

'Here you can't live as you like - in anyway or circumstance. You're like a bit out of those coloured marble mosaics in the hall, you have to fit in your own set, fit into your own pattern, because you're put there from the first. But you don't want to be like a fixed bit of a mosaic - you want to fuse into life, and melt and mix with the rest of folk, to have some things burned out of you'(113).

This burning that Lettie tells about is nothing else than burning of his primitivism, his wildness, his reckless freedom to enjoy life.

While Lettie devotedly loves George; her 'Taurus', and initiates plans to tame him, Leslie Tempest, an aristocrat, on the other hand, loves Lettie with a monopolistic attitude towards her. Leslie is a youth with 'fine lithe physique, suggestive of much animal vigour, his person was exceedingly attractive'(89-90). But he is more mental than physical, more conscious than sensitive, quite opposite of George in lifestyle. He shows tenacious loyalty to Lettie with occasional prattle about his blue blood. Although he is not unaware of Little-George love relationship, yet he remains indifferent to its profundity. George is, to him, a 'common fellow' having no refined taste and aristocratic status, so is quite unmatched with Lettie as her lover. As a true predecessor of Clifford Chatterley of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Leslie considers love a light sentimental issue that develops through verbal tricks, the necessary condition for it being the refined aristocratic taste and status. He has no capacity to understand the underlying assumption that love is more physical than mental.

Leslie symbolically represents modern England with its flourishing industrialism. His prosperity insinuates into the development of fake, counterfeit, mechanical lifestyle that implies the decline of George and decadence of the values he stands for, the unsophisticated natural qualities of life. Leslie's love for Lettie is shallow, non-vital and devoid of a spark of life. But he has one thing, the financial privilege that enchants Lettie. She, despite her initial antipathy towards him, gradually falls for him, thus deceives her own self. It is not her physical urge but her greed for wealth and position that turns her towards Leslie. She now wishes not to let him out of her control. One day, Leslie passes her in the street without even saying hello, a behaviour, she thinks

despicable, that enrages her. In her subsequent meeting, she takes revenge on him keeping herself silent and unresponsive throughout his inquiry. She does it intending to bring him closer to her, a perverse act of her split personality. Her strong desire for financial security creates within herself an attraction towards Leslie. But a fake love-relationship bereft of physical urge always remains 'cold' and such a relationship is 'but a fading dawn'(138). Lettie wants Leslie when he remains out of her sight, but when she meets him, his emotional humbug sometimes causes her vexation. She occasionally stops Leslie by saying : 'what are you making so many words about ?' (138). More social than individual as she has been, she fails to realize that life is a law unto itself and that the demand of intuitive life always does not cognise social status and position. She surrenders herself to Leslie's proposal to be engaged with him.

Immediately after her verbal engagement with Leslie, she visits George at his house, makes love with him forgetting for the time being, altogether about her engagement with Leslie. In the dark night, both George and Lettie get out of home to bring some mistleto. There in the dark :

'She leaned forwards and upwards to pierce the darkness; he also straining to look, felt her breath on his cheek, and turning, saw the pallor of his face close to his, and felt the dark glow of her eyes. He caught her in his arms, and held her mouth in a kiss. Then, when he released her, he turned away, saying something incoherent about going to fetch the lantern to look'(152).

Their communion is so deep that Cyril feels 'the light seemed to hold them as in a globe, in another world, apart from the night in which I stood'(152). This love relation is spontaneous, physical and beyond verbal expression. It expresses itself suggestively to

the sensual understanding where words and speeches are 'incoherent'.

The bond of love that binds Lettie and Leslie is spun out of superficiality, frigidity and artificiality. It however reminds Leslie of the natural and spontaneous and flesh-to-flesh love between George and Lettie. Leslie, now disheartened with the thought of George's predominance over Lettie, plans to detach her from George. On the occasion of Lettie's birthday, in which she comes of age, Leslie presents her with a gold ring decorated with sapphires and diamonds apparently as a token of love, but implicitly, as an allurements to confine Lettie into his family circle on the pretext of love. He wishes to be the master of Lettie. He also wants Lettie to be his, completely his woman. George's physical presence at the birthday party, a matter of overwhelming joy to Lettie, would be a matter of consternation to Leslie. When he hears from Lettie about George's possibility to attend the party, he angrily bites his moustache. To be precise, he may be a weak lover, but is a strong master. He exerts pressure on Lettie only to exploit her physically for he has nothing to offer her. He appears to Lettie like one of those of her friends in whom she feels 'there was nothing ... than they tired me'(171). But it is George who 'would for ever hang fire' in her. Her greedy nature makes George 'Cinderalla', the neglected or despised person. Openly she neglects George for his lower status and down-to-earth simplicity, but her inner self is always burning for him. Her love for George develops due to the urge of her flesh and blood and she is unable to resist temptation to love George. Indeed, Lettie's mental effort to reject George implies her tendency to divert herself from the source of her life. This diversion is a result of her forced engagement with Leslie to whom she surrenders but cannot accept. The

conversation between Lettie and Leslie discloses Lettie's mental conflict. She is reluctant even to continue her conversation with Leslie and stops him by saying: 'what's the use of saying anything when there is nothing immediate to say'(154). Such a remark implies that she is going to marry the man she never has loved and she is a tormented soul. But immediately afterwards, she inquired of Cyril about George and is eager to listen to talk about him. Although betrothed to Leslie, she is unable to keep herself off from the temptation to continue her 'forbidden game' of love with George. But what for?

The answer comes from Lettie. While wandering with her friends, she comes to open nature. Its primitive fervour stimulates her memory of the past. She realizes that she has come in close contact with nature through George Sax(t)on, the guru of her living wisdom. Her vital relation with him and nature provide her with a new insight about life, mainly physical. George's spontaneous activities, the rhythmic functions of his body while he reaps the corns, his chasing of wild animals and so on, have revealed the charm of human body and its nature to her. This understanding attracts her towards George and their love for each other develops in a spontaneous manner through their living activities in open nature. Lettie's love for George symbolically represents her love for nature and her rejection of him implies her uprootedness from nature. Her temptation for George implies the defeat of her will power to the demand of her flesh. That is why, Leslie appears to her unreal ('You do not seem real to me' 189), although she is engaged with him.

In *The White Peacock*, Lawrence introduces his process of living understanding,

that, in his opinion, comes willy-nilly into one if he keeps his sense organs sensitive enough while he lives in close contact with nature. It is, for Lawrence, the understanding of the flesh and blood, sensual not conceptual and has no alternative to acquiring wholeness and harmony in life. In his mature novels, Lawrence elucidates this process of living understanding in depth but here we only get an inkling of what is developing as the central preoccupation of Lawrence.

The unexpected news of Lettie-Leslie engagement contributes much to George's undoing. Lettie's sudden resolve to turn George down, an act, cruel, capricious and unjust to both herself and George, makes George indifferent to his own life; his spontaneity is gone and a deadness engulfs him. Lettie's instantaneous visit to George, now a dejected man, worries her; she comes back from him with a 'quiver of suppressed tears'(198). Even Cyril finds George for the first time in his life 'a tired boy' (205). Again Lettie, in her last premarital meeting with George, now her forbidden lover, exposes herself further. Even if she is glad to meet him she is instantly overcome by grief and sorrow with the thought of her imminent separation from him. Sadder and wiser as she now is, she learns a bitter lesson that it is life that is supreme, not emotional humbug, and as far as her life is concerned, she is a complete failure. Now a tormented soul, Lettie confesses that 'Life is very cruel and love is the cruellest of all'(280). Her timidity, her weakness and above all her greed for status symbol turn her away from George. She can neither marry him nor wipe out his strong impression on her. Having realized the impossibility to be united with him physically and cherishing a higher view about his person, she takes him for the god of her love and wishes to worship him : 'If

you were a faun, I would put guelder roses round your hair and make you look Becchanalian'(284). Lettie's expressed wish of the dark god-worship, later on, in Lawrence's last masterpiece, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, is fulfilled by Constance Chatterley, Lettie's true successor, but with a slight change into phallic worship, a vital part of Lawrence's doctrine of love and life.

The sadness of parting torments Lettie; she tries hard to keep herself off from his influence, but temporarily succumbs to it. Leslie finds her dejected when he visits her. Her cold response, an offence to him, enrages him. He angrily says :

'I suppose you want me out of the way while you sentimentalise over that milkman (George). You need not bother. You can do it while I'm here. Or I'll go and leave you in peace. I'll go and call him back for you, if you like - if that's what you want-' (235)

No doubt, Leslie, despite his earnest effort, fails to bring Lettie out of George's hold. But his fortune favours him when he meets with an unfortunate car accident. After his accident near Lettie's house, Lettie and her brother Cyril take Leslie's unconscious body home to bring him round. Leslie, having regained his consciousness, finds Lettie engaged on nursing him. He chances on this opportune moment to persuade Lettie to marry him. His desperate approach and her cold response clear up the situation :

'Love-love- I don't know anything about it. But I can't - we can't be - don't you see-oh, what do they say, - flesh of one flesh.

'Why' he whispered, like a child that is told some tale of mystery. She looked at him, as he lay propped upon his elbow, turning towards hers, his white face of fear and perplexity, like a child that cannot understand, and is afraid, and wants to cry. Then slowly tears gathered full in her eyes, and she wept from pity and despair'(264).

Now falling on the horns of a dilemma, Lettie denies Leslie's marriage proposal with a

weak voice that encourages Leslie to stick to his persuasion tenaciously. Finally she accepts his proposal but denies the urge of her flesh and blood.

In *The White Peacock*, Lawrence depicts George - Lettie love relationship with greater significance than that of Lettie-Leslie pair. But nowhere in the novel does he render sufficient reason behind Lettie's antilife decision to reject George except her emotional turmoil and her longing for status and position. The conflict between two kinds of love, physical and mental, hints at his later role as a sinister prophet who wants to establish the truth of physical love and to reveal animalism in man. But in the present novel, he fails to achieve this perhaps due to his timidity to come into direct conflict with social tradition. Lawrence till then was not prepared enough to make Lettie either a lost girl like Alvina of *The Lost Girl*, or as a self-accused woman like Constance Chatterley of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. His own timidity restricted Lettie to acquire that power with which she can free herself from the perverse social cage. But at its root, the novel elucidates a deep distrust against contemporary social milieu.

Lettie marries Leslie, not because she does not love him, but because she wishes to fulfil her longing for financial security and family status. Also George, now a vindictive lover takes revenge on Lettie getting married to Meg, a woman whom he never has loved, thus paradoxically revenges on his own self; for still he remains devoted to and sensitive about Lettie. In his next visit to Lettie, presently Leslie's faithful wife, at Hampstead, he observes 'a little hardness about her mouth and disillusion hanging slightly on her face' (362), despite her hard striving after controlling her dejected appearance. As her suffering suffers him, the 'barren futility' of her

conjugal life makes his own life grief-stricken. He, who always wishes a new lease on Lettie's life, now becomes broken-hearted and this begins to act against his well-developed physique. Add to this, his own family, particularly his wife Meg, with her recurring indifference towards him, accelerates his physical deterioration. Fifteen years later, George, physically almost exhausted, again visits Lettie on her 31st birthday at her home when Leslie has been out of home. Their intimate conversation, Lettie's singing of songs, her combing of his hair, everything implies that physical love is eternal and inviolable; it is a natural activity of life. Frustration in such a love causes physical deterioration. So within fifteen years of his separation from Lettie, George turns to be a condemned man with 'delirium tremens'(404). 'His arms seemed thin and he had bellied and was bowed and unsightly'(406).

Beside the main story, Lawrence introduces another love-story as a foil, rather undeveloped. The relation between Cyril and Emily, mainly autobiographical, has never gone beyond deep friendship. Emily in actual life is Jessie Chambers, Lawrence's girlfriend and Cyril is no other than Lawrence himself. Throughout the novel, Cyril remains a sensitive spectator, but as a lover, he is rather undeveloped. He loves Emily, but it is his secret wish never to be approached. Lawrence, till then lacked the courage to develop his love relationship with Jessie and left it temporarily to develop in full detail in *Sons and Lovers*. The mother-son bitter relationship, Lawrence's major theme of *Sons and Lovers* is not altogether absent from *The White Peacock*. One day, Cyril, after taking his dinner with Emily in her house at Strelley Mill, returns home rather late. His mother is offended against him and says: 'I am sure I don't know what you can find in

any of them to take you there so much'.... 'I know you like her'(Emily).

To begin with, Lawrence a self-introduced social critic, selected an effective way to criticize the modern civilization introducing Annable, apparently a brutal and primitive character. He is a man of one idea that 'all civilization was the painted fungus of rottenness'(207). All the world hates him and he is almost ostracized from the civilized society. His motto is : 'Be a good animal, true to your animal instinct'(208). On the outset, Annable is a primitive man and civilized people hate him for he cannot be civilized and he hates the civilization for the same reason. But it is not so. The root of his hatred does not lie in his primitivism. Rather, he has gone farther than most of our modern men can go. He knows much more about civilized life and is not slipped from the civilized people due to his incapacity to adjust to it, but has rejected it realizing that it cannot offer spontaneous lifestyle with personal autonomy. He had been a Cambridge don, married Lady Christabel and led the decent aristocratic life for three years. But this offered him only shallow idealism of outer pomposity and soulliness. So he rejected modern civilized life for its artificiality and sought his solace beyond or outside the narrow boundary of modernism. Annable is a symbolic character of Lawrence's sinister philosophy. But Lawrence could not yet prepare the true soil to keep him alive throughout the novel. Consequently, he died in an accident, to be reborn as Mellors, in his last major novel, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

In sum, *The White Peacock* is a callow novel, as Lawrence calls it in his later life. But at its core is Lawrence's abiding interest in live and life, both in capital letters. This interest he keeps alive through the bulk of his works. It is no wonder then, even in

his very first attempt, he shows great potential for a major novelist to emerge out in future.

: : : : : :

Chapter III

SONS AND LOVERS

DH.Lawrence began his masterpiece of the first phase; *Sons and Lovers*, then called 'Paul Morel' in October 1910. He wrote three versions of it, of which the first two were incomplete. The last complete version underwent two substantial revisions by Lawrence himself and a drastic pruning by Edward Garnett, the editor friend of Lawrence. The first incomplete version, written sometime before his mother's death on 10 December 1910, was highly fictionalised. The second, written at a period of crisis after his mother's death, was concerned with the melodramatic story of a brutal father, a working class miner and his middle-class wife. Here the father, having killed his elder son in a confrontation, was jailed and died immediately after release. The father is portrayed as an irredeemably bad fellow and the mother, as a blameless victim. Paul, the younger son, aspired to be refined in the way his mother would like him to be without even the slightest conflict with her. The writing appeared to be extremely tired, forced and characters were 'locked together in a frustrating bondage'(E.T. 190). Jessie Chambers, Lawrence's sweetheart, was oppressed by its "lack of living touch" and severely criticized him saying that : "his treatment of the theme was far behind the reality in vividness and dramatic strength"(E.T.190). But simultaneously, she encouraged Lawrence to rewrite the entire novel sticking much closer to the actual life, for she thought : "what had really happened was much more poignant and interesting than the situations he had invented" (E.T.- 192).

Accepting her suggestion, Lawrence set to rewrite the material in early November 1911. But his writing came to a standstill when he fell critically ill in late November that year. Although he recovered from his illness, he suffered from bouts of lethargy and depression and felt apprehensive about the completion of his work without Jessie's active collaboration. He requested her to write down what she could remember of their early years of friendship. She handed him the notes she had been writing for last three months and perhaps that stimulated Lawrence to resume his work on 'Paul Morel'. In Jessie's opinion, Lawrence incorporated her notes into the next version and sent her a few pages of the manuscript at a time for her comment. The early part of the novel, dealing with the married life of Paul's parents and of their early years of friendship, delighted her :

"Here was all that spontaneous flow, the seemingly effortless translation of life that filled me with admiration. His description of family life were so vivid, so exact and so concerned with everyday things we had never even noticed before.... Born and bred up of working people, he had the rare gift of seeing them from within, and revealing them on their own plane" (E.T.: 1965, pp.197-98).

But, as she came to the later part of the novel, the fictionalised account of their own relationship depressed her. She felt that : "it was a double betrayal, in life and in art" (Sagar,K. 1985,84). Lawrence's mother, the great obstacle between their love-affair, was dead and gone; he had broken his engagement with Louis Burrows; his involvement with Helen Corke was over; his career as a teacher came to a premature end and now he was "like a man with a broken mainspring" (E.T.199). But till then "his mother was to be supreme, and for the sake of that supremacy every disloyalty was permissible" (E.T.

210). The Paul-Miriam part of the novel appeared to her as “a travesty of the real thing” (E.T.:210), and Lawrence tried in this novel to hand over his mother “the laurels of victory” (E.T.: 202). Jessie expected impartial presentation of their life in the book. But what Lawrence was trying to accomplish was not an autobiography, but a novel, introducing into it another kind of reality with the help of those autobiographical fragments : “the wastage of the best of humanity” (Drapper : 1970, 58) a theme, remote and not easily understandable that Jessie was reluctant to consider.

Lawrence finished in its first form the colliery novel on 11 April 1912, and revised it at Waldbrol in Germany where he had been after his elopement with Frieda Weekley, his would be wife, on 3 May 1912. He sent the completely revised manuscript to Heinemann on 9 June who rejected the novel on the ground that : “the book is unsatisfactory from several points of view; not only because it lacks unity its want of reticence makes it unfit but as a whole it seems to me painfully mistaken” (*Letters*, C.U.P. Vol.I,421). Heinemann’s relentless comment although temporarily depressed Lawrence, it made Lawrence more persistent than ever before to bring the book out in print. He sought Garnett’s suggestion and following it, immediately got down to improve the novel upon the previous version. Now Frieda, too, engaged herself in the task of revision. She already had been equipped with Freud’s theory of “Oedipus Complex” at second hand from Otto Gross, her previous lover. She at once realised that the core of the novel lay in Paul’s intense love for his mother which precluded him to love other girls. She informed Garnett : “I think L. quite missed the point in “Paul Morel”. He really loved his mother more than anybody, even his other women, real

love, sort of Oedipus..." (*Letters*, 449).

Lawrence finally reached a consensus with Frieda on the theme of the novel, which, in Frieda's opinion, concerned more with sons as lovers than Paul Morel's autobiography. The final draft of 'Paul Morel', revised for the second time and retitled as *Sons and Lovers* following Frieda's suggestion, was sent to Garnett for his careful consideration on 18 November, along with a letter on the following day defending the construction of the novel. His well-known synopsis follows the idea that :

"A woman of character and refinement goes into the lower class and has not satisfaction in her own life. She has had passion for her husband, so the children are born of passion and have heaps of vitality. But as her sons grow up she selects them as lovers - first the eldest, then the second.... He is left in the end naked of everything, with the drift towards death." (*Letters*, pp.476-77)

This synopsis, thematically over-simplified, fails to explain so many ambiguities of the novel, and shows occasional contradictions to the main plot. The ending of the novel is a case in point. But the class conflict, mentioned in the synopsis, remains to be a fundamental issue of the novel, well disposed but unresolved. The new title, "Sons and Lovers" shifts the centre of attention from melodramatically character-centred story to "a great tragedy ... the tragedy of thousands of young men in England". (*Letters* : 477). But till then, Garnett was dissatisfied with the novel for its over much length and prolixity. He found : "many passages of irrelevant, slack, sometimes embarrassingly bad writing" (Sagar, K. 1985 : 94). So he made seventy odd cuts reducing the length of the novel about one tenth. He deleted "eighty eight passages of length varying from a few lines to several pages, the majority in the first six chapters, some relating to parental

quarrels, more to William as a lover” (Pinion, F. : 1978, 141). In 1977, Mark Schorer edited and published a facsimile of the manuscript showing what Garnett originally had made it with his own initiative. In his introduction, Schorer concluded that Garnett, as a brilliant editor, transformed the prolix text into a compressed and powerful novel, although he at times did some hard strokes to undermine the original meaning of the novel.

The three women, Jessie Chambers, Frieda Weekley and Lawrence’s dead mother contributed enormously not only to the construction of the novel but also to Lawrence’s understanding of women from inside. This new insight, somewhat critical of women, is easily perceptible in his third and final version where he continuously searched for self-liberation. Here Paul’s father is portrayed as a struggling fellow with occasional glimpses of creative spirit, the spirit that Paul continuously struggled to achieve for the freedom of his self. Paul’s mother, instead of being a blameless victim, has become a self-centred woman, arrogant and opinionated, and it is she who had to die pathetically, not her husband. Paul, with occasional conflict with his mother, finally found a way out of the paralysing situation in which he had been brought up. Finally, this version emphasized more to the brutality of social system that victimized the whole family.

Lawrence conducted reshaping of “Paul Morel” by changing only the turning points; but the autobiographical elements, he had introduced into it, remained unchanged in *Sons and Lovers*. Paul and his parents are Lawrence and his parents in actual life; Miriam is a portrait of Jessie Chambers, Lawrence’s sweetheart. Keith Sagar

however argues that Miriam is an amalgam of three women : Jessie Chambers, Louis Burrows and Helen Corke. (Sagar, K.: 1985-88). Mr. Braithwaite, the celliery clerk, is Alfred Woolston Brentall in actual life, a cashier for Barbar Walker and Company, who remained so till two years before his death at the age of ninety in February 1924, twelve years after Lawrence had put him into *Sons and Lovers*. (Moore, H.T., 1974, 44). Clara Dawes is a fictional invention of Lawrence based on Alice Dax, a member of local socialist and suffragist circle, who is supposed to have given Lawrence his first experience of sex. Baxter Dawes is not clearly modelled on Alice Dax's husband and appears to be a complete fictional invention; it is till now not identified on whom his character is based. Also the social and natural settings of the novel are based on Lawrence's birth place Eastwood, Nottinghamshire and its sub-urban area. The autobiographical fragments that Lawrence incorporated into the novel serve the dual purpose of shedding light on the creator's life, on the one hand, and on the other, making a sense of it in terms of a process of self-liberation and growth. For instance, the quarrel between Mr. and Mrs. Morel, directly transcribed from Lawrence's autobiography, helps us understand the family from which Lawrence came; and at the same time it implies the pathetic life-style that the working people were forced to accept by the pressure of growing industrialism. The autobiographical elements, when communicated with the text, provides with a wider significance the socio-economic background; the theme as a whole becomes rich and flexible and the novel attains artistic freedom.

The novel centres round a proletarian community, mainly comprised of coalmine workers of low living status. The locality, a sub-urban colliery village, Bestwood already

advantaged itself over the facilities of industrial development like the modernization of colliery system and the improvement on the residential quarters. The workers, themselves being the basis of industrial development, led a lifestyle, rich in physical vigour with occasional songs, music and dances; a process of living so remote from the mechanized life-style of the industrial world. Walter Morel, a true representative of this organic community was a "well set-up, erect and very smart youth" with a "vigorous black beard that never had been shaved" (*Sons and Lovers*, Pen, 1984-14, Hereafter by page number). He was soft, non-intellectual, warm and had a "rich ringing laugh". His physical charm and frankness mesmerized Gertrude Coppard, a middle-class woman, reasonably well-educated, articulated and determined. She got married to him. But as soon as she entered into Walter Morel's household, she was disenchanted and felt suffocated by their pitiable living condition. She could neither adjust herself to the new situation, nor obliterate from the memory the course of her past happy life except being anguished by the thought of the past. Although she was now downgraded in social status, she preferred superior status : "her rent was five shillings and six pence instead of five shillings a week"⁽¹⁶⁾. She distinguished herself in the community by her self-respectivity, purity of mind and command over language, the qualities hitherto alien to working-class community. Despite being a new comer, she gradually became an influential figure in the family. On the other hand, the tiring physical labour that Walter Morel had to perform under the coal mine made him physically dirty and brutal. His laxer moral quality, a trait of the working-class community, diminished his manhood to Gertrude Coppard, now Mrs. Morel. Walter Morel, sometimes returned home

intoxicated with wine, sometimes over-expended money when the family badly needed it and sometimes evaded responsibility for the household management. The gradual diminution of his personality to Mrs. Morel made Walter Morel more brutal and reckless. Add to this, Mrs. Morel's own initiative to rectify him spoilt him further. He, now a despicable person even to his children, was gradually alienated from the family. It may be put differently that the family, under the mother's dominance, was beginning to be alienated from its working-class status by gradual instillation of the middle-class ideas into it, a phenomenon still then far-fetched to most of the celliery families. Walter Morel, however, stuck to his old ways. This developing polarity between husband and wife led them into the struggle for dominance over one another and bitter quarrels between them was a regular occurrence.

To begin with, the present novel at the outset, appears to be more about Mrs. Morel and her domineering personality rather than the personality traits of Walter Morel. He was never allowed to speak for himself as Mrs. Morel did. But the implicit theme of the book, contradicting the surface value, shows the supremacy of the working class spirit, identified with Walter Morel, over the middle class views and ideas represented by Mrs. Morel. The gradual unfolding of the novel shows, in Paul's personality, a development of the free and fighting spirit that his father has represented. The two images of Walter Morel; a drunken brute with callous attitude towards his wife on the one hand and on the other, a creative spirit with widespread popularity in his community, are simultaneously presented by Paul narrator, the former, with his conscious articulation and the latter with his unconscious slipshods of speech. At the

initial stage of the novel, Paul, his mother's son, presented Walter Morel, his father obliquely before us. He described his father as a : "collier's small, mean head with its black hair slightly soiled with grey, lay on the bare arms, and the face, dirty and inflamed, with a fleshy nose and thin, paltry brows, was turned sideways, asleep with beer and weariness and nasty temper"(66). This single sentence, too ruthless to portray his father, implies that Paul's conscience has already been monopolized by his mother, who always struggled to keep Paul under her emotional snarl. Simultaneously, the narrative voice counterbalanced this judgement, placing it in an ironic perspective, by more objective description and dramatization of scenes in which Walter Morel's warmth, humour, tenderness, delight in creative activity and so on make him a vital centre of life. He was favourite to his community and was an active participant in social occasions, particularly in songs and dances. He was an amiable person to his fellow workers and never stopped work for his drinking. There was always a humanistic side active in him. After his bitter quarrel with Mrs. Morel, he was repentant and became polite towards her realizing "how hard it was for his wife to drag about at her work"(31). He helped her in household chores preparing tea and bringing it to her. And this remains to be a remarkable scene of their intimacy with a comic fervour. Again, when he used to work at home, cobbling his boots, mending the kettle or his pit-bottle, he always remained in a jolly mood. His works became a matter of great joy for the children : "He always sang when he mended boots, because of the jolly sound of hammering"(67). Keeping in mind those activities of Walter, some critics identified in him a creative spirit. Also Walter Morel loved his children very much. He attended Paul when he was

laid up with an attack of bronchitis although he "felt his son did not want him"(70). He was happy at the success of William, his oldest son, and wept bitterly for his death. He never loses our sympathy, although he gradually is pushed back to the background. Even Paul, who prayed for the death of his father, instantly prayed; "let him not be killed at pit"(64). This spontaneous ejaculation proves that Paul had some respect for the true self of his father that underlies his dirty and brutal appearance. In the novel, Walter Morel, the most vital character, had a deep respect for his independence both in being and in doing. He remained the least perverted character although he was presented at the outset as a physical brute. But it was perhaps to retain his own identity as a free man. His fault was that he was his own master. Terry Eagleton expresses a similar view when contradicting the line : "he had denied the God in him"(66), he doubts, whether this heavy authorial interpolation, solemn and obtrusive as it is, earns its keep or not. For, the very novel which tells us this also shows us the opposite (Widdowson, P. : 1992, 65).

Now the prospect of a better future, still lay dormant in Mrs. Morel, began to act in William, her eldest son. William was born and brought up under the emotional snarl of his mother. His mother's profound influence caused him suffer when she suffered. Mrs. Morel's progressive ideas inspired William to be a distinguished person. He saw his mother had joined the Women's Guild, read paper, wrote in her rapid fashion, thinking referring to books - a matter of great respect to the children. So, joining the Co-op.office as a clerk, William wholeheartedly devoted his spare time with renewed energy to be educated in both manners and wits. He was engaged in serious study

besides keeping close contact with the bourgeois : the clergymen, the bank managers, the doctors, the tradepeople.... He finally was successful in his mission. But he could not cast aside the qualities identified with his father. He was prone to his inherited working-class culture, a tendency hostile to his achieved mission. We frequently see him dancing with common girls and find him in an aggressive mood before his angry father. His spirit of hard work to achieve success is also an attribute of his father. He, therefore, consciously followed his mother's ideas and ideals, but subconsciously engaged himself in activities against them, thus becomes a split personality. The Freudian critics have taken up the matter otherwise. They often cite William's visit to the local fair, at the age of seven, to buy two egg-cups which Mrs. Morel "knew he wanted for her" and William's "cut to the heart to let her go" from the wakes - as tokens of his incestuous love for his mother. But William was at that time a boy, much before the beginning of his pubertal stage. It was natural for him to take his mother for the closest friend and the best guide. His craze for enjoying the local fair in company with his mother manifests both his curiosity about the outer world and his deficiency to resist temptation to be a joint visitor with his mother. Again, when William won the first prize in a race, he offered it to his mother. She accepted it "like a queen"(56). This simple incident sometimes raises a misunderstanding about mother-son relationship; for, if she was "like a queen", then who would be the King? - perhaps William. But it is not true. Mrs. Morel thought of her son as a prince who had defeated others in competition and she was his mother. This view is further confirmed by Walter Morel, her husband, who noticed both William and her beloved Lily while they were going to the Church, and who

“watching the gallant pair go, felt he was the father of prince and princesses”(120).

Indeed, the knotty problem arose when William, as a handsome youth, began courting girls, a matter that displeased Mrs. Morel. She never wanted his son's plunging himself in dance performances. It was, she thought, an attribute of her husband, rather common and vulgar. The girls, William used to meet, were, in Mrs. Morel's eyes, also common, thus unsuitable for his son as mate. The mother-son conflict was aggravated when William brought home his beloved Lily, a splendid dance-girl but not well-educated: “Read a book! why, she's never read a book in her life she can't read” (31). He was madly in love with Lily, the girl he thought to get married. But still he was under his mother's thumb and without her consent, his marriage was impossible. Although Mrs. Morel was completely aware of the situation, she remained deaf to William's appeal for her permission to marry Lily. Mrs. Morel, however, wanted, for William, an aristocratic lady, reasonably well-educated. She was disillusioned to find William's lack of prudence in selecting his woman. This inconsiderate activity, she thought, brought William down to his father's status, a contradiction to Mrs. Morel's high minded ideas and expectation about her sons. More egocentric than humane as she was, she failed to reach a consensus with William on his marriage and this contributed much to his undoing. William, however, had shown occasional audacity to disobey his mother. He once, gleefully putting on a ‘highland bonnet’ went out to a fancy-dress ball disregarding her strong protest. But, here, at the critical situation, he failed to come out free from his mother's hold and finally succumbed to it, a tragic end of his life.

But Paul's case is more complex. His dual role, one commendable and another

contemptible, presents him as an ambiguous personality in the novel. He killed his mother with an overdose of morphia, a criminal offence; he sexually met Clara Dawes, a married woman parted from her husband; and betrayed Miriam, his beloved. On the other hand, he ceaselessly struggled to come out free from the vicious entanglements of these female counterparts. His ultimate success in it, a heroic performance indeed, provided him with a new lease of life. Since his birth, Paul looked down on his father. He took him for a brutal tyrant with nasty temper and a representative of the proletarian community. Walter Morel's rude behaviour at home, indeed an outcome of his daylong strenuous work under the pit; his physical appearance, smeared overall with pit-dirt, at the neat and tidy home; everything was, to Paul, a matter of aversion. As Paul was under the spell of his mother's highfalutin ideas, he turned a blind eye to the grave situation in which his father had been. Paul held his father responsible for creating the chaotic situation at home and wished him to die at the pit : "Lord, let my father die" (64). But instantly, he contradicted himself : "Let him not be killed at pit"(64). This ambiguous attitude of Paul towards his father implies that the father-son odious relationship was at bottom a social conflict rather than personal. Paul thought himself to be a member of the family represented by his mother, an woman of middle-class origin, instead of his father, a proletariat. With never going to the in-depth analysis of the difficult situation, Paul started hating the proletarian community and the life they led. He visited the celliery office to collect his father's wages and found the system humiliating. On the way home, while Paul was walking along the Mansfield Road, he could hardly identify the colliers he had seen and known before, because of their dirty

appearances, smeared all over by pit-soot. It was a torturous experience to him. At home, he protested to his mother against the system and denied his further going to the pit, for : 'they're hateful, and common Mr. Braithwaite drops his 'h's, an' Mr. Winterbottom says, 'you was'''. Paul hated the dialect his father used to talk at home. If his father were a decent middle-class gentleman, the father-son relationship might be different.

From his very birth, Paul was physically weak but sensitive and desperate. Even in his boyhood, he had a sort of recklessness, a trait so close to the spirit of his father. He broke the rag doll of Annie, his sister. It was an accidental occurrence, for he did it without knowing about it. But the next decision to burn it was taken consciously without hesitation. It was a terrible act at that age, but he did it with "wicket satisfaction"(62) making his sister horrified. Again, when he went to Mrs. Leivers' Farm, he easily could befriend with the boys who were also farmers of working-class status. Paul let the hens peck from his palm, as did the other boys, without perplexity; and with Miriam Leivers at the cowshed, he swang recklessly for the joy of movement. All these activities imply that Paul, in flesh and blood, belongs to the class represented by his father instead of his mother.

When Walter Morel was in Hospital from an injury sustained at the mine, Paul, the fourteen-year boy, triumphantly declared : "I'm the man in the home now"(90). The psychoanalytic critics like A.B. Kuttner suggest that Paul wished to play the husband in the family : "when Morel is confined to the hospital through an accident in the mine, Paul joyfully plays the husband" (Salgado, G., 1969, 73). But that isolated statement of

Paul, when communicated in terms of the text, provides a more complex meaning. Mrs. Morel received the news of her husband's injury and was upset. The entire family was upset. Paul arranged everything for his mother's visit to the hospital where his father had been admitted. She departed and "his heart ached for her"(88). This does not mean that the bond of love between mother and son was deep but that "she was thrust forward again into the pain and trouble"(88). Mrs. Morel could feel the depth of the shock her son had suffered on hearing the news of his father's injury. She thought : "It will upset the lad when I tell him how bad it is"(88). Later on when Walter Morel was getting better, the whole family was relaxed and rejoiced. At this jolly and peaceful moment, Paul felt the vacuum created in the family by his father's absence. The family now was one-sided, under the control of his mother. Paul's declaration : "I'm the man in the home now" established his own male identity in the family against that of Mrs. Morel. His declaration implies his own unconscious identity with his father. Here Paul stood for his father and against his mother.

When Mrs. Morel asked Paul to seek a job outside the pit, his heart contracted; for his reckless freedom of a vagabond life was coming to an end and he was going to be a "prisoner of industrialism"(92). He got work at Thomas Jordan's factory of Surgical Appliances situated in "an insanitary ancient place"(04), not much better than the pit of his father. But as soon as he was adjusted to his new situation and familiar with his mates, he was happy. The work was a matter of joy and pride to him :

"The factory had a homely feel --- Paul always enjoyed it when the work got faster, towards post-time, and all the men united in labour---- The man was the work and the work was the man, one thing, for the time being"(113)

This working spirit of Paul reminds us of the same spirit of his father :

“He (Walter Morel) was hewing at a piece of rock that was in the way for the next day’s work. As he sat on his heels, or kneeled, giving hard blows with his pick, “Uszza-uszza” he went. -- And he went on striking. He was tired --- Still he struck and hacked with all his might. He had overworked himself”(34-35).

In point of fact, despite Paul’s continual complaint about his father’s status, he had in his self a similar spirit of his father. Although he censured his father and praised his mother, his activities turned him towards the direction he and his mother consciously never had liked; a contradiction in terms.

A further complexity was added to Paul’s situation when he met Miriam Leivers, a fourteen-year girl, physically timid but mentally alert. She had a puritanic attitude to life with devotion to Church religion. Although she herself was of working-class origin, she hated this kind of life. Her burning ambition was to get herself out of her dead-end career at home with the aid of education. Paul’s recurrent visit to Willey Farm, his joined activities with Miriam : his swinging at the cowshed, feeding the hens, helping Miriam in her education – everything brought them closer. They began to love each other long before they understood about it. But this love was non-sensual, abstract. Love, Miriam thought, is a matter of sacrifice like that of Christ who sacrificed himself for the love of humanity. She wished self-devotion for lover’s satisfaction, a matter of sympathy and tenderness. She loved to think : “Then he was ill and ---- he would be weak. Then she would be stronger than he. Then she could love him”(143). Paul let himself be entangled with Miriam in such a love relationship in which one was

considered up and another, down, only to develop a feeling of impotence and dissatisfaction within himself. One evening, while both Paul and Miriam were coming back home jointly, they saw that "an enormous orange moon was glaring at them from the rim of the hills"(75). Paul was physically aroused; his blood was 'concentrated like a flame in his chest"(176). But "their intimacy was so abstract, he did not know he wanted to crush her on his breast to ease the ache there"(176). He was physically afraid and mentally tormented. His love of Miriam could not offer him freedom, either physical or mental. While he stayed at home, his whole heart urged him to meet Miriam and in a state of trance, he came out in the afternoon to meet her. But when he was with her, he tortured her with unnatural and sometimes brutal behaviours. Later on, he enjoyed sexual intercourse with Miriam at her grand-mother's house at Woodlington. But it was also a failure, for they had different approach to love and sex. Paul thought sex, a part of life and a way to physical and spiritual fulfilment; but Miriam was puritanic about sexual intercourse. She always considered physical fulfilment secondary whereas Paul considered it primary. So the sense of failure on Paul's part grew stronger :

"At first it was only a sadness. Then he began to feel he could not go on. He wanted to run, to go abroad, anything. Gradually he ceased to ask her to have him. Instead of drawing them together, it put them apart. And then he realized, consciously, that it was no good. It was useless trying : it would never be a success between them"(284).

This sense of failure developed in Paul another failure to continue their eight years' love affair further. His decision shocked Miriam but it was not unexpected to her. Paul, she

knew, was eccentric and has fallen prey to some force more powerful than his own. She found his love for her as a childish game and thought him "a child of four"(288). But now, in his denial, she recognized in him a new man with strong determination. He was coming to his maturity as a male : "the male was up in him, dominant"(286). This 'male', a symbolic manifestation of the uncompromising determination identified with the spirit of his father, was the positive force that urged Paul to self-liberation : "nothing-only to be free"(288).

But Paul's powerful tie lay at his house. His mother, "the very source of the energy which pushes him ambitiously beyond home and pit - is at the same time the powerful emotional force which draws him back" (Widdowson, p.1992, 64). Although Paul blamed Miriam for the failure of their love affair, Miriam sensed in Paul his mother's oppressive and strangulating tie. One day, she visited Paul at his house while Mrs. Morel was out of doors. Paul was then preparing and baking bread. Accidentally, a bread on the oven under Paul's care was burnt. Mrs. Morel, after her return, saw the burnt bread and charged Paul for his carelessness. She held Miriam responsible for it and turned furiously against Paul condemning his absorption in Miriam. Mrs. Morel's grievance came from her panic of being severed from Paul. She bewailed to Paul : "I've never had a husband" (209). Naturally, this remark gives rise to the question of her sexual dissatisfaction that she had never mentioned throughout her married life. But actually she had been materially and culturally dissatisfied and wished Paul to execute her plan for better life. She pressed Paul with all the burden of her future prospect and never let him be free from her emotional entanglement. Thus Paul fell prey to two

women, his mother and Miriam. Now he had "that poignant carelessness about himself, his own suffering, his own life, which is a form of slow suicide"(252). But he was self-critical :

"Why was he torn so, almost bewildered and unable to move ? Why did his mother sit at home and suffer ? He knew she suffered badly. But why should she ? And why did he hate Miriam and feel so cruel towards her, at the thought of his mother."(190).

This new realization paved the way to Paul's self-liberation. His foggy understanding about life began to be transparent. He revealed that "only from the middle-classes one gets the ideas, and from the common people - life itself, warmth"(250). He declared : "I belong to common people"(250), and at once turned down his mother's high hope with a comment : "That's a woman's whole doctrine for life - ease of soul and physical comfort. And I do despise it"(251). The new insight he got was that "so long as life's full, it does not matter whether it is happy or not"(251). With this understanding, the strangulating tie of mother-son relationship started slackening but still Paul was powerless to come out of his mother's hold.

On the other hand, Miriam Leivers, however afflicted by Paul's rejection of her, understood Paul's dilemma much more than anybody else. She diagnosed that Paul had to undergo the "baptism of fire in passion"(343). She introduced him to Clara Dawes, a suffragette and a married woman, parted from her husband, Baxter Dawes. She was light-minded, cheerful and had attractive physical grace. Paul loved her at first sight and their love-relation was more physical than mental. After his performance of sex act with

her, Paul looked temporarily relaxed : "he had considerable peace and was happy in himself"(343). His relationship with Clara proved to be more fruitful than that of Miriam Leivers; but it had been comparatively shallow and superficial. Paul was successful to keep himself free from being over-much engaged with Clara. Paul, as he was now more considerate than ever before, thought his sex-experience impersonal, a positive outcome of the male-female union through him and her : "It seemed almost as if he had known the baptism of fire in passion.... But it was not Clara. It was something that happened because of her, but it was not her" (343). This sexual communion with Clara brought Paul out of his physical timidity. What he had failed to perform against his father, a duel between two males, now he did it with another proletariat, Baxter Dawes, Clara's husband. As soon as he threw a glass of beer on Baxter's face, he was forced to identify himself as a man detached from his mother. He came home and thought :

"There was now a good deal of his life of which he necessarily could not speak to his mother. He had a life apart from her his sexual life.... His life wanted to be free itself of her there was a distance between them"(334).

His battle with Baxter Dawes in the dark of night (symbolic to the darkness of the pit) completed his final stage of physical revival. The very injury he sustained in the battle with Baxter healed him of his malady. With it he came in deep contact with the living reality of his self. The relationship established between them through hate later proved to be more positive than any of Paul's relationships with his female counterparts. Indeed he now struggled out of the devouring women, mainly of his mother. In

contradiction to his mother's soothing words, that he had not met the right woman to marry, he instantly replied : "and I never shall meet the right woman while you live" (340) - a comment too tough for her. He urged Clara Dawes, who appeared to him, too insignificant to solve his problem, to be re-united with her husband. But Clara Dawes' own experience of Paul was rather unpleasant. There was no stability in him. Paul appeared to her "paltry and insignificant". She found him "small and mean"(393) - reiteration of the same words with which Paul earlier had described his father : "collier's small, mean head" (66). Thus, with Paul's gradual acceptance of proletarian community of his father, his urge for the autonomy of self was also fulfilled. As a consequence, he 'killed' his mother with an ambiguous act of love, hate and self-liberation. He broke his love relationship with Miriam and rejected Clara, and now "wanted to go on alone"(394).

But the emotional bond of his dead mother was for him too hard to break with. He had to suffer terrible mental agony in order to survive. The love of his mother created in Paul two kinds of forces, centripetal and centrifugal. The centripetal force affected his feeling, his understanding and above all his normal life. Sometimes, he intended to commit suicide. At last " a stroke of hot stubbornness inside his chest resisted his own annihilation"(397). This 'hot stubbornness' can be identified as the revived male spirit in him that finally helped him survive and move on tearing himself free from the centripetal force of his mother. And with this he moved on towards the world of his mother's aspiration :

“But no, he would not give in. Turning sharply, he walked towards the city’s gold phosphorescence. His fists were shut, his mouth set fast. He would not take that direction, to the darkness to follow her. He walked towards the faintly humming, glowing town, quickly”(406)

H.M.Dalesky comments that Paul’s killing of his mother “represents symbolically, both a repudiation of what she stands for and a decisive act of self-liberation; as does his turning towards city at the end of the book” (Salgado, G. : 1969, 200). This statement would appear to be self-contradictory if Paul is supposed to have repudiated the ideas and aspirations of his mother, (‘what he stands for’). If indeed he did so, he might not have decided to go forward to the city, the vast outerworld of his mother’s aspiration. Paul did really repudiate the backward pull, the centripetal force of his mother except the outward push, the centrifugal force that she provided as inspiration to him. Simultaneously, Paul rejected the mean qualities of his father that the sexual division of labour and the capitalist’s unsympathetic treatment imposed upon him. Paul really recognized his father’s assertive personality. Thus metaphorically speaking, although Paul, in the end of the novel, remained to be his mother’s son going forward to the town, the world of his mother’s aspiration, he succeeded in realizing within himself the active male spirit that his father symbolized. It is a state of unity in duality, a foremost condition, according to Lawrence, to achieve freedom in life.

: : : : : :

Chapter IV

THE RAINBOW

The Rainbow was shaped out of the fictional material of 'The Sisters', a big novel that Lawrence began sometime in the beginning of 1913. He completed its first draft that year, but rewrote the material for about seven times in the next three years and finally split it into two great novels, *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*. So far as the chronological development of the plot was concerned, the first part of his writing was then entitled 'Wedding Ring', later on to be *The Rainbow*, a title that Frieda suggested and Lawrence thought suitable.

The Rainbow was the first major product of Lawrence's 'transition stage'. During the period that began from the death of his mother in 10 December, 1910, the moral and intellectual struggles led Lawrence to an impasse. His meeting with Frieda and his elopement with her brought him happiness and an excess of new life. 'Emotionally as well as socially and geographically, Lawrence begins to stand in different relation to his material' (Hough, G. : 1970, p.71). The supremacy of the flesh over the Word that he mentioned in the 'Foreward to *Sons and Lovers*' (1913), now needed artistic representation. Lawrence tried to accomplish it in *The Rainbow*, 'a destructive work' (*Lett.* (ed) Moore, H.T., 519) in his opinion, with decisive act of destroying the traditional ideological humbug. *The Rainbow*, he said, 'was a kind of working up to the dark sensual or Dionysiac or Aphrodesiac ecstasy, which does actually burst the world, burst the world-consciousness in every individual' (*Lett.* 519). As a mature and confident artist, now he was fully conscious of the difference

of his present approach to life and art. His letter to Edward Garnett (5 June, 1915), intended as a defence to the construction of *The Rainbow*, gives a brief outline of his thematic and artistic formulations which marked his shift from the past. In that letter, he expressed his reluctance to create vivid scenes in powerful light of emotion that he had done in *Sons and Lovers*. His interest was now in writing about 'a bit of inhuman or non-human truth, that our fuzzy human emotions can't alter' (*Lett.* 491). The character now would 'fall into the form of some other rhythmic form --- unknown' (*Lett.* 282). The hero or the protagonist of the novel is not just a character, but 'some unnamed and nameless flame' (*Phoenix* - II, p.419). In this novel neither love nor character is the centre of his interest. His central interest is to show 'how two people bound together in the Flesh, opposed in the Word, contrive to live together and ultimately to find in it some sort of salvation' (Hough, G. : 1970, p.82). The protagonist of the present novel, Ursula Brangwen, appears to be a vehicle of 'the vision of the darkness with which the conscious personal, deliberate social life of mankind is surrounded' (Clarke, C. : 1969, 75). The revolutionary theme of the book is that Flesh-to-Flesh relationship implies something deeper than the Christian love or charity. While the Christian love is, in Lawrence's opinion, only an affair of the Word which is comparatively shallow and cannot touch the ultimate, that is, the Flesh; the Flesh-to-Flesh relationship is on the other hand non-mental, mainly physical, which involves the body itself.

Despite its great underlying theme, the novel was banned in November 1915, soon after its publication on 30 September. The suppression was caused by a certain

league : the league for the promotion of moral purity. (*Lett.*, C.U.P., Vol.2, 467). Richard Aldington stated that 'the prosecution of obscenity (was) instigated by a self-styled Public Morality Council of London, a body of puritanical fanatics who were making themselves patriotically useful by trying to suppress anything they did not approve. (quoted from *Letters*, Vol.2, C.U.P., p.467). H.T.Moore pointed out that two erotic passages in particular, one of them being the account of a love scene between Ursula and Winifred Inger and the other between Ursula and Anton Skrebensky, were responsible for the suppression of *The Rainbow*. (Moore, H.T., 195, pp.110-11). But the cause of suppression was more political than moral. Lawrence's preference for individual liberty over national interest at a critical period of inter-war years, further discredited him.

The Rainbow is, at the outset, a colourful history of three generations amidst changing social perspectives from about 1840 to 1905. It describes the continuity of life with its conflict and crisis in a world of growing industrialism, where Lawrence in real life had to live and suffer :

'In a year Wiggiston appeared, a great mass of pinkish rows of thin, unreal dwelling of five rooms each. The streets were like visions of pure ugliness; a grey-black macadamized road, asphalt cause-ways, held in between the flat succession of wall, window, and door, a new brick channel that began nowhere and ended nowhere.' (*The Rainbow*, Penguin, 1976, p.345, Hereafter by page number).

Lawrence, however, preferred another world, the world of Ursula's dream, from which 'the old, brittle corruption of houses and factories swept away' and 'the world built up in a living fabric of Truth, fitting to the over-arching heaven.'(496). The

novel opened with a similar world, pre-industrial and organic, wherein the family-history of the Brangwens began. The prose with heightened intensity showed the flow of life with living vigour in the Brangwens. They 'knew the intercourse between heaven and earth'(8) and were 'impregnated with the day, cattle and earth and vegetation and the sky ---- their brains were inert, as their blood flowed heavy with the accumulation from the living day'(8). Their senses were full-fed, faces turned to the heat of the blood, staring into the sun, a perfect harmony with the living and the non-living, a communion between earth and heaven, a perfect rainbow. This organic social setting of the Brangwens rooted in the fertile soil, was created by Lawrence's sharp imagination in contrast with the industrial world. The reality of presentation is the reality with which Lawrence has presented them. But the actuality is not ascertained. The history of life began from his imagination.

While the Brangwen man was happy and fulfilled keeping perfect rhythm with nature, the Brangwen woman was different. Her attitude was vertical compared to that of her male counterpart described by Lawrence as horizontal. She aspired to enlarge her 'own scope' and range of freedom'(9), was eager to know the 'far-off world'(9), desired the higher form of life and wished to be 'the fighting host'(9). That higher form of life, she thought, could be achieved through knowledge : 'It was a question of knowledge'(10). In the course of the novel, Lawrence hinted at two types of knowledge; one is the living knowledge, non-mental, that comes to one willy-nilly in the process of living, and the other, intellectual knowledge, mental, that can be acquired through formal education. The characters, like Tom Brangwen,

Lydia and Will Brangwen represent dominantly the former type of knowledge and Anton Skrebensky, Paul Lensky, Anna and Ursula's uncle Junior Tom represent the latter dominantly. But in Ursula, we get both types of knowledge, sensual and mental in an equipoise. She was the most successful character in the novel although she herself remained a failed adventurer at the end of the novel.

The history of the Brangwen family began at the time when industrialism was beginning to be introduced into the Marsh Farm, the dwelling place of the Brangwens. About 1840, a canal was excavated across the meadows of the Farm, a colliery was dug on the other side of the canal, railway came down the valley and rural England began to lose its significance. Thenceforth, the story of Tom Brangwen began. As a boy, Tom was sensitive and delicate with physical vigour and charm but formal education was to him, a horror; he cut a sorry figure at school. As he came of age, he, being seduced by a prostitute, faced a two-fold problem : religious and physical. He was confused, because his respect for woman got a tremendous shock. He as well as other Brangwen men, considered woman as the symbol for that life which 'comprised religion and life and morality'(9). He knew that :

'The men placed in her hands their own conscience, they said to her, "Be my conscience-keeper, be the angel at the doorway guarding my outgoing and my incoming"---- They depended on her for their stability. Without her, they would have felt like straws in the wind, to be blown hither and thither at random. She was the anchor and the security, she was the restraining hand of God'(19).

This idea was frequently presented and elucidated by Lawrence in his non-fiction

and letters of that period. In the 'Foreward to *Sons and Lovers*, he said about woman that 'she is the door of our ingoing and outcoming' and 'in her we go back to the Father' (Clark, C. (ed), 1969, pp. 34-35). In the *Hardy Study*, he said that the man-woman relationship is a process of 'stasis-in-motion', where woman symbolizes the stasis and man, the motion. Lawrence's doctrine of two Wills : Will-to-Motion represented by man and Will-to-Inertia represented by woman and their perfect communion - symbolizes two-in-one, a third thing, the Holy Ghost or the rainbow.

The physical problem that Tom faced after being seduced was now acute; he vainly tried to satisfy it either by courting girls or by excessive drinking. But instead of being relieved, he intensified his crisis further. He now intuitively began to search for a woman who could offer him freedom, both physical and mental. As soon as he met Lydia Lensky, a polish widow who had a four-year daughter, Anna, he realized that Lydia was the right woman he had been looking for. But the decision that comes from blood, direct was not easy to take. Before he could take a firm determination, Tom suffered a crisis, a storm within himself that was symbolically represented by the storm of nature outside :

'One evening in March, when the wind was roaring outside, came the moment to ask her. He had sat with his hands before him, leaning to the fire. And as he watched the fire, he know almost without thinking that he was going this evening'(41).

He went across the orchard gathering daffodils, and turned towards Lydia's house as if hypnotized. He waited outside her room, suspended, looking at the wild weaving of trees by the wind in the dark night. It was to him 'a suffering like fate'(44). At

last getting into her room, he proposed to her. He got her consent and then the crisis was over. Their married life was a grand success, for through it, Lydia overcame her physical torpor and Tom seemed to be 'newly created, as after a gestation, a new birth in the womb of darkness'(46). Their conjugal life became a symbolic adventure of two free individuals into one another, a Flesh-to-Flesh relationship :

'They had their hour, ---they were ready for it - ready to renew the game --- on the edge of the outer darkness, when the secrets within the woman are game for man, hunted doggedly, when the secrets of the woman are the man's adventure, and they both give themselves to the adventure' (63).

This perfect union of male and female has to undergo a living understanding for such a relationship has a natural ebb and flow. After the first intimate hours, there came an ebb, a period of struggle in their relationship. But through living understanding, the understanding that comes through living, they succeeded in achieving in life, freedom and fulfilment, both physical and mental. The perfection of their married life was confirmed by Lydia's observation : 'What was Paul Lensky to her, but an unfulfilled possibility to which, he Brangwen, was the reality and the fulfilment?'(96). The narrative voice also showed this fulfilment with high intensity, saying that 'the house was finished and the Lord took up his abode'(96). What Tom struggled to solve before, was now itself solved through the marriage, for Lydia, his wife, was to him 'the gateway and the wayout' and 'she was beyond and... he was travelling in her through the beyond.'(96).

In the second generation, Anna, who came with her mother to the Marsh Farm, not only fell in but also herself became, a trouble to the new situation. One

night, when her mother was suffering from labour pain, she, herself over-insistent, was crying desperately to go to her mother. Tom, his stepfather, to avoid a grave situation, took her on his back covering her with his mother's shawl and brought her to the cowshed while it was raining. Here Anna was relaxed and sank into sleep. The scene is a brilliant example of Lawrence's superb art. The shawl had been Tom's mother's, that he also had used in his boyhood and that he now used to cover his step-daughter, Anna. The shawl implicitly relates three generations. Precisely, *The Rainbow* is an affirmation of the life-flow with its gradual metamorphosis to the changing social perspective. It implicitly presents the inter-generation relationships along with their problems and significance in living.

Now, as Anna came of age, she met Will Brangwen, her cousin, who had come to the Farm to work and to stay. She was then eighteen and Will, twenty. They began to love each other being attracted by one another's physical grace. On one night, when Will Brangwen just had come to the Farm and engaged in talking to his uncle Tom Brangwen, Anna, deeply moved by his physical charm, forced him go to the barn with her. There they embraced each other passionately remaining oblivious of both the outer-world and time. Tom Brangwen, now anxious about their delay in coming back, went forward a few steps towards the barn and saw the passionate couple in embrace. At once, his memory turned him back to the past when at such a rainy night he brought little Anna to the barn, crying, unquenchable, yet was quelled at last. Now she was quenching her sensual demand at the same spot but another way. A new generation was in front of him and he had to approve of this

universal demand of life, the sexual demand of this generation, a new experience and understanding to him.

Anna, now, being conscious of her physical demand, wished for a new life with Will, the conjugal life that she thought, could offer her physical satisfaction. Will appeared to her 'the hole in the wall, beyond which the sunshine blazed on an outside world'(114). But their relationship began with a sense of dormant conflict. Anna physically wanted Will, but showed little interest in his spontaneous activities. She laughed at his chanting of prayer in the church and remained indifferent to his mystic attitude to church and church-religion. They appeared to be persons of different planes, not 'flesh of one flesh'. On the scene where they worked to place the sheaves of corn in a moonlit night, the rhythmic work of coming and going, of uniting and departing excited them physically. They met together and kissed each other passionately, but 'there was all the while a slight tension of irritation'(125) between them. Even their married life was not so successful as they had aspired before. From the days of their honey-moon, a sense of failure engulfed them due to their failure to communicate sensual life to the natural course of life and to uplift themselves to that higher plane of conjugal life which Anna's parents previously had achieved. Rather, when relaxed, both Will and Anna felt the sense of embarrassment. Their adventure into the unknown self of one another became a mechanical activity offering no deeper meaning or a sense of mystery. Although Will felt a change in himself after the marriage, it was not life-fulfilling. He did not feel invigorated. Anna was more domineering than interested in liberating his

creative spirit.

The conflict in their conjugal life developed from the difference of their approach to religion. While Will Brangwen, uncritical and imaginative, remained devoted to the Church, Anna, more articulate and intelligent, was critical of the church and church sermons. He went to the church and listened to the hymns and sermons. But she thought them to be merely rituals, offering her nothing :

‘—as she sat in church her face had a pathos and poignancy. Was this what she had come to hear : how, by doing this and by not doing that, she could save her soul? She did not contradict it. But the pathos of her face gave the lie. There was something else she wanted to hear, it was something else she asked for from the Church.’(158)

Clearly, Anna was modern in her attitude to life. She ‘clung to the worship of the human knowledge’(173) and believed ‘in the omnipotence of the human mind’(173). The intellectual knowledge of the modern world was to her supreme and the mysterious living-knowledge about dark human nature, of little appeal. ‘What he (Will Brangwen) thought about life and society and mankind did not matter very much to her’(171). She was in her spirit, a Lensky, and followed her dead father, Paul Lensky, ‘an intellectual, a clever surgeon and physician’(256). An inherent element of self-assertiveness and aggression marked her character from the very beginning. When her father refused her permission to marry Will, she was enraged and even challenged his authority that he exercises as a father.

Anna’s criticism of church sermons and her incapacity to respond to them created in her an antipathy towards her husband Will Brangwen, who with his vast

noncritical, imaginative and mysterious attitude to life remained her opposite. Her destructive attitude against his creative spirit had thrown him into dejection and gradually 'he grounded his soul in uneasiness and fear'(151). Although Anna knew that 'he had something real'(173) in him, her sharp logic and reason and intellectual approach to life spoilt that real thing in him. He burnt his 'Adam and Eve Board', a symbolic representation of creative activity, which for the time-being affected Anna.

But her assumption about her husband was negative and life-denying :

'She began to realise more and more that he did not alter, that he was something dark, alien to herself. She had thought him just the bright reflex of herself. As the weeks and months went by she realised that he was a dark opposite to her, that they were opposites, not complements'(169)

Never being conscious about what her husband actually had been, she tried to nullify him, either by dancing naked in her room even before him or opposing him in his spontaneous activities. But Will Brangwen was more positive in his attitude to her. He wished Anna to be his complement, a life-long partner in his adventure into the future course of life, unseen and unknown. Without her, he thought : 'he was shackled and in darkness of torment'(182), and he could neither come to his fulfilment nor be liberated from himself. Anna was the prime partner in his life adventure. Even she was 'his life and his derivation' and 'if she were taken away, he would collapse as a house from which the central pillar is removed'(188). But Anna denied him of the source of his life. So their conflict, instead of being resolved, was further aggravated in the Cathedral scene, where Will Brangwen, looking at the Lincoln Cathedral, was deeply moved thinking of its mysterious significance :

'Away from time, always outside of time ! Between east and west, between dawn and ...sunset, the church lay like a seed in silence, dark before germination, silenced after death' Containing birth and death, potential with all the noise and transition of life, the cathedral remained hushed--- Spanned round with the rainbow, the jewelled gloom folded music upon silence, light upon darkness, fecundity upon death as a seed folds leaf upon leaf and silence upon the root'(201).

But Anna was dissatisfied, for to her reality mattered more than the imaginary significance of the church in which her husband believed. The church, she felt, was a limited boundary and she thought that 'the open sky was no blue vault, no dark dome hung with many twinkling lamps, but a space where stars were wheeling in freedom' (203). Her intellectual understanding and sharp logic crushed Will's mystic belief and brought him down to the narrow limit of stark reality. His mystic belief remained an illusion, and his absolute, containing 'all heaven and earth' turned out to be no more than 'a shapely heap of dead matter'(205). Finally Anna won; she was 'Anna Victrix'. But her victory was empty in ultimate analysis because she failed thereby to achieve that depth and purposefulness of conjugal life which her previous generation had successfully achieved. Finally, she surrendered to her mechanical life of child bearing and child rearing.

The flow of life in the first generation had been smooth and undisputed; in the second, it had a dormant conflict between sensual and mental planes; but in the third generation, there was an overall crisis in every aspect of life. Man appeared to be entrapped in his craze for material development through industrialization which turned his living activities insensitive and dead, and nature lost its natural splendour

for him.

As Ursula, the daughter of Will and Anna, began to grow up, the focus of the narrative gradually shifted towards her. She grew up in an intimate atmosphere where the father-daughter relationship had been still deep like the previous generation. Will Brangwen became Ursula's nearest and dearest companion in her childish activities and enjoyments. He made her a cradle, her little chair, little stool and a doll out of an old table leg. He took her to the canal to swim, jumped from the canal-bridge down to the water below clinging the little child on his back, taught her how to put potato seeds into the seed-bed and scolded her when she toddled on the seed-bed without knowing that her foot-print would harm it. He gave her a further consciousness of the real world so that : 'she was awake before she knew how to see. She was awakened too soon'(221).

But before Ursula's coming of age, the old rural England would be swept away by the flood of rapid industrialization. Similarly, Tom Brangwen, the representative of old rural England would be swept away by the flood at Marsh Farm to be the history of a fulfilled life like the history of old rural England. Tom Brangwen now lived in the memory of the family, particularly of Lydia, Ursula's grand-mother, to whom Ursula, as a small girl, occasionally came to learn about the history of past rural life-style. Lydia told her about her past conjugal life with both Paul Lensky and Tom Brangwen. Paul Lensky married her to use her like an instrument that he used in his profession of a surgeon. She was, to him, 'one of the baser or material conditions necessary for his welfare in procuring his ideas, of

nationalism, of liberty, of science'(257). 'She became his slave' (257); he used her but never roused her in her body and spirit. Thus being married to Paul Lensky, a young doctor, 'a patriot and an emancipee' in the apparent sense, but actually a captive of his own conceit, Lydia 'was obliterated, carried along in her husband's emphasis of declaration and his whirl of patriotism'(50). She followed him and served him and finally found herself annihilated. Finally, 'he had failed on his work -- -- stiffened, and died'(298), leaving Lydia and her daughter alone. At that critical period, Tom Brangwen, her second husband came to her life and she was revived both physically and mentally. Now, Tom is dead and gone, but : 'he had made himself immortal in his knowledge with her. So she had her place here, in life, and in immortality'(258). Ursula, then a little girl, hardly comprehended everything that her grandmother told her. But in her soul, the history of the past had a great impact; she was enriched in her self like the civilization that enriches itself with the history of the past :

'Here from her grandmother's peaceful room, the door opened on to the greater space, the past, which was so big, that all it contained seemd tiny; loves and births and deaths, tiny units and features within a vast horizon. That was a great relief, to know the tiny importance of the individual, within great past.'(269)

Lawrence made Ursula his contemporary so that the presentation of his experiences, as a student and as a teacher became realistic and convincing. As Ursula attained her adolescence, she felt confused by religious preaching and resented 'her first acquaintance with the evangelical teachings'(274). She discovered an anomaly between religious preaching and actual living for, religious

performances were only gorgeous social functions that hardly mattered to the individual in his daily life. She was doubtful; she wanted 'to do what was right' and 'did not want to do what the gospel said'(285). A critical as well as radical outlook was developing in Ursula. The traditional life-style appeared to her to be false for it tended to suppress the felt-truth of life. Her criticism of the church and the church religion reminds us of Anna, her mother, who also had been a strong critic of them. But her criticism remained destructive and life-denying due to her failure to associate them with life. But Ursula tried in her understanding to link religion to life. She thought : 'resurrection is to life, not to death'(281). It was related to becoming 'perfect in body and spirit, whole and glad in the flesh, living in the flesh, loving in the flesh, begetting children in the flesh---- whole(ness), perfect----'(281). She was expecting a man who would come to her as a 'son of god' to help her achieve that state of 'resurrection' in body and soul. She met Anton Skrebensky, a military engineer of twenty one when she herself was sixteen. She developed an intimacy with him. On one occasion, while Anton was sitting in front of her father, she called him to see her wood-carving in the shed where they played love-games. This scene at once takes us back to past love-affair between her parents who also met in a similar way at the same spot. But there is a difference. While the love affair of her parents had been at least a success with a concealed conflict, her love affair with Skrebensky was

'daring and reckless and dangerous they knew ---- their game, each playing with fire, not with love. A sort of defiance of all the world possessed her in it - she would kiss him just because she wanted to.

And a care-devilry in him, like a cynicism, a cut at everything he pretended to serve, retaliated in him.'(302).

Although Ursula's sensual enjoyment with Anton offered her a short-lived physical satisfaction, paradoxically she thought, she felt it within her through the male that was in Anton, an impersonal experience. But when she was with Anton, the conscious individual, she felt in herself a negative sense of life opposed to the intuitive understanding about life and its natural activities. Anton, with devotion to war, never thought of his future except in terms of pugnacious activity. He considered himself part of the nation violating his integral identity as an individual; he was part, not whole. How could such a man be physically so sensitive as to offer sensual fulfilment and freedom to a woman? It appeared to Ursula absurd. A feeling of deadness engulfed her, creating a dead-lock of passion between them. She said to Anton: 'You seem like nothing to me'(311)

Now the question arises what kind of life did Ursula desire? An instance of the same comes from their joint visit to a family living at an empty barge. It was an unsophisticated small family with a child yet to be baptized. Her intimate talk to them revealed that here, in the family, lay the satisfaction of living; they had a life-style positive and fulfilling. She baptized the child offering her her own necklace and finally,

'she went hastening on, gladdened by having met the grimy, lean man with the ragged moustache. He gave her a pleasant warm feeling. He made her feel the richness of her own life. Skrebensky, somehow, had created a deadness round her, a sterility, as if the world were ashes.'(316).

This negative feeling of deadness embittered her intimacy with Skrebensky. She realized that Anton 'never really want(s) a woman, not with the whole of him, never love, never worship, only just physically want(s) her'(316). But the male-female relationship is not simply a sexual one. It has its religious significance. D.H.Lawrence identified female in woman with the moon-goddess and male in man, with the sun-god. The union of god and goddess is, in his opinion, possible only through the sexual union of man and woman at a higher plane, where both man and woman are free and integrated and unite with the same reverence to each other as the worship of god and goddess. In the symbolic scene, where both Ursula and Anton went to the stackyard in a moonlit night, the female in Ursula was roused. She was in a mystic state expecting to receive the male in man. But Anton failed to achieve in himself that higher state which Ursula sought and remained mechanical and impotent.

This growing conflict has its root into the industrial world. As representatives of two different worlds : Ursula, of the pastoral unsophisticated Lawrentian world with its root into the soil, and Skrebensky, of the modern industrial world which was, so to speak, rootless due to the lack of its vital connection with the soil, their approach to love and life were diverse. What Skrebensky desired was a world of industry where the soft soil would be overlapped by stone and the sky, with dust. But Ursula never could accept it, for it was deficient in providing that dark sensual understanding which, she thought, could liberate her from modern deadness. Skrebensky, she observed, wanted 'the good of the greatest

number'(328) with a belief that 'a man was important in so far as he represented all humanity'(328). He was reluctant to consider that 'the community is an abstraction from the many and is not the many themselves'(329) and that 'no highest good of the community --- would give him the vital fulfilment of his soul'(328). He was guided by the idea of 'common good' that, Ursula observed, in practice, had become 'a general nuisance, representing the vulgar, conservative materialism at a low level'(329).

Now, this was not Ursula's only experience, too disappointing to accomplish her high expectation of life, but wherever she went with high ambition, to school, to College, to pit--- she discovered the same 'conservative materialism at its low level'. At High School, she met Winnefred Inger, her mistress, a woman of twenty eight, with whom she developed a deep intimacy that finally turned to lesbianism, a secret shame in the women's world. She visited her uncle Tom's pit at Wiggiston where she apprehended another form of vile pursuit over the workers, who, being caught by the pit, a terrific death trap, were blackened in their body and soul by the pit dirt. The pit stood like their fate : 'they must alter themselves to fit the pits and the place, rather than alter the pits and the place to fit themselves'(347). They were caged into the sinister hold of modern technology. Again, with two-fold intention to understand the vast outer world of the working people and to be self-dependent, Ursula, completing her matriculation examination, joined the teaching post at Kingston. But teaching was a terrible job to a sensitive girl like Ursula. Frequent interference of Mr.Herby, the Headmaster of the school, wicked behaviours of some of the students,

and continuous pressure to keep the entire class in proper order - everything forced her to be obstinate, insensitive and mechanical. The entire process of teaching appeared to her dull, unsympathetic and life-denying. Now, Ursula, the teacher, resigned her job to be a student, devoted to study. She was admitted to the College, enshrined with a high hope to acquire knowledge, dark and mysterious, about life. She believed that 'the monks of God held the learning of men and imparted it within the shadow of religion'(430). But within a year, her high hope vanished. She was, now inquisitive; where was that higher form of education, that helped fertilize body and soul, the whole of her, expecting which she had come to learn? The College appeared to her 'a sort of second-hand curio shop, where one bought curios and learned the market-value of curios; dull curios too, on the whole'(434). Precisely, coming to the College in order to learn, she got the real learning that :

This (College) was only a little side-show to the factories of the town. --- This was no religious retreat, no seclusion of pure learning. It was a little apprentice-shop where one was further equipped for making money. The College itself was a little, slovenly laboratory for the factory' (pp. 434-35).

Ursula observed tremendous expansion of industrial mechanism everywhere, in schools, in colleges, in factories, in politics and even in the mind of the people. She failed to enrich her soul through education; for it attempted to analyse everything in 'the light of science and knowledge'(437), the intellectual knowledge. The interpretation that 'life consists in a complexity of physical and chemical activities, of the same order as the activities we already know in science'(440), appeared to her a misinterpretation of life, because, the apparently seeming

unlimited power of 'science and knowledge', she observed, had only the capacity to uncover a very limited area, the enlightened conscious area of life leaving aside much that always remained beyond or outside its boundary. She thought : 'which she was, positively, was dark and unrevealed, it could not come forth'(437), and 'this world in which she lived was like a circle lighted with a lamp'(437). The dark mystery of life, which science and intellectual knowledge could never fathom, now appeared to her more important. She understood that any vital knowledge about life is mysterious and without that mysterious knowledge, life becomes mechanical and dull. With a high hope to enlighten her soul with the dark knowledge, Ursula entered into the Botanical Laboratory. She looked through her microscope into the unicellular living organism to see the bright mist of its ciliary activity, the gleam of its nucleus :

'Suddenly in her mind the world gleamed strangely, with an intense light, like the nucleus of the creature under the microscope. Suddenly she had passed away into an intensely-gleaming light of knowledge. She could not understand what it all was. She only knew that it was not limited mechanical energy, nor mere purpose of self-preservation and self-assertion. It was a consummation, a being infinite. Self was a oneness with the infinite. To be oneself was a supreme gleaming triumph of infinity'(441).

Ursula, now being enlightened with dark wisdom, got out of the laboratory to meet Skrebensky, her source of sensual understanding, 'the key, the nucleus of the new world'(442). But as soon as she met him, she was repelled to find that still 'he belonged to a different world from her' (442). The stark reality gradually dawned upon her that Skrebensky was one of those intellectuals, who knew the 'monkey-

tricks of knowledge or learning or civic deportment.' (448) She attacked Anton's shallow democratic ideas, for they were, she thought, a process of 'side-tracking his own soul'(443). But unlike her mother Anna who also contradicted Will Brangwen only to nullify him, Ursula denied Anton's notion of fake nationality in order to convey to him her message of the vast territory of life that the civilization with its logic and reason, has either quashed away or refused to take notice of.

Ursula, with Anton, went to Dorothy's cottage at the foot of the downs and at night, they ascended to its top. From the peak, they looked down to earth below and saw what England was : '-a blind, sordid, strenuous activity, all for nothing, fuming with dirty smoke and running trains and groping in the bowels of the earth, all for nothing'(466). But the peak of the downs, a pre-historic spot like 'an earthwork of the stone-aged man'(465) was undefiled and uncontaminated by the evils of modern civilization. It was dark by the clear night, but not darkened by smoke or soot. There, they spent the night like Adam and Eve, making adventure into the mystery of each other's physical self. It was to them a way to 'resurrection', a state of rebirth into pure free self. Skrebensky having stayed with her as an active participant throughout the night, understood what Ursula wanted at the bottom of her heart. But as Skrebensky was confined to his fragile ego, he struggled more to retain his own identity as a modern representative intact than to come out of the dead shell of modernism. So their communion finally turned to be a failure. But this does not imply that Ursula could not succeed in conveying her message to Skrebensky. For Skrebensky, later on confessed his own enrichment in communion with Ursula and

her absence made his deficiency conspicuous :

'He felt as if his life were dead. His soul was extinct. The whole being of him had become sterile, he was a spectre, divorced from life. He had no fullness, he was just a flat shape. Day by day the madness accumulated in him. The horror of not-being possessed him'(458).

What Ursula desired; an intuitive wisdom about physical life at high level, a

'blood knowledge' was deficient in Anton. So Ursula denied his marriage-proposal and instantly he burst into tears creating an unnatural situation that, she felt, exerted on her a pressure to submit to him. She was in a dilemma; for her submission would be synonymous to the denial of her self, a complete crush of everything that she stood for. Finally, their relationship broke up and immediately afterwards, Skrebensky getting married to his colonel's daughter left for India.

But having cut off her relationship with Skrebensky, Ursula was much more affected than before. Now, as she was pregnant with Skrebensky's child, an anathema of failed relationship, she wrote to him willing to expiate what had gone wrong in their relationship and requesting him to accept her as his wife. Such an apologetic letter, if was written at the beginning of their affair, might be considered true; but now, it implies her submission to the tremendous pressure exerted on her by the circumstances. She was sick, and, in a state of delirium, was victimized by the distraction of the senses, that symbolically was presented by the lashing attack of wild horses. The horses represented the dark sensual male-power of which Skrebensky was deficient and in communion with which, Ursula overcame the resistance of her negative inner forces. So the crisis was over: she now realized that

life is supreme and any defeat in life marked an end of a wrong track that she had followed before. But from this end, she knew, would begin a new direction, positive and life-fulfilling as a token of which she dreamt a dream of rainbow, a prediction about a new world, pastoral, organic not far different from the old one with which the novel began :

'She (Ursula) saw in the rainbow the earth's new architecture, the old, brittle corruption of houses and factories swept away, the world built up in a living fabric of Truth, fitting to the over-arching heaven'(496).

: : : : : :

WOMEN IN LOVE

Although *Women in Love*, remodelled on the remnants of "The Sisters", is thematically complete in itself, in spirit it is a continuation and development of Lawrence's rainbow-thesis. The opening conversation between two sisters, Ursula Brangwen and Gudrun Brangwen, obliquely suggests at Ursula's ill-match with Skrebensky, her inevitable break with him and her suffering at the end of *The Rainbow*. For Ursula, at the very beginning of *Women in Love*, considered marriage a serious matter, the 'end of experience' in life. She, now more considerate than ever before, was 'trying to lay hold on life to grasp it in her own understanding' (*Women in Love*, p.8, Hereafter by page number). These authorial remarks about Ursula represent her as an aggrieved woman inwardly shaken by some bitter experience in life. *Women in Love* describes Ursula's ceaseless struggle to overcome the crisis she had faced in *The Rainbow*. She, as we find her at the end of *Women in Love*, in communion with Birkin, achieved salvation, which is 'the paradisal entry into pure single being, the individual soul taking precedence over love and desire for union, stronger than any pangs of emotion, a lovely state of free proud singleness" (232-33). Again, despite being complete in all respects, *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* are thematically inter-related at a deeper level. Ursula Brangwen, at Gent Station, having seen a man with a lantern coming out of a farm by the railway, took a trip down the memory lane to the remote past. "She thought of the Marsh, the old intimate farm-life at Cossethay She remembered the servant Tilly, who used to give her bread and butter sprinkled with brown sugar, in the old living room..."(360). On another occasion, "she told him

(Birkin) about the Brangwens, and about her mother and about Skrebensky, her first love and about her later experiences." (138). Besides, there are so many references to *The Rainbow* story in *Women in Love*. Considering this aspect of the novel, Graham Hough refuted Leavis's view that *Women in Love* "has no organic connection with *The Rainbow*, (Leavis, F.R., 1955, 113), and said : "I first read *Women in Love* without knowing of the existence of *The Rainbow* and I found the social setting and status of the Brangwen girls so difficult to grasp that it seriously interfered of their presentation. ...Ursula and Gudrun... have behind them the whole Brangwen family history." (Hough, G., 1956; 91-92).

Ursula met Birkin when she was enriched with that living experience which, if not sweet enough, she had gained from her previous relationship with Skrebensky. But Gudrun, lacking that experience, suffered a setback in establishing a living relationship with Gerald Crich. She, unlike Ursula who was wise enough, was desperate, emotional and whimsical in taking a serious decision in life. "Marriage" was a word that tempted her ; it was to her a matter of joy, not a thing to consider so seriously as Ursula did. Gudrun was looking for 'a highly attractive individual of sufficient means'(2) to get married. Abruptly ending their conversation on marriage, the two sisters went to attend a marriage ceremony of the aristocratic Crich family at a church. There they met other major characters like, Gerald Crich, Birkin and a minor character, Hermione Roddice. As soon as Gudrun saw Gerald, she sensed 'something northern about him that magnetised her'(8), for, 'in his clear northern flesh and his fair hair was a glisten like cold sunshine refracted through crystals of ice'(8). Ursula, on the other hand, was

inquisitive about Birkin who 'piqued her, attracted her and annoyed her'(13). She felt within herself a natural kinship and a tacit understanding between him and her that should be developed. The two love-relationships with different outlooks on life, thus, began to develop : the former towards fatalism and the latter towards salvation. The Gerald-Gudrun pair, through their love could not achieve 'wholeness, or completeness, which is peace' (*Phoenix*, 142), whereas the Ursula-Birkin pair was a successful one in their joint venture into married life. Indeed, *Women in Love* illustrates Lawrence's idea of individual freedom that one should enjoy in conjugal life. It is no doubt a traditional theme, but Lawrence's ultimate solution, as we find it in Ursula-Birkin pair, takes us to another shore, somewhat remote to the prevalent custom. Lawrence's assumption that the two terms 'love' and 'marriage' have been trivialized by modern man reducing their great significance to life, led him to search for an alternative meaning of love and marriage that can provide man with peace and fulfilment so that he can boldly face the loneliness and boredom of modern life.

The wrong turn of Gerald Gudrun love affair appears at the outset to be an inevitable outcome of their faulty approach to life and Gerald is mainly responsible for it. But the reason behind it is intricately interwoven with the long history of social development, especially of the mechanical side, that is symbolically represented by Gerald, an aristocratic coal-mine owner. Gerald is a self-conceited and unsympathetic man. His accidental killing of his brother in childhood reveals an innate brutality within himself. Birkin, indeed reluctant to admit this incident as an accident, an isolated fact in life, thought that 'there was no such thing as accident; it all hung together in the deepest

sense'(19). Ursula, going a step further, commented : 'Perhaps there was an unconscious will behind it. This playing at killing has some primitive *desire* for killing in it'(40). Again, when Gerald's father, due to his acute illness, remained absent from the marriage ceremony of his daughter, Gerald played the host. His loud blowing of the conch-shell to get the guests together, troubled his ill father much, against which only a teen-aged girl cautioned him. On another occasion, both Ursula and Gudrun, while attending the water-party arranged by Gerald, found him with a bandaged hand, for he accidentally trapped it in some machine. Such is Gerald, the reckless man, whose life is full of accidents and accidental issues, and the final accident, his premature death, is not an unexpected matter.

D.H.Lawrence was mainly interested in the mystery of physical life. His literary pursuit, as some of the psychoanalytic critics have shown in *Sons and Lovers*, is a further testimony of Freud's philosophical speculations over Oedipus complex. Now, *Women in Love* suggests Lawrence's acquaintance with Mandel's 'Laws of Heredity' which describes human nature as an inherited quality of the parental generation. For, in order to provide a clear understanding about what Gerald is at bottom, Lawrence delved deep into Gerald's parental history. In the second chapter of *Women in Love*, the colourful celebration of the marriage ceremony of the Crich family also hints at something which suggests the wrong trend of the family. Mrs. Crich, Gerald's mother, while attending the wedding ceremony, appeared to be an 'estranged woman'(17) with 'tense clear face'(17). She came neither to enjoy nor to supervise the ceremony, but to meet Gerald, her eldest son. Her apathy towards the guests or the humanity itself points to her life-

long suffering and despondency. In Chapter XVII, we get a detailed account of what has gone wrong with her. Thomas Crich, Gerald's father, married Christiana, a proud haughty lady, and, as it seems, used her for his purpose, like his use of the pit, his another great 'mistress'. He never tried to understand her, nor to speak of loving her. As a consequence, she in her turn :

"took no notice of him, externally. She submitted to him, let him take what he wanted and do as he wanted with her. She was like a hawk that sullenly submits to everything. The relation between her and her husband was wordless and unknown, but it was deep, awful, a relation of utter interdestruction."(198)

To speak otherwise, Mr. Crich let himself be tied hard with his wife and also with the miners of his pit. His christian attitude of love and self-sacrifice and his emotional over-response to them led him into trouble. His idea of equality, indirectly provoked his fellow-workers to be ambitious about their material prosperity on the one hand, and on the other, forced him to use his own estate as a source for charity, a tendency that Christiana sternly refuted throughout her married life and that ultimately trapped Mr. Crich into a chaos. At the last stage of his life, Mr. Crich, a failed ideologue and a patient of acute pain, thought that "his wife and the consuming pain were the same dark secret power against him, that he never faced."(195). But whatever he did, the humanitarian side of his character always remained active, he never thought himself isolated or terror-stricken and at least was not unsuccessful in his relationship with the working people and with his wife although he had failed in keeping his mine in perfect order.

Now Gerald, as the new proprietor of the mine, deliberately set down to reform

the mining system with an intention to amend his father's shortcomings, but in the process he committed other wrongs. He brushed aside the philanthropic motives, the leading quality of his father, and led the mine towards "pure organic disintegration and pure mechanical organization"(210). What he needed was "a marvellous adjustment of myriad instruments, human, animal, metallic, kinetic, dynamic, a marvellous casting of myriad tiny wholes into one great perfect entirety"(208). He took the role of a super machine, the god of machine - 'Deus ex machina'(208). He himself appeared to be a great instrument of will-power not only at the pit but also in every sphere of life. A clear instance of his application of will-power in a brutal and 'unmanly' way is his treatment of the Arab mare. He took it for granted that the mare was for his use and he has used it in a way he liked, an act suggestive of his innate brutality.

Gudrun, who never thought of love and marriage as effective means of personal salvation, was longing for the establishment of a love-relationship with Gerald. But her attitude towards him was fiercely competitive rather than co-operative. Gerald's swimming in the Willey-Water perturbed her. She began to envy him for "the freedom, the liberty, the mobility" he used to enjoy being a man and that she could not being a woman. "She was so hot, so flushed, so furious that Ursula was puzzled"(39). With an intention to shatter his reckless freedom through her sportive and violent love relationship, she was seeking for a chance to meet him and she got it soon. One day, she was busy sketching the natural scene sitting beside the Willey-Water when both Gerald and Hermione Roddice arrived there to see her incomplete sketch book. At the time of handing it over to Gerald, the sketch book accidentally slipped on the mud and got

the first blow" (153). Gudrun, undaunted by his charge, replied with a smile that she would strike the last. Gudrun's violent game with Gerald, however, discloses that something is wrong with her, and that her association with Gerald cannot ensure the prospect of a peaceful settlement. Again, Gudrun's desperate attempt to bring Bismark, the wild rabbit, out of its cage is another act of impudence. The animal, with its sharp paws bruised her hands. She was bleeding and Gerald's immediate intervention relieved her. But at this moment :

"Gudrun looked at Gerald with strange darkened eyes, strained with underworld knowledge, almost supplicating like those of a creature which is at his mercy, yet which is his ultimate victor. --- He felt a mutual hellish recognition.--- He had the power of lightning in his nerves, she seemed like a soft recipient of his magical, hideous white fire."(220)

This animal scene, with two others, the cattle scene and Gerald's taming of Arab mare, completed the preliminary stage of their growing intimacy. Their physical brutality, unsympathetic application of will-power and blood shedding sports imply their violent nature and the grim prospect of their love-relationship. Everywhere they are non-cooperative and callous, scarcely showing any sign of positive approach to life.

Gerald's step to effect what may be called mechanical fulfilment in his mines, created within himself a void, diminishing his physical vigour. His abortive attempt to rescue Diana from drowning and his horror-stricken condition at the scene of his father's slow death, made him conscious of his own limitation. He, as he found himself trapped in his own mechanical devices, sought for a way out of this situation with the help of Gudrun, his last hope. In a state of mental trance, he set out for Gudrun at night and

stealthily got into her room. His night-long stay with Gudrun temporarily relieved her : “He felt his limbs growing fuller and flexible with life, his body gained an unknown strength. He was a man again, strong and rounded”(317). Gerald, for the first time understood the positive role of a woman in life. He immediately disclosed his intention to Birkin that he would marry Gudrun. But deeply rooted in tradition as he was, he never believed that “a woman and nothing but a woman will ever make my life” (47). With no feeling of true and sincere love in his blood, he became lovesick only to save himself from “agony of inertia’. The result is disastrous.

At Innsburck, both Gerald and Gudrun stayed together. But their close friendship only fuelled to further their combative moods. Gudrun seemed to have felt Gerald’s deficiencies both as a lover and a man more clearly. She took him for ‘a perfect instrument’(386) intending to combat him and to triumph over him. She never considered him as an individual, so atomic and private, a representative of modern industrial England. In him she thought ‘she had touched the whole pulse of social England’ (386). So Gerald was now finished to her. And she turned towards a new man Loerke, an “odd creature, slight and unformed like a boy’s”(374). Her intimacy with Loerke was further deepened when she found that he was also an artist and a sculptor. In him, she found “the rock bottom of all life”(394). But to Ursula, Loerke was nothing but ‘a rat in the river of corruption’(395). The statuette of a naked girl, small and finely made, sitting on a big horse that Loerke showed the two sisters at once unveiled his hide bound brutality before Ursula. He appeared to her to be an idealist who had modelled his horse to a stock, stiff animal to fulfil his own idea of corruption. But Gudrun took it

otherwise. Echoing Loerke, she declared 'art and life' as 'the Reality and the Unreality'(414), and love, in her opinion, was one of the temporal things in her life, a subsidiary issue. The only man she now considered worthy was Loerke, who "had understanding where Gerald was a calf"(416). She rejected Gerald for, he assumed that the subjection of woman depended on "handsomeness and nobleness" but never had gone further to understand the secret of woman's life and to transcend "the climax of sensual reaction".(417).

The Gerald-Gudrun relationship at the outset may be called a love affair; but it is a dangerous game with life. Both realized that the germ of degeneration had already been latent within the relationship. They could never love each other devotedly. They were deficient in living understanding. We heard from Mrs.Crich that he (Gerald) is the most wanting of them all'(18). The word 'wanting' seems to imply that Gerald is "both the most lacking in self-sufficiency, and the most apt to demand vital support from others". (Leavis, F.R., 1976, 88). But the paradox is that he neither realized, nor admitted his own deficiency. In the last stage, when Gudrun protested against his parasitic nature, he for the first time in his life enquired of himself : "can't you be self-sufficient?"(411). But till then he failed to give up his domineering will-power that, as we have seen, defeated him in every vital activity, now leading him towards self-annihilation.

A positive and life-sustaining love is presented by Birkin and Ursula. Of course, through the Birkin-Ursula pair, Lawrence brought into question the whole institution of marriage which *The Rainbow* had taken for granted. Ursula was dissatisfied with what

may be called hellow-darling-kiss-me type of conjugal life and was seeking for an alternative type of marriage that would bring a new meaning in her life. She knew the school inspector Birkin as a progressive intellectual. But Birkin's hot debate with Hermione Roddice discloses to Ursula a new direction, downward from head to blood. Birkin supported the physical understanding (realizing and responding with one's whole being) in opposition to Hermione's desire to know (the intellectual understanding). This aroused Ursula's interest towards him. She heard him saying that "it is a fulfilment — the great dark knowledge you can't have in your head - the dark involuntary being. It is death to one self - but it is the coming into being of another."(34). Ursula, being unable to interpret his phrases, demanded a further explanation. Birkin curtly replied : "you've got to lapse out before you can know what sensual reality is, lapse into unknowingness, - -- you've got to learn not-to-be, before you can come into being"(35). Although Ursula hardly comprehended what he actually meant, she realized that his expression was itself a clue to understand the dark physical self. She was satisfied, for Birkin, like her, also "dared throw a firebrand into the darkness"(438).

But Birkin himself was caged into modern ideological humbug. His love of Hermione Roddice never let him be free from 'the vicious mental deliberate profligacy'(35). When he was busy inspecting Ursula's Grammar School, Hermione intervened in it and created "a little scene between the lovers"(28). Birkin's vehement protest against her abstract notion of life made her insistent and obstinate. In fact, she could neither come out of her bruised ego, nor transcend her life-denying intellectualism. Rather, a proud woman on that score, she tried to impress upon Birkin

her views and ideas of life. As she was thwarted by Birkin's refusal to be submissive to her, her "hatred of him was subconscious and intense"(77). She looked really gay while she insulted him. The conflict reached its climax when Hermione charged him at the time of copying a Chinese art. Birkin's decision to remain unsundered to her ideological humbug incurred her wrath. She was exasperated and hit him with a *lapis lazuli* with intention of taming him. But this desperate act was, so to speak, a death-blow to their wearisome intimacy; it loosen her hold over Birkin who was now forced to ponder over his relationship with Hermione. Her relentless act paradoxically provided Birkin with a new energy to come out free from her emotional spell.

True, Birkin had no past, no social history. But he had one thing intact. He never cut himself off from the great source, the nature. His every step, whether it was an act of seeking solace at difficult time or of establishing a living relationship with a woman, took place in the lap of nature. To soothe the pain he sustained from Hermione's attack, he went straight into the wild valley full of trees and plants while it was raining. There he relaxed himself lying down almost naked like a primitive man on the soft grass. The stillness of the place relieved him of his mental sore. He thought : "what a mistake he made thinking he wanted people, thinking he wanted a woman" (95). But Ursula of *The Rainbow* gained from a similar situation a different experience. She understood from her night long visit to a lone valley that fulfilment in life can be achieved through physical communion with a man who already had possessed in him the dark sensual knowledge. However, she was unlucky; Skrebensky lacked that wisdom.

Besides, Birkin often contradicted himself. Although he attacked Hermione

Roddice for defects of knowledge in the head, he, in his own way, argued more than anybody else in the novel. His argument figured prominently in the novel only to be dismissed or devalued by his interlocutors, mostly by Ursula. When both Ursula and Birkin visited a small island, overgrown with bushes and a few trees in the middle of a big pond, Ursula found that Birkin was misanthropic. He wished a world minus humanity, for, 'man is a mistake'(113). His highfalutin ideas, often absurd, fell flat to Ursula's sharp logic and "he was beginning to feel a fool?"(113). Immediately afterward, they decorated the pond with floating daises and enjoyed a romantic voyage together. At that time, Birkin declared that he was ready to throw away everything else to get one thing - 'freedom together' (117). It is a contradiction to his previous comment. It implies that Birkin, who appears to be more mental than Hermione Roddice, is no less physical or primitive than later Lawrentian heroes. He was two in one. When he remained with Ursula amidst wild nature, he became a dark Lawrentian hero.

However worn out Birkin was by Hermione's suffocating love, he never became pessimistic about love and marriage and their significance in life. He stuck to the idea of perfect union with a woman-sort of ultimate marriage. He told Ursula that he wanted a strange conjunction with her, not meeting and mingling, but "an equilibrium, a pure balance between two single beings - as the stars balance each other"(133). Simultaneously he denied that it was love, but something else. Ursula was confused. It seemed to her, as if he were in love with the analysis of love that he directly denied to confess. Their entire discussion was more like fight than friendship. But in spite of all

of these, Ursula found in Birkin a seriousness and an earnestness in his discussion, although she was not convinced. While their debate was on, Ursula saw Minu, a male cat bullying a female one. It appeared to her disgusting like that of Gerald's brutal treatment of the mare. But Birkin sided with Mino that made her doubtful about Birkin as a big bully. Further, she found him fickle-minded and vacillating and criticized him saying that : "you don't trust yourself. You don't fully believe yourself what you are saying" (137). This implies that either Birkin was trying to make her understand what itself was till then incomprehensible to him, or he was struggling to express what words cannot express.

In the Water-Party, they saw the drowning of Diana Crich and Gerald's abortive attempt to rescue her . The horror of death terrified them. Ursula heard Birkin saying : "I do want to die from this life.... One is delivered over like a naked infant from the womb, all the old defences and the old body gone, a new air around one, that has never been brathed before."168). Ursula failed in her conscious ego to make out what he meant (--- that words themselves do not convey meaning - 168) except a feeling of "his gesture through her blood"(168). All of a sudden, she, being charmed by his physical grace, held him tight and "covered his face with hard, fierce kisses of passion"(169). This sudden act at once revived Birkin from his monklike state. The blood beat up in him. He became a potent lover, mainly physical to be united with her. This physical communion provided Birkin with a new wisdom. He now thought about nothing but "this ultimate and triumphant experience of physical passion, that had blazed up anew

like a new spell of life”(169) and except this, he contemplated : “I was becoming quite dead-alive, nothing but a word bag”(169).

Unlike later Lawrentian heroes who were desperate seekers after the dark mystery of physical life, Birkin was physically timid. He was eager to marry Ursula, but feared her female ego. “Women”, he thought, “wanted to have, to own, to control, to be dominant”(182). She was the Magna Mater, “Man was hers, because she had borne him and she now claimed again, soul and body, sex, meaning and all”(182). Birkin had a horror of Magna Mater. The ‘Moony’ scene is a dramatic/symbolic presentation of Birkin’s fight against female ego. One evening, Ursula set off for Willey Green and came to Willey Water. Here in the still moonlit night, she saw Birkin pelting stones at the pond to disperse the shadow of the moon in water. He was, at the same time, cursing the moon calling it Cybele, the accused Syria Dea. The moon is mythologically the white goddess, the primal woman image by which Birkin was obviously haunted. Ursula initially thought it ridiculous; but Birkin’s over insistence on it symbolically shattered her female ego. “She felt she had fallen to the ground and was spilled out, like water on earth”(226). She went to him, subservient and requested to stop it. This scene brought them closer together in the lonely woods. But here again they began the old fight that concluded with a new understanding that love relationship “must happen beyond the sound of words”(229).

In order to save himself from a destructive mechanism and sentimental love affair, Birkin now searched for something deeper, darker than ordinary life could give. He remembered what he had seen, at Halliday’s room, the African fetish, a symbol of

“pure culture in sensation, culture in the physical consciousness, --- mindless, utterly sensual” (68). But no, he did not want to retrace to the past. He thought :

“There was another way, the way of freedom. There was the Paradisal entry into pure, single being, the individual soul taking precedence over love and desire for union, stronger than any pangs of emotion, a lovely state of free proud singleness, which accepts the obligation of the permanent connection with others, and with the other, submits to the yoke and leash of love, but never forfeits its own proud individual singleness, even while it loves and yields.”(232-33).

Birkin had to fulfil this, getting married to Ursula. He went straight to her house and met her father instead of her. Later on, Ursula arrived there and found the situation getting tense and provocative. As a consequence, she angrily rejected Birkin’s proposal. This is one of Birkin’s unsuccessful attempts to fulfil his mission which reminds us, what Gerald said about Birkin, that “instead of wanting a woman for herself, he wants his ideas fulfilled, which, when it comes to actual practice, is not good enough”(264).

The final peace accord between them was established only after their stiffest quarrel, bitter than that of Hermione’s. Birkin appeared dubious to Ursula. When he was with her, he became free and frank to her; but the intervention of Hermione Roddice between them always shrank him back to her. Ursula suffered such a humiliation at the hands of Birkin and was ready to combat him. Next day, she mutely accepted Birkin’s proposal to accompany him in his tour. But as soon as she heard from Birkin about his early departure to meet Hermione, she got off the car and unleashed a storm of angry protest against him. Even she threw to his nose the gifts he had offered to her and left him in rage. Her violent criticism was too hard to digest for Birkin. But this brought

him back to his good senses. He found Ursula's accusation right. He thought that "his spirituality was concomitant of a process of depravity, a sort of pleasure in self-destruction. There really was a certain stimulant in self-destruction, for him - especially when it was translated spiritually. But then he knew it ---- and had done." (284). This understanding turned every impediment out of their fruitful communion. His defeat to Ursula finally let him win over Ursula. She came back to him and as it seems, surrendered to him when she got him as a dark physical hero bereft of all ideological humbug.

The couple now decided to marry. For, the married life, according to Birkin, is a state of new superfine bliss where "there is no I and You, --- only the third, unrealized wonder, the wonder of existing not as one oneself, but in a consummation of my being and of her being in a new one, a new paradisaal unit regained from duality"(341). Through marriage, they were transported into this state of 'freedom together'. In this connection, the final words came from Ursula who said to Gudrun :

"I believe in something inhuman, of which love is only a little part. I believe what we must fulfil comes out of the Unknown to us, and it is something infinitely more than love. It isn't so merely *human*."(405)

Ursula's realization of the "inhuman" in her love relationship, and of the "Unknown" in her known and performed living activities transcends the mere events of the novel and hints at the third force, the "Holy Ghost", which is, in Lawrence's opinion, the reconciler of the male and female.

The difference that Lawrence has drawn between Gerald-Gudrun and Ursula-

Birkin pairs reveals Lawrence's profound understanding. His integrated study of love, and marriage in terms of Gerald-Gudrum pair on the one hand, and Ursula-Birkin pair on the other presents "a dazzling original narrative form, through which profound intuition of life could be brought to confront the systems of custom and convention, habit and law, work and art, thought and emotion determining the nature of social existence"(Moynahan, J.; 1963, 89).

But the novel concludes with another theme, man-to-man relationship. Birkin, having been informed about Gerald's death at Innsburck, immediately rushed there. As he looked at Gerald, now dead and cold : "Suddenly his heart contracted, his own candle all but fell down from his hand, as, with a strange whimpering cry, the tears broke out. He sat down in a chair, shaken by a sudden access"(442). His grief-stricken condition implies his deep and intricate friendship with Gerald. Indeed, Birkin never wished to confine himself only within the man-woman relationship but also an equally important one between man and man, a matter that remained unresolved and unfulfilled in the novel. Frequent instances of Lawrence's life-long struggle to invest this man-to-man kinship with deep and mysterious meaning is conspicuous from the very beginning of his writing. *The White Peacock* depicts such a friendship between Cyril Beardsall and George Saxton. The same is present between Aron Sisson and Lily in *Aron's Rod*. But with a clearer description of it in *Women in Love*, Lawrence, as it seems articulates a revolt against the very conventional relationship between man and woman. For, in contemporary England, he found "mistrustful couples insulated in private houses or private rooms, always in couples, and no further life, no further immediate, no

disinterested relationship admitted; a kaleidoscope of married couples.”(181). Lawrence’s man-to-man relationship, an alternative and effective way to face boredom of loneliness one suffers in conjugal life, after all, satisfies his longing for something which he, in relation to woman, felt compelled to resist. But the apparent sense of vagueness of his idea inspired some critics to make the charge of homosexuality, a direct contravention of Lawrence’s thesis. Lawrence always disfavoured homosexuality. He strongly criticized the Cambridge dons like Keynes and Birrell and said : “these horrible little frowsty people, men lovers of men, they give me such a sense of corruption, almost putrescence---” (*Lett.*, Moore, H.T., 333). In the *Classic American Literature*, he said : “For the great merger, woman at last becomes inadequate--- so the next step is the merging of man for man love. And this is on the brink of death. It slides over into death” (Lon, 1924-25). A brief notice of the background of Lawrence’s preparation of the final draft of *Women in Love*, will help to make his view transparent. The suppression of *The Rainbow* in 1915 made Lawrence more alert and more cautious. Donald Carswell read one copy of the typescript of *Women in Love* and annotated it in December, 1916. He perhaps warned Lawrence of the risk of man-to-man relationship that, in Carswell’s opinion, was prone to homosexuality. Now Lawrence struck out from the final typescript of the chapter ‘Man to Man’ a passage in which Birkin thought :

“Gerald and he had a curious love for each other. It was a love that was ultimately death, a love which was complemented by the hatred for man. --- It tore man from woman, and woman from man. The two halves divided and separated, each drawing away to itself. And the great chasm that came between the two sundered halves was death, universal death.”(40)

Lawrence rejected the type of writing that intensified the contradiction between male-to-male and male-female relationships. In the preparation of the novel, he struggled to make the former a complement to the latter relationship. In the published version of the novel, Birkin's kinship with Gerald is presented as a complement to his love relationship with Ursula, a new possibility not fully realised but wistfully longed for by Birkin. He proposed Gerald to swear *Blutbruderschaft*, an eternal conjunction between two men :

"You know how the old German knights used to swear a *Blutbruderschaft*" he said to Gerald---- "Make little wound in their arms and rub each other's blood into cut" said Gerald.

"Yes- and swear to be true to each other, of one blood, all their lives - that is what we ought to do".(188)

In chapter XX, Gerald found himself without real work and felt bored. He had completed the mechanization of his pits. Despite being free to do anything now that leisure affords, he found nothing to do, a condition of non-action like death in life. Birkin visited him when 'he was suspended motionless, in an agony of inertia, like a machine that is without power'(243). With mutual consent, they engaged in a wrestle, entwined with each other until both fell down on the floor, unconscious, for 'the wrestling had some deep meaning to them - an unfinished meaning'(249). Regaining consciousness, Gerald, now curious about the significance of the bout in life, enquired of Birkin if it was something like *Blutbruderschaft*. Birkin replied : 'perhaps, Do you think this pledges anything?'(249). This implies that Birkin was not confident about what he wished. But the wrestling, as we see later, revitalized Gerald by removing his physical inertia. This process of enhancing physical intimacy and vigourness is perhaps

borrowed from the nomads like the patterers who used to hawk on the streets and believed in the idea of 'duel'. It was for them a way to purify the body. The youths occasionally engaged in such physical bouts to develop greater intimacy among themselves. As soon as the fight was over, 'they shake hands and forget all about it'(Watt, Ian. 1971,472).

After this refreshing bout, both Gerald and Birkin could not resist talking about their love affairs. Birkin kept saying about the latest development of his love with Ursula, his visit to her father who angrily turned him down as Ursula's suitor; and Gerald, about his interest in 'love-true love'(251) of women. Thus Lawrence here complemented the man-to-man kinship to the man-woman love relationship. But this never implies the former's subservience to the latter relationship. Lawrence struggled to present man-to-man relationship, as a unique theme, complete in itself, not less significant than man-woman relationship. To provide a full-fledged elucidation of the significance of man-to-man kinship, Lawrence borrowed his idea from Cooper, an American artist, whom he quoted in *Classic American Literature* :

'A stark, stripped human relationship of two men, deeper than the deeps of sex. Deeper than property, deeper than fatherhood, deeper than marriage, deeper than love.'(1923, 61)

Clearly, Birkin suffered a great shock from Gerald's immature death and finally remained a failed prophet due to the non-fulfilment of his mission of true friendship with Gerald. A few days later, Ursula, resuming her talk about Birkin's unfulfilled relationship with Gerald, said to Birkin : 'You can't have two kinds of love---. You can't have it, because it's false, impossible.'(444). And Birkin's last reply, as well as

the last sentence of the novel : 'I don't believe that'(444), keeps incomplete not only the dialogue between two characters but also the novel itself. The conflict is not resolved, the final word is not said, and the book remains open-ended suggesting a thematic freedom of the novel in terms of a plurality of meanings.

: : : :

Chapter VI

THE LOST GIRL

After the completion of *Sons and Lovers* in November 1912, Lawrence conceived four different novels in the next four months. His plans for the first two, 'Scargill Street' and a 'Burns Novel' were quickly abandoned, the material of the last one 'The Sisters', was eventually turned into *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*, while the third 'Elsa Culverwell' was transmuted into 'The Insurrection of Miss Houghton' later renamed *The Lost Girl*. Lawrence's initial impetus for *The Lost Girl* came from his reading of Arnold Bennett's *Anna of the Five Towns*, that no doubt depressed him. He told Sallie Hopkin: 'I shall do a novel about love triumphant one day. I shall do my work for women, better than the suffrage' (Lett, H.T.M.(ed), 170-71). The story referred to as 'Elsa Culverwell' and its successors, 'The Insurrection of Miss Houghton' and *The Lost Girl*, concentrated on the Cullen family of Eastwood which Lawrence knew as a boy and adolescent. George Henry Cullen whose failures became legendary, his invalid wife, his governess, his daughter, who like Alvina Houghton became a nurse - all are presented in disguise in *The Lost Girl*. The twenty-page fragment of 'Elsa Culverwell', a first person narrative of a girl describing her family and her girlhood, abruptly broke off in the middle of a paragraph. Lawrence probably wrote it by the end of December 1912.

Seven years later, in 1920, Lawrence found England faced with another problem, the problem of surplus women. Now, with the help of that remote story of

Elsa Culverwell, he wanted to suggest a solution to this problem. He wished to complete the incomplete story renaming the protagonist as Alvina Houghton. As Lawrence preferred an 'extraordinary and wonderful ... woman who can support the insupportable, can cross oceans and mountains in an answer to her thorough-going self' (Drapper, R.P., 1970, 154) he brought Alvina Houghton out of the humdrum lives to make her a 'declassé'. This unfamiliar attempt made the book "different from --- all other work, not immediate, not intimate - except the last bit, all set across a distance" (Lett, 11 June, 1920). The novel lacked the seriousness of his previous masterpieces so that Graham Hough said that the novel "seems to have originated in a far more superficial region of the mind than any of its predecessors except *The Trespasser*" (Hough, G. 1970, 111). But the novel proved to be a popular one. It was awarded the James Tait Black Prize, the only prize and formal recognition that Lawrence had ever received. J. Moynahan described the novel as showing a movement downward into a rich, shapeless darkness, a flight to remote pastoral place, Italy, which is, in a sense, an image of Lawrence's change of heart. As Moynahan comments; '*The Lost Girl* celebrates the triumph of lowmindedness and attempts to replace the old metaphors of moral strenuousness which fixed moral achievement in expressions like 'higher laws', "ascendency", "superiority", "uplift" and so forth with fresh metaphors of downwardness and underneathness' (Moynahan, J. 1966 : 122). But such comments often conceal the reality instead of revealing it. To speak otherwise, in a writing, when a profound contradiction arises between the writer's intention and the reader's susceptibility, the reader finds that

his own colour won't soak and he says that he does not like the writer (Drapper, R.P., 1970, 151). Keeping these two different comments in mind, we can say that *The Lost Girl* invites modern civilized man to see himself in terms of the vital self of its protagonists.

The theme of the novel explores in a renewed way Lawrence's metaphysics of the "blood knowledge". In *The Rainbow*, Ursula Brangwen craved for this dark knowledge symbolized by a host of horses. That was fulfilled perhaps at a hallucinatory state against the background of a pastoral world similar to that of Italy in *The Lost Girl*. Like Ursula Brangwen, Alvina Houghton is also a woman of middle-class origin. But she gladly embraced intuitive life, preferred a remote pastoral place in Italy and ultimately accepted primitivism instead of the life of the mind imposed upon by the industrial world.

The Lost Girl, at the outset appears intricate due to the introduction of a variety of minor characters. But it is 'unilinear in construction with no complication of plot' (Pinion, F.B.; 1978, 181). The mining townlet Woodhouse in the novel is Eastwood and the social setting is the same as that of *The White Peacock* or *Sons and Lovers*. But it looks different simply because Lawrence is not part of it and the portrayal is from outside :

A well-established society is Woodhouse, full of fine shades, ranging from the dark of coal-dust to grit of stonemason and sawdust of timber-merchant, through the lustre of lard and butter and meat, to the perfume of the chemist and the disinfectant of the doctor, on to the serene gold-tarnish of bank-managers, cashiers for the firm, clergymen and such-like, as far as the automobile refulgence of the general-manager of all the collieries: (*The Lost Girl*, 1981, 1; Hereafter by page number).

But Lawrence is now critical of the quality of life it offers. Here Alvina failed to earn sufficient means to afford her livelihood and had to compromise much to her dignity. But again from here she got the impetus to fulfil the mission of her life. Finally, she led her conjugal life at a remote place in Italy opposite in spirit to her birth place;

It seems there are places which resist us, which have the power to overthrow our psychic being. It seems as if every country had its potent negative centres, localities which savagely and triumphantly refuse our living culture. And Alvina had struck one of these, here on the edge of the Abruzzi, (314).

At the core of the novel is the marriage of Alvina and Ciccio. Alvina is a middle-class woman of the civilized modern society and Ciccio, a 'barbaric' Italian with dark physical vigour and apparently their marriage is just impossible. But this is a vital part of Lawrence's vision. In his first novel, *The White Peacock*, we hear from Annable that 'all civilization was the painted fungus of rotteness' and his advice is to 'be a good animal', and to 'trust to your animal instinct'(W.P.). Lawrence felt a sense of crisis which the Western civilization as a whole was undergoing. Although he never wanted the retrace of modern civilization to the past, he felt the necessity for the primal experience to fight modern deadness. Lawrence said :

We do not need to live the past over again. Our darkest tissues are twisted in this old tribal experience, our warmest blood came out of the old tribal fire—-. But I don't want to go back to them---. I never want to deny them or break with them. But there is no going back. My way is my own. (*Phoenix*, 99).

In *The Lost Girl*, Alvina plainly discarded her higher self^s of moral,

intellectual and social awareness and upheld the lower self of physical instinct. As she was extraordinary she followed the call of her dark self the real self, and married Ciccio.

Alvina Houghton's upbringing for the first twenty years was rather simple with no remarkable event. While being brought up under the care of Miss Frost, her governess, Alvina saw the pathetic life-style of her heart-stricken neurotic mother. Simultaneously, she saw her father's successive failures in business. These bitter experiences provided her with courage and cunning endurance to break with the dead and dull situation. The temptations of Woodhouse, the constrictions of Alvina's sheltered living and paradoxically, her derisive attitude towards the youth who yearned to love her - all this created in her the rebellious defiance to reject the so-called modern society. At twentythree, she met Graham, an Australian of 'medium height, dark in colouring, with dark eyes'(22) who had taken her medical degree from Edinburgh. Alvina developed an intimacy with him but when she had to decide whether she would marry him or not, she was most obtrusively stopped by Miss Frost. Miss Frost implied that Alvina did not and could not love him because Miss Frost herself could not. This gave rise in Alvina a desperate woman, primitive and sensual. There was an 'old, derisive look at the back of her eyes, a look of old knowledge and deliberate derision'(21). She yearned to slip out of this weary situation. Meanwhile, she availed herself of a six-month training of a maternity nurse at Islington. It provided her with not only a temporary relief from the humdrum routine at Woodhouse, but also a new understanding. She was now

critical of the human situation itself :

Why have standards and regulation pattern ? Why have a human criterion? There's the point! Why in the name of all the free heavens, have human criteria? Why? Simply for bullying and narrowness. (46).

As Alvina was dissatisfied with everything that is modern, she preferred 'primitivism' both in life and in culture. The result is her failure in two love affairs, one with Albert Witham and the other with Dr. Mitchell. Alvina was eager to meet Albert Witham, a thirty-year old scholar of Oxford. But her short-lived relationship with him only confirmed the impression that marriage with him would be nothing but a repetition of what her neurotic mother had experienced. Although her father appreciated Albert, she found him a cerebral sort of man who 'did not think about what he was feeling and --- did not feel what he was thinking about'. (72). At the same time, Alvina was more interested in Arthur Witham, Albert's brother. On one evening, while Arthur was working on an organ loft, he fell down from it and was injured. Now, when Alvina was engaged in nursing him, the way he pressed her hands on his shin revealed to Alvina something intimate that was more than mere friendship. She was impressed by a 'secret determinedness' and a 'closeness' in Arthur, but at the same time was disillusioned at finding him selfish and egoistic never caring to understand her.

At that time, Alvina's father James Houghton called on a Red Indian troupe, 'Natch-Kee-Tewara' consisting of four young men and a woman, Madam Rochard. Here, in this troupe, Alvina met an Italian, Francesco Marasca or Frank, nicknamed

Ciccio, a youth 'fairly tall but loosely built --- with slightly sloping shoulders'(127). Lawrence modelled Ciccio on a native of rural Italy. For the nickname, Lawrence borrowed the name of the proprietor of the Fontana Vecchia, Francesco Cacopardo Ciccio, about whose romance Lawrence wrote to Amy Lowell in a letter on 26 June 1919. Ciccio was, to the modern, civilized people, a human animal. His appearance gives the impression that he was either degraded or backward in culture : 'His long, fine nose, his rather long, rounded chin and curling lips seemed (to be) refined through ages of forgotten culture'(160). He was more physical than cerebral, a man of action. His intimate talk with Alvina was rare, but what he wished to communicate was even plain from his appearance and physical gestures. Alvina loved him and let him leave Woodhouse only after he promised to meet her again. The relationship that began to develop between Alvina and Ciccio was 'a profound and dangerous interrelationship'(62), where 'the heart hears the heart'(146). Behind the veil of Ciccio's brutal appearance, she felt convinced of his ultimate good nature. He seemed to her to be the only passionately good-natured man she had ever seen. Ciccio was the first Lawrentian hero with dark, primitive physical vigour, a forerunner of Oliver Mellors, the hero of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, not in respect of genesis but, category. Lawrence's idea of the hero with a dark sensual power, an anti-hero in modern sense, initiated a new direction towards primitivism in his writing. This revolutionary idea of the hero defied socio-moral code and convention. Virginia Woolf noticed the emergence of this new tendency in Lawrence which is evident from what she comments on *The Lost Girl*. It is, she says, 'either a

postscript or a prelude' (Drapper, R.P., 1970, 143).

The Lost Girl embodies Lawrence's doctrine of silence, a state of sensual understanding, non-verbal and non-mental. It also marks his break with the past. In *The Rainbow*, Ursula's revolt against social maladies came out mainly through her expressions of discord and contradiction against the views and ideas of Skrebensky whom she rejected after a prolonged love relationship. In the present novel, Alvina never developed a prolonged love relationship with either Albert or Dr. Mitchell, who were, like Skrebensky, representatives of modern society; rather she tactfully evaded them. But this does not imply that Alvina was an escapist who dreaded modern youths and modern England which she finally left for a primitive place in Italy. She was a desperate woman, perceptual rather than conceptual, and a silent revolutionist who was always seeking to fulfil her deep sensual desires through silent physical communion instead of a lot of circumlocution. It is a process that Lawrence fully explored in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

After Alvina's father's death, Ciccio and Alvina met each other face to face at the door of Alvina's room. As soon as their eyes met, an understanding seemed to have instantly developed between them : 'His face too was closed and expressionless. But in his eyes, which kept hers, there was a dark flicker of ascendancy'(175). He suddenly asked with confidence : "You love me?-Yes?-Yes?"--in a voice that seemed like a palpable contact on her.

"Yes" she whispered---' (176).

Ciccio's sudden outburst charmed her, touching the strings of her secret

soul. She confessed to Madam later : “Siamo de accordo.”(we are agreed) came the voice of Ciccio. — “I don’t know” she said vaguely. “Have I” and she looked at him’(178). Her confession was not direct but it was enough to betray herself.

Alvina joined the Natchas as a pianist more for her love for Ciccio than for her livelihood. But she found that ‘they had horribly low standards - such low standards - not only of morality, but of life altogether’(209). So she decided to keep clear of the Natchas and as much of Ciccio. But her struggle to come out free from Ciccio’s spell only further intensified her love for him. She returned to her Manchester House with Ciccio. She “clung to Ciccio’s dark, despised foreign nature. She loved it, she worshipped it, she defied all the other world” (215). Later, she declared to Miss Pinnegar, her second governess, that ‘perhaps in the end I shall marry him’(217). It was unthinkable for Miss Pinnegar who called her a ‘declassé’, ‘a lost-girl’. But Alvina’s response was more towards her inner impulse than social or material status. She thought Ciccio understood her physically. But the low standard of the Natchas, quite unsuitable to her, forced her leave it and join a nursing job in a Hospital. Here she met another modern aristocrat, Dr. Mitchell, a Scotch ‘about fifty years old, tall, largely built with a good figure but with extraordinarily large feet and hands.’(253). His face was red and clean-shaven, his eyes blue, his teeth very good. He asked her to be engaged to him, tactfully creating a situation that compelled her to be so. However, Alvina observed him to be a hectoring person who, when he was crossed, became unendurable with a devil’s temper. While she had been with him, she felt, both physically and mentally, more depressed than

aroused. Indeed Dr. Mitchell was a gentleman but he was consciously so and Alvina knew 'if a man is conscious of being a gentleman, he is bound to be a little less than a man'(257). The engagement ring that Dr. Mitchell offered her was to her superficial and meaningless because 'he wanted her to be always there. And so he craved for marriage to possess her entirely, and to have her always there with him, so that he was never alone'(pp.270-71). It was for Alvina a caged life that she never could accept. Meanwhile, travelling with Dr. Mitchell, she saw Ciccio at a railway station in the fatal year 1914 when the First World War had just begun disturbing everything even the strolling life-style of Ciccio's Natchas. Her and Ciccio's eyes met for a secret understanding that gave Alvina a new turn in her life. She was now in a dilemma. If she married Ciccio, she would be lost, but her marriage with Dr. Mitchell might recuperate her social status and position. But she could not accept him as husband for he was, as she observed, arrogant and haughty, and when he was thwarted, he shouted her down rendering her dead in her spirit. Two isolated, passages, one of Dr. Mitchell and another of Ciccio, may show us the difference of their attitude to Alvina :

"Come" he (Dr. Mitchell) said, beckoning for her to give her hand. With a barely perceptible shake of the head, she refused, staring at him all the time. His ungovernable temper got the better of him. He saw red, and without knowing, seized her by the shoulder, swung her back, and thrust her, pressed her against the wall as if he would push her through it. His face was blind with anger, like a hot, red sun. Suddenly, almost instantaneously, he came to himself again and drew back his hands, shaking his right hand as if some rat had bitten it. "I'm sorry!" he shouted--- He dithered before her.(267-68)

Instantly falling to his knees before her, Dr. Mitchell begged for her pardon and her love", forgive me! love me!"(268). Now this is the way of Dr. Mitchell, a modern gentleman, to possess a woman simultaneously frightening and cajoling her, a tyrannical act with no call of love from within. But Ciccio's approach was quite different :

"Allaye!" he (Ciccio) said caressing her hand, kissing it with a soft, passionate, yearning mouth. Alvina shivered. Quickly he opened the gate and drew her through. He drew her into the shadow of the wall, and put his arms round her, lifting her from her feet with passionate yearning. "Allaye" he said "I love you, Allaye, my beautiful, Allaye, I love you, Allaye!". He held her fast to his breast and began to walk away with her. His throbbing muscular power seemed completely to envelop her. (278)

The way Ciccio expressed his passion for Alvina is straight-forward, originating from the heart. Alvina too could not keep herself to his call. The two directions, one forward to recuperate her social status and position, and the other backward, to the state of her physical self only, were now open to her. She was in a dilemma. But all on a sudden without completely realizing what she was going to do, she telegraphed Ciccio to come to her. This sudden act implies the defeat of her lofty self to her dark physical self. She married Ciccio and accepted the atavistic life-style without compunction. She became Mrs. Marasca and gladly swallowed 'the bitter cherry'(289).

In the opinion of Moynahan, Alvina's career was an arduous one. It was impeded yet evinced a triumphant ascent from death to life. Her instinct made her sink in the estimate of her so-called respectable fellow citizens, but thereby she

escaped the worn-out family tradition, best symbolized by the invalid mother with her neurotic heart disease (Maynahan, J. 1966, 124). She extricated herself from the drab circumstances of her life, but in Moynahan's opinion, not by rising above it but by sinking below. For Alvina, however, this does not apply. For her, to be related to the instinctual substratum of life is to be related to the reality of one's self, the 'blood knowledge'. For Lawrence too nothing can be more authentic.

With Ciccio Alvina left England that appeared to her 'like a long ash-grey coffin'(294), thereby shed the repressive and mechanized bourgeois life of industrial Midland. She was happy with the outer world : 'whatever life may be, and whatever horror men have made of it, the world is a lovely place, a magic place, something to marvel over. The world is an amazing place'(299). Alvina loved to be an adventurer. She felt both frightened and charmed by the new alien place, Pescocalascio, a primitive village in Italy. Originally Pescocalascio was Picinisco in the province of Caserta where the Lawrences spent a short time in the winter of 1919, and a vivid description of its icy and comfortless grandeur is on record in his letter to Rosalind on 16 December 1919 :

It is a bit staggeringly primitive. You cross a great stony river bed, then an icy river on a plank, then climb unfootable paths----. The village 2 miles away, a sheer scramble - no road whatever - the market at Atina, 5 miles away - perfectly wonderful to look at, costume and colour--- the sun shines hot and lovely, but the nights freeze : the mountains round are snowy and very beautiful. --- I believe you would enjoy it here. (Lett, 601).

Lawrence seemed to have relieved the experience through his fictional counterpart. While he left it in a fortnight, Alvina spontaneously decided to live

there. It is because Lawrence only turned his imagination towards primitivism, whereas Alvina her life itself. Alvina observed Italy as a vivid and colourful counterpart of England in the same continent of Europe. She was happy and fulfilled there. Her pleasure and satisfaction were expressed symbolically through the spring flowers, the green silken corn and maize :

The loveliness of April came, with hot sunshine---. Alvina was amazed. The burning day quite carried her away. She loved it : it made her quite careless about everything. She was just swept along in the powerful flood of the sunshine.(334).

Now the paradox is that Alvina was not lost, rather she focused herself. She was out to 'affirm her freedom, expressivity and most of all, passion' (Brown, K. 1990, 58). Her flight to Italy was an escape to a life of primitive simplicity and natural instinct. But it does not imply that she was forced to live there 'to work out her destiny'(Hough, G., 1961, 116). Her decision was spontaneous and she was free either to live there or to leave it :

She had sixty pounds of her own money, always intact in the little case. And after all, the highway beyond the river led to Ossana, and Ossana gave excess to the railway, and the railway would take her anywhere. (331).

But she would not leave Italy. She loved it. Its unravished natural beauty made her life open and free. What England and its bourgeois society failed to provide, she found in Italy. Ciccio was now more fond of her than before; his love was genuine; 'she knew how he loved her - almost inhumanly, elementally without communication'(321), and his passion 'haunted her like a dark angel'(321). Although she saved herself having fled the toils of modern civilization, she could not

avoid its fatal effects that manifested in the form of the First World War, a 'colossal idiocy' of modern men. Ciccio, who was afraid of the war and was doubtful of his return from it, had yet to join it. But Alvina never lost her faith; she remained optimistic about Ciccio's return :

"If you make up your mind to come back, you will come back.

We have our fate in our hands"she said. He smiled slowly.

"You think so?"he said.

---"I know it" she said.

"All right" he answered. (338-39).

: : : : : :

Chapter VII

LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER

In a letter to Willard Johnson, an American journalist, Lawrence wrote :

“God enters from below” said the Egyptians, and that’s right. Why can’t you darken your minds, and know that the great gods pulse in the dark and enter you as darkness through the lower gates. Not through the head. Why don’t you seek again the unknown and invisible gods who step sometimes into your arteries, and down the blood vessels to the phallus, to the vagina, and have strange meeting there ? (Lawrence : *Letters*, 726).

D.H.Lawrence had this radical but religious idea of “the phallic reality” (*Lett* : 1046) at the back of his mind when he began *Lady Chatterley's Lover* sometime between 9 September and 30 October 1926. On 9 September, he was “still feeling dead of writing altogether”(*Letters* : 936), and on 30 October, as we heard from Frieda : “Lawrence goes into the woods to write, he is writing a short-long story, always breaking new ground ---- no I don’t explain it well, the animal part” (*Letters* : 944). This ‘short-long story’ was probably the first draft of the novel published by some of his enthusiastic friends in 1944 under the title *The First Lady Chatterley*. Lawrence wrote the novel for three times. *The First Lady Chatterley* had been relatively short, dark and above all a rough sketch written under the impression of recently experienced English gloom. The second version, written after his Etruscan adventure, was much longer, and the final one was of the same length but “there is a sharpening of intellectual issues and a deepening of pathos” (*Schorer, M.* : 1961, p.146) in it. The gamekeeper Parkin of the previous two versions was renamed as Oliver Mellors in the final version. Here Lawrence introduced the character of Michaelis, a successful trivial playwright, to put Constance Chatterley at the very centre of the full emptiness of the socio-intellectual world. As a result, the final

version became, 'a novel in a solid and sustained social context, with a clear and happily developed plot, in which characters function fully and the author allows them to speak for themselves' (Schorer, M. : 1961, 145). Unlike some of his tentative masterpieces, the present novel was Lawrence's product of confidence and a shock-therapy to the bewildered intellectuals. He said : "I feel I've shot it like a bomb against all their false sex and hypocrisy ---- against all their a-sexual sexuality' (*Letters*, 1077). A Florentine critic, having realized such a desperate attempt by Lawrence at this novel, cautioned him with a comment : 'I don't know - I don't know if it's not a bit too strong ---- Listen Singnor Lawrence, you find it really necessary to say it ?" (Lawrence : *A Propos* --- 126). Lawrence's characteristic response to him was : 'I told him I did' (*A Propos* --- 126). The reason behind this curt but firm remark lies perhaps in his apprehension that the malady of modern civilization developed due to the suppression and misunderstanding of true sex. In the present novel, Lawrence successfully brought sexuality from its long-drawn linguistic extrapment into the clear light of language. He tried to regain for sex a "full truth as a process of nature, a truth which has long been lingering in the shadows and hiding under various disguises' (Widdowson, P.; 1992,121). Like Foucault, Lawrence "has shifted from a vocabulary centering on the *episteme*, a discursive concept, to an approach centering on the apparatus, a concept both discursive and non-discursive; a system of relations that --- goes beyond discourse and that reflects a new recognition of structures that are outside language" (Widdowson,P. : 1992, 124).

Lady Chatterley's Lover may be taken as a double-voiced discourse with two

different themes : one about woman's exploitation by her male counterpart through love and marriage, and another, about her self-liberation and self-assertion. Lawrence's presentment of traditional views and ideas about erotic and conjugal life and his severe criticism of them suggesting an alternative view produce a double-edged tension in the novel. His ruthless criticism of the widespread view about love and marriage was itself criticized in its term. Lawrence's alternative to modern deadness is attacked from moral standpoint as a wayback ultimately. As a result, his hero is an anti-hero, his heroine is an adulteress and his abode is the woods instead of modern aristocratic homestead.

Constance Raid or Connie, a country-loving vigorous young woman was married to Clifford Chatterley, a baronet. But Clifford actually was not what Connie had expected him to be, a well-to-do intelligentsia with vibrant sex-thrill within himself. Despite being a lieutenant of a smart regiment in the war, Clifford was, to her disillusionment, a coward, always conscious of his own defencelessness although he had all the defence of privileges. He married Connie, inferior to him in social status, because of her self-confidence and capability of confronting the world. He was neither charmed by her blooming femininity, nor compelled by a male urge within himself to fulfil itself in communion with the female in Connie. The sex part was a secondary issue even in their month-long honeymoon :

'They were so close, he and she, apart from that. Connie exulted a little in this intimacy which was beyond sex,--- Sex was merely an accident, or an adjunct, one of the curious obsolete organic processes which persisted in its own clumsiness, was not really necessary' (*Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 14, Hereafter by page number).

The marriage-tie wherein sex plays a secondary role would be either a failure or a

bondage. Such a marriage lacks the "long event of perpetual change, in which a man and a woman mutually build up their souls and makes themselves whole." (Lawrence : *Phoenix*, 193). The embarrassing predicament wherein Connie landed herself through her marriage was further aggravated by Clifford's cripplehood. Even before celebrating the first wedding anniversary, Clifford came back home from the war with smashed lower portion of his body. After two years' prolonged treatment, he was pronounced cure, but "the lower half of his body, from hips down, paralysed for ever"(5). Thus he was reduced to be an emasculate male. In reply to the repeated enquiry whether Clifford was intentionally created so or he was symbolic of some deficiencies of modern man, Lawrence said :

As to whether the 'symbolism' is intentional - I don't know. Certainly not in the beginning, when Clifford was created. When I created Clifford and Connie, I had no idea what they were or why they 'were'. They just came, pretty much as they are. But the novel was written, from start to finish, three times. And when I read the first version, I recognized that the lameness of Clifford was symbolic of the paralysis, the deeper emotional or passional paralysis of most men of his sort and class today' (Lawrence : *A Propos ---*, pp.123-24).

Now the colour of Connie's life faded; her vitality was on the wane. She was disillusioned. The secondary issues like material fulfilment and honour to high social status were futile to her. She was horror-stricken by the blank dreariness of the dismal house of Clifford. Mentally Clifford was so intimate to her but physically he was non-existent, utterly out of her touch. She was, so to speak, victimized, caged and physically nullified by the marriage. Lawrence strongly criticized such non-phallic marriage and said that marriage should be basically and permanently phallic having a correspondence

of male blood and female blood. He declared :

‘The phallus is a column of blood that fills the valley of blood of a woman. The great river of male blood touches to its depths the great river of female blood-yet neither breaks its bounds. It is the deepest of all communions, as all the religions, in practice know. And it is one of the greatest mysteries, in fact, the greatest, as almost every initiation shows, showing the supreme achievement of mystic marriage’ (Lawrence : *A Propos* --- 112).

As a serious sexologist, Lawrence, with his convincing argument, magnified the difference between mystic marriage, mainly physical, and modern marriage, a degradation of the same. He observed that the great significance of sex in connubial life had been reduced to a minimum in modern age. Clifford, the modern aristocrat, elucidated his fantastic view about modern conjugal life with a comment that “little by little, living together, two people fall into a sort of unison, they vibrate so intricately to one another. That’s the real secret of marriage, not sex; at least not the simple function of sex.”(52). This meaning of marriage did not put his disability into question. Rather, gladly having acquired the advantage of modern machine, a wheel-chair, to overcome his lameness, he remarked on the triaviality of sex in married life with the comment that “we ought to be able to arrange this sex thing as we arrange going to the dentist”(52) for a toothache. To be precise, Clifford displaced the deep-rooted meaning of marriage from the physical to the cerebral plane and initiated plans to develop a logocentric intimacy between them. He became a writer for nothing but to overwhelm Connie. But she, instead of being charmed, by her husband’s idealistic humbug, was disappointed, hurt, even humiliated. The dead and dull situation of Clifford’s household created a

restlessness within herself. She thought : "She would rush off across the park, and abandon Clifford --- she must get away from the house and everybody. The wood was her only refuge, her sanctuary." (23). Her autonomy and freedom, she felt, was seized by Clifford. She was, in practice, either his a-sexual female companion at the best, or his maid of all works at the worst. All great words like "love, joy, happiness, home, mother, father, husband" (73) were meaningless to her. She led a solitary life amidst the household of Clifford. Her disappointment was further intensified when she visited a newly developed town, Uthwaite, an epitome of modern industrial England. Despite its apparent splendour, she observed it to be dead and dull. The new development had swallowed up even livingness and vigour of men. She observed :

"--- the celliers trailing from the pits, grey-black, distorted, one shoulder higher than the other, slurring their heavy ironshod boots. Underground grey faces, whites of eyes rolling, necks cringing from the pit-roof, shoulders out of shape. Men ! Men! Alas, in some ways patient and good men. In other ways, non-existent. Something that men *should* have was bred and killed out of them. --- they were half, only the grey half of a human being!" (186).

And her lame husband, Clifford Chatterley, another distorted man, was the master or the lord of those men. Master and servants, all were distorted by the tremendous pressure of the mechanically developed industrial civilization. Connie's experience is Lawrence's own experience. His profound antipathy towards the new England, the industrially developed centre, is reflected throughout the book; and his launching of an all-out attack on modernity is conducted by Connie. Like Lawrence, Connie wanted to come out of the bored situation, which was, in opposition to the way of the world, opting for primitivism.

Amidst this aggrieved situation, Connie met Michaelis, a successful Irish playwright, aged about thirty. Initially, she assumed him to be a youth of much physical animation, a reliable personality to help her self-seeking activities. But her intimate talk to him exposed his physical timidity and sex-menace. Although she was confused, she called him to her bedroom and enjoyed sexual intercourse with him. The sexual encounter was plainly a failed effort to develop an in-depth physical intimacy between them. Further, to her disillusionment, Connie found in Michaelis a "melancholy specimen of extraordinary success"(27) whose "eyes were so perfectly unchangingly melancholy, or stoical, or disillusioned, or afraid."(21) In Michaelis, Connie discovered another Clifford, but with a difference. While Clifford was paralysed below the navel, Michaelis was already dead at that part. This bitter sex-experience at once placed Connie at the centre of modern voidness.

In Clifford's study-centre, the well-to-do intelligentsia, believers "in the life of the mind"(36), frequently got together to celebrate the cerebral supremacy over the physical one. Only Tommy Dukes, an unsuccessful intellectual, had a different approach to life. He placed sex at the centre of life with his sharp comment that "sex is just another form of talk, where you act the words instead of saying them"(39). He termed sex as a sort of normal physical conversation between a man and a woman. He said :

"Real knowledge comes out of the whole corpus of the consciousness; out of your belly and your penies as much as out of your brain and mind. The mind can only analyse and rationalise--- while you live your life, you are in some way an organic whole with all life."(44)

Modern civilization, he observed, was lopsided due to its overweening emphasis on the mind and on the brain, with no attempt to integrate them to the body. The only way to integrate body and mind, thought and action, according to Tommy Dukes as well as his creator Lawrence, is to reconcile the opposites with the help of a third force, the Holy Ghost. And the phallus, its representative in the present novel, bridges the chasm between dissolution and creation, male and female, and symbolizes "the resurrection of the body"(87). Tommy Dukes' idea of "the resurrection of the body" had a stimulating effect on Connie. She, having lived with Clifford, as his boon companion, was, so to speak, suffocated by a humdrum life. A hitherto dependent but sensitive woman relegated to Clifford's household, she now wished to be a castaway, active in seeking her own salvation. She now wanted to come out of doors in search of "something special" to satisfy her dissatisfied physical urge. In the Wragby Woods, she saw Clifford's gamekeeper Oliver Mellors, a tall and lean man, aged but still radiant. He was a collier's son, married but parted from his wife. The dark sensual power that Lawrence had previously identified with Walter Morel, the collier in *Sons and Lovers*, not only was revived in the present novel but was also given a dominant role. Lawrence composed *Sons and Lovers* remaining much under his dead mother's thumb and failed to appreciate the dark physical vigour that Walter Morel represented. But in this novel, Lawrence appeared to have come round to see the truth. He recognized his father by cognizing the need of the dark vitality essential to fight deadness of modern life. He further extended his view with a comment that even woman, who desired to achieve salvation, had to undergo physical contact with a man who possessed within himself that

mystic quality. But this does not imply woman's inferiority in achieving salvation, for neither man nor woman can achieve fulfilment or salvation singly. Fulfilment of life needs the union of the opposites, of male in man with female in woman.

On one occasion, Connie had to visit Mellors' lonely cottage in Wragby Woods to deliver Clifford's message to him. She peeped through the window and looked in to see Mellors' well-built torso while he was bathing. His slim physique held her spell-bound. She was confused. She pondered over the matter for a while. Suddenly her attention turned towards a new direction. An insight dawned on her that "the resurrection of the body" was possible only through an integrated approach to life instead of intellectual pursuit; and in this connection, the importance of a well-developed physique should not be neglected. Back home, she turned her interest towards her own physique and found herself glamourless and disappointing with unbloomed femininity. On another occasion, going back to Mellors' desolate cottage, she found a brood of hens, warm and dominant at the breeding period. She observed in them 'something special' that was conspicuously absent from her female self. She thought :

Her body was going meaningless, going dull and opaque, so much insignificant substance. It made her feel immensely depressed and hopeless. What hope was there ? She was old, old at twenty seven, with no gleam and sparkle in the flesh. Old through neglect and denial, yes denial---. The mental life! Suddenly she hated it with a rushing fury, the swindle"(81).

All of a sudden, she found herself weeping, an instantaneous outcome of her grief.

Oliver Mellors, the Game Keeper, standing beside, observant, understood about what

had gone wrong with her. He caressed her lightly with his hand, led her into his hut and helped to overcome her physical inertia through sexual intercourse. It evoked within herself a sense of excitement and a joyful expectation about life. She was happy indeed. But on the other hand, her degradation from ladyship to the state of a sexual moron seems to turn the time-machine back towards primitivism. It may be Lawrence's fantastic audacity but it raises a pertinent question whether civilized people can do away with that primal desire or rethink to put vital sex at the centre of life. The present purposive novel defines its own initiative to the problem with a comment that "the novel, properly handled, can reveal the most secret places of life : for it is in the passionate secret places of life, above all, that the tide of sensitive awareness needs to ebb and flow, cleansing and freshening"(117).

Connie Chatterley's new understanding, sensual and silent, intensified her dissension with both Clifford Chatterley and his idea of cerebral life. She, now overcome by the new sex-experience, came out of her previous wait-and-see sort of business with desperate intention to seek her own salvation. She sought and easily got Clifford's consent to affirm her motherhood with full-bloomed femininity on condition that "it made no difference between them"(128). This permission implies that Clifford, in spite of his intellectual over-maturity, could hardly cross childhood, as far as the physical life is concerned. He undervalued the sex-role in conjugal as well as in adult life, whereas Connie thought it vital. Connie realized that physical fulfilment is the first and foremost achievement in life, whereas child-bearing is a by-product, a forked-flame. She, now non-interested in both Clifford's literary achievement and his household

activities, deputed Mrs. Bolton, a nurse, to serve him. With this step, she was somewhat relieved from her wearisome task of Clifford's companionship. She had now a whale of a time to enjoy herself in the desolate forest. Meanwhile, she visited Mrs. Flint, an adorable mother, and took her little child in her arms. This simple incident suggests her repressed maternal instinct. She thought that it was "warm and fulfilling somehow to have a baby"(154). Her yearning for motherhood drew her physically close to Mellors. On her way back home, she had had sexual intercourse with him. Her frequent sex-act not only renewed the female vigour, but also provided her with an insight that sex-function, in life, develops "an awareness of (one's)— own nature"(371). This new understanding, mainly phallic, later on was further signified by Mrs. Bolton, who reminiscing about her own bygone connubial life, said to Connie :

"That's my lady! the touch of him (her dead husband)
I've never got over it to this day and never shall.
If there's a heaven above, he'll be there and will
lie up against me, so I can sleep." (192)

Indeed, Connie's sex awareness provided her with new insight and wisdom. She discovered that "sex is just another form of talk"(39), "a sort of normal physical conversation between a man and a woman"(39). Her only business now was to realize sex fully and completely, and to "balance up the consciousness of the act and the act itself" (*A Propos* --- 90), in her understanding. This turns us towards Lawrence who throughout the bulk of his work struggled to envision this alternative wisdom that comes through the language of silent physical touch. In the modern age, Lawrence observed, the mystic quality of the body has been peeled off by logic and reason laying no proper

importance to physical communion. Lawrence suggests that this physical understanding comes through deep sexual communion between the male and female partners. In *The Rainbow*, the dialectal differences between Tom Brangwen, an English man, and Lydia Lensky, a polish lady created no problem, at all, in their natural love for each other. They were a successful couple. Again, Alvina Houghton, in *The Lost Girl*, gave up her inherited property and social status in order to accept the atavistic life-style with Ciccio, an Italian. She rejected everything that was modern without regret to ensure her acceptance of the aboriginal culture, mainly physical. Although this new primitive tendency of Lawrence's characters is severely criticized, it demands of us a careful reconsideration of the thrust of Lawrence's thought.

Connie's transcendence from a sex-starved state to the sex-fulfilled one symbolizes her self-awakening. As a triumphant woman, she ran away from Clifford's dominance with a desperate craving for something elevating, and finally discovered the hinterland where the dark god and goddess of creation reside. Sex organs, now instead of being disgraceful, played a key role in her fulfilment. Lawrence handled this matter with a great sense of respect. He never wished to make Connie a sexual moron, and Mellors, a debauch that would turn the entire story towards obscenity. He tried to drive home the point that modern man pay sex and sex-life its due respect and honour, and realize its significance. In Lawrence's opinion :

"We are cut off from the great sources of our inward nourishment and renewal, sources which flow eternally in the universe. Vitally, the human race is dying. It is like a great uprooted tree, with its roots in the air. We must plant ourselves again in the universe" (*A Propos* --- 119).

To search for a possible solution to this vital problem, Lawrence turned towards "the warm blood-sex that establishes the living and revitalizing connection between man and woman" (*A Propos*--- 115), and the connecting bridge is the phallus, "the great old symbol of godly vitality" (*A Propos* --- 116).

Connie was till tame, but the shock of Clifford's brutal treatment of Mellors forced her to take the ultimate decision of leaving him for good. One day, Clifford went out of the house in his wheel-chair. Accidentally, it went out of order midway. He vainly attempted to repair the chair and was rather exasperated with his repeated failure. He called on Mellors and forced him assist him in his journey, pushing the wheel-chair. This incident exposed the hindside of Clifford. He bullied Mellors and threatened him of non-payment of wages. His bully-boy tactics remind us of Gerald Crich who, like Clifford, had exerted his brutal force to tame the Arab mare or the wild rabbit or, paradoxically speaking, Gudrun, his beloved. Lawrence observed such habitual brutality in person whose love-relationships with women were either a failure or a counterfeit one. Although Clifford's treatment established his authority as a ruling-class representative over Mellors, it exposed his own deficiency as a man. With this, Connie's understanding of two types of relationships, the living one with Mellors and the dead and bullying one with Clifford, was complete. She determined to leave Clifford and left for London with the help of Hilda, her sister.

Immediately after Connie's departure, Bertha Coutts, Mellors' legal wife, spread his scandal with Connie at Wragby. Connie's efforts at personal salvation now faced

threats of social degradation. But Connie was not afraid, for what society termed as scandalous, was to her a way to personal salvation. She not only faced the consequences of her actions but also cheered up Mellors to brush aside the social scandal as mere trifles. Connie wrote to him : "I am very much distressed to hear of all the trouble your wife is making for you, but don't mind it, it is only a sort of hysteria. It will all blow over as suddenly as it came"(311). Connie was now determined to shake off the deadness of her non-phallic conjugal life with Clifford and the consequent forlornness. She unhesitatingly disclosed to Clifford the paternity of her conceived baby and expressed her desire to choose that man, that is, Mellors as her husband. This shocking piece of information instantly shattered Clifford's strength of mind. Clifford said to her with disgust : "you're not normal, you're not in your right senses. You're one of those half-insane, perverted women who must run after depravity, the *nostalgie de la boue*" (348). This comment of Clifford is to somewhat similar to that of Dr. Mitchell, another aristocrat, who remained unsuccessful in his love with Alvina Houghton, in *The Lost Girl*. He said to Alvina :

"I little thought at the time when I was hoping to make you my wife, that you were carrying with a dirty Italian organ grinder. So your fair seeming face covered with schemes and vice of your true nature. --- I hope that, when I met you on the streets of Liecester Square, I shall have forgiven you sufficiently to be able to throw you a coin" (*The Lost Girl*, 403).

Apparently both Alvina Houghton and Connie Chatterley are socially depraved; but at a deeper level, they remain successful adventurers into the dark territory of the libido, the mystery of the physical life. Although they are outcasts from modern coivilized society,

their satisfaction with the newly discovered mystery of the primal order of life compels us to ponder the matter with respect and seriousness. In case of Connie, it was her inner sanity rather than insanity that provided her with sufficient courage to confess her felt-truth about life without pretension. Her bold remark shattered Clifford's assumed superiority. He caught hold of Mrs. Bolton's hand for a support and rested his head on her breast. As she once lightly kissed him, he said : "Yes! Do kiss me!"(341). Indeed Clifford was a devil child who wished to keep a wife-mother.

Lawrence, however, could not successfully accommodate Annable, the gamekeeper to the modern temper when he wrote *The White Peacock*. Annable had to die leaving behind an ominous prophecy that "all civilization was the painted fungus of rotteness". (*The White Peacock*, 207). Lawrence in his last masterpiece could in a measure accomplish this incomplete task by successfully placing Mellors as a symbol of vitality, firmly in the very midst of life. But Mellors' prophecy, unlike that of Annable, offered a new hope for the future civilization;

I don't believe in the world, not in money, nor in advancement, nor in the future of our civilization. If there's got to be a future for humanity, there'll have to be a big change from what now is"(324).

In the present novel, we see that Lawrence's hero is unsocial, his heroine is socially deprived, his idea of love is mainly sensual and narrow, his world is the primitive one, his god is the dark god of phallus and his motto is one for another shore, the other of modern civilization. But the things he struggled to make us see are the essential realities of life, a proper understanding of which might usher in a 'big change' within us and hence the world.

Chapter VIII

D.H. LAWRENCE AND FEMINISM

Since 1960 the 'politics of interpretation' has become a challenge to the 'freedom of interpretation', particularly in the feminist criticism. The feminists sought to explain 'the production of every text except the text that provides explanation' (Booth, W.C. in Morson, G.S.(ed); 1986, p.146). They took up chiefly the male - produced literary texts as sites for analysis, but cast most of them away as specimens of misogynistic art. They had, therefore, to set their wits to re-imagine, to re-interpret, to re-think and to rewrite the central texts of Western culture. Virginia Woolf speaks of 're-writing history' (Quoted in Showalter (ed)1985, 92); Adrienne Rich claims that Women's writing must begin with a "revision of the past"; Carolyn Heilburn comments that we must "restore women to history and ---- restore our history to women"(Showalter (ed), 1986, 32). All of them insisted on a "revisionary imperative" (Showalter,32). But what the revisionary and re-interpretative productions of the feminists did in the late sixties and early seventies is that "it tends to speak more clearly about what it is against than about what it seeks" (Morson, G.S.(ed): 1986, 161). Indeed the feminist critique, despite its greater dependence on tradition than it acknowledges, has become a diversity and a challenge to the canonical genre.

Although the feminist literary theory in the form in which we now know it is more or less a result of the social and political upheavals of the 1960s, it has its root in the long-drawn literary culture. In the later part of the eighteenth century, the male author's monopoly in the development of Western culture created a counter-voice within and against itself. This voice of protest paved the way for another discourse recognized

as feminism, a foster-child of the mainstream. The first classic text, the foundation stone of modern feminism, is Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1792), where Wollstonecraft raises her voice against domestic tyranny over women. In her opinion, the denial of political rights, right of education or of equal work for women is tyranny. She observes that women, born with equal rights, are taught to be subordinate, weak and feather-headed. Later on, Margaret Fuller's *Women in the Nineteenth Century* (1845) and John Stuart Mill's *The Subjection of Women* (1869) and a number of other books tried to uphold that voice of protest raised by Wollstonecraft. This counter argument was further carried on by the suffragette movement in the beginning of the twentieth century. In the 1920s, the demands of the individualist feminists for equal rights have been fulfilled in legal or formal sense along with women's right to vote in 1928. But within this, according to some feminists, remained the seed of inequalities of opportunity for women to develop and realize their talents and to pursue a career in civil and political society. Virginia Woolf in her classic feminist document, *A Room of One's Own*, observed that the social and economic obstructions are responsible factors for the backwardness and weakness of the women community. But with her famous concept of androgyny, a reconstructive rather than a deconstructive attitude, she visualizes a world where man and woman can co-exist peacefully. The next great contribution to the feminist criticism is Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* (1949), an encyclopaedic work drawing on history, biology, psychoanalysis, Marxism and literature. Beauvoir observes that throughout history women have been reduced to objects for men; women have been constructed as men's other and man has denied her

the right of subjectivity. The patriarchal social ideology presents woman as immanence, and man, as transcendence. This fundamental assumption dominates all aspects of social, political and cultural life. About woman she says : "Her body is not perceived as the radiation of subjective personality, but as a thing sunk deeply in its own immanence; it is not for such a body to have reference to the rest of the world; it must not be promise of things other than itself; it must end the desire it arouses" (Beauvoir, 1949, 189). She, in fact reiterates Wollstonecraft's idea that one is not born a woman but rather becomes a woman. Indeed Beauvoir's book is implicitly 'a call to woman to assert her autonomy in defining herself against man' (Charvet, J. 1980, 100). Kate Millett's *Sexual Politics* (1969), on the other hand can be called 'one of the wittiest and most savagely ironic pieces of literary demolition one could hope to find' (Widdowson, P., 1992, 14). In her book, Millett tries to assert that the relation between the sexes now and throughout history is an instance of male dominance over female, and this sexual domination is the most pervasive ideology of Western culture.

Till 1970, feminist criticism, mainly feeding on the patriarchal ideology, deconstructs it demonstrating male hegemony over the formation of the female subjectivity. But thereafter, the feminists begin to focus their attention exclusively on the works of women writers giving birth to a new phase of feminist criticism, the 'gynocriticism'. This new reconstructive attempt is 'more self contained and experimental, with connections to other modes of new feminist research' (Showalter (ed), 1985, 129). The gynocritics, paying attention mainly to female authors, insinuated to their own shortcomings that woman's writing demands an attention to the

philosophical, linguistic and practical problems of women's use of language; for, the language, which is part of dominant male culture, is to the woman, oppressive. Women's failure to have access to language 'forced them into silence, euphemism or circumlocution'(Showalter,255).

The development of the feminist criticism from the first phase of deconstruction to the second phase of reconstruction, from woman as reader to woman as writer, is a great stride forward to linguistic, psychoanalytical and ideological emancipation. But this kind of sectarian polemics paradoxically intensifies the dissension between the sexes. In this connection, Avrom Fleishman says that an artist should not be seen as a 'single minded monological spokesman for a home-brewed ideology — whether approved or disdained, — but as offering the rhetoric, ideas and other inputs of a whole range of characters, representatively modern men and women.' (Brown, K.(ed) 1990, 109). For art, as Wyane C. Booth says, 'is the one last domain, the domain of aesthetic where alone freedom is untrammelled'. (Booth, 148). The chief enemy of artistic freedom is its concern for ethical, political and social validity. Yet art-work, as Booth observes, must have implicit in it some metaphysics or doctrine. Any work of art spiritually empty, socially futile or politically destructive or otherwise repugnant is valueless or worthless. To maintain freedom of art and artistic criticism that feeds on and support art is 'to forego judgement and attempt only description'(Booth, 149). Since art springs from some implicit metaphysics or ideology, criticism may also be based on some ideology : discipline or code invented by others.

Bakhtin's is such an open-ended ideology that can possibly avoid the faults of

ideologues. Being discontented with the simpleminded ideological lebellings and gradings, he undertook to develop 'a dialogue between two truths' (quoted in Booth, 150). He discovered a dialogic imagination at play at the heart of human life in all its forms and presented a clear and bold yet flexible criterion for estimating ideological worth. He conducted a steady polemic against narrow formalistic or individualistic views of the world and the self. He discarded the notion of unitary self with a comment that self is social and each of us is constituted not as an individual, private atomic self but as a collective of many selves. We encounter these selves as what Bakhtin calls the 'voices' or 'languages' thrown up by others. Language, in his opinion, is of course made of not only words, it is a whole system of meaning, constituting an inter-related set of beliefs or norms. So 'language' to him, is sometimes synonymous with 'ideology'. Each person is, in his view, constituted as 'a hierarchy of languages, each language being a kind of ideology brought into speech'(Booth, 151). Bakhtin says that social man is surrounded by ideological phenomenon, by object-signs of various types and categories, by words in the multifarious forms of their realization, by scientific statements, religious symbols and beliefs, works of art and so on. All these things in their totality comprise the ideological environment which forms a solid ring around man within which his consciousness forms and develops. Individual consciousness, Bakhtin says, can only become a consciousness by being realized in the forms of ideological environment proper to it; in language, in conventionalized gesture, in artistic image, in myth and so on.

To be precise, self is polyphonic and art-work similarly is more or less a

representation of polyphony. Literary forms are, for Bakhtin, formed ideologies and those who make and receive them are in fact plural selves. Any kind of art-work that does most justice to polyphony or heteroglossia is most praiseworthy and the novel, in this respect is the highest literary form. In its truest form, it insists on resisting monologue and on countering the temptation to treat human being as 'objects' reducible to their usefulness to us. The people who inhabit fiction "are essentially, irreducibly, 'subjects', voices rich beyond any one's uses performing in chorus too grand for any participant's full comprehension" (Morson, G.S. (ed), 1986, 152). This describes the differences between individuals though they live in the same society and speak the same language. The language with which they interact with each other forms a heteroglossia forming new socially typifying languages. This helps us underline the differences between the sexes and simultaneously hint at the fact that "women now talk or have ever talked in ways different from men's"(Booth, 154).

In the light of the above viewpoint, if we consider the people who inhabit fiction as 'essentially, irreducibly subjects', we have to face some unavoidable questions concerning the novels of a great imaginative artist like Lawrence. Do his novels treat women as members of a class inherently inferior to men? Do his novels reduce individual women to objects, not persons, objects to be used or abused for the enjoyment of men? Any work of art that portrays women as inherently inferior to men, or as objects for use, is an unjust act, unless the portrayal is somehow effectively criticized by the work itself. Certainly there are sufficient propositions both in favour of and against women, in Lawrence's imaginative works, balancing and criticizing each other. If

surface attitudes count, the opposite is also true. We see similar treatment of men. But the total effect is different. His works as a whole, his complete imaginative offering produces a third thing, his ideology of life and of human relationships, particularly the man-woman relationship. Such an ideology that we appraise is not only what we infer in Lawrence himself, but also what we find in his society as influencing the work and what we find in ourselves. Consequently, his work is both author-criticism and reader criticism.

Although Lawrence, in his *oeuvre*, presented a number of women, mistresses of their own selves with firm determination, his own view about women is ambiguous. His later women characters are however escapists, upholders of the atavistic life-style, the women of his earlier novels upto *Women in Love* are mostly revolutionary in their rejection of the modern mechanistic life. Let us consider the concluding passage of *The Rainbow*, where Ursula, the female protagonist of the novel, dreams her dream :

She knew that the sordid people who crept hard-scaled and separate on the face of the world's corruption were living still, that the rainbow was arched in their blood and would quiver to life in their spirit, that they would cast off their horny covering of disintegration, that new, clean, naked bodies would issue to a new germination, to a new growth, rising to the light and the wind and the clean rain of heaven. She saw in the rainbow the earth's new architecture, the old brittle corruption of houses and factories swept away, the world build up in a living fabric of Truth, fitting to the over-arching heaven' (*The Rainbow*, 495-96).

Is not it our own hope and aspiration ? Ursula stands here not only for herself as a woman but also for the whole humanity. She at once becomes the mouthpiece of both the author and the readers. If we trust the tale and not the teller and imaginatively

accompany Ursula in her struggles against her family, against man's world and the life denying industrial world, we would rather eagerly support her cause. The entire novel can be seen as a history of a matriarchal family where women are both the 'fighting host' and the fighting selves. To the vital feminist question whether the narrative of the novel reveals women as a class with inherited inferiority - we have only a confident 'NO'.

Again consider another concluding piece, now of *Women in Love*, a dialogue between Ursula and Birkin :

“Having you, I can live all my life without anybody else, any other sheer intimacy. But to make it complete, really happy, I wanted eternal union with a man too : another kind of love” he (Birkin) said. “I don't believe it.” she (Ursula) said. “It's an abstinence, a theory, a perversity”--- “You can't have two kinds of love. Why should you! “It seems as if I can't” he said. “Yet I wanted it”. “You can't have it, because it's false, impossible,” she said. (*Women in Love*, 444).

Here Ursula establishes herself as a critic not only of Birkin and his perverse ideology, but also of his creator, Lawrence. She expostulates with Gerald Crich, a representative of modern mechanistic society, for his brutal treatment of an Arab mare and strongly criticizes Birkin for his indecision about selecting his life-partner. Now, if Birkin is taken to be the mouthpiece of Lawrence, then whose mouthpiece is she ? And whom does she represent ? Surely, she is her own mistress and represents her own free self everywhere. She is an intelligent modern woman who exercises her autonomy both in understanding and in activity. The intriguing truth is that Birkin does not believe in her criticism, yet he has to accept, to swallow and to digest it. She is 'all women' to him. But everywhere she contradicts him and his idea of love. She finally accepts him but not

his ideas and ideals. She fights against his theory and perversity but finally surrenders to the man Birkin, bereft of his ideas. She is, in the novel, not an object to be used or abused by a man, but a subject, an interlocutor of Birkin, at least his equal in thought and action. She is, as Birkin says, a representative of all women, a fiery voice which the youths of the society like Birkin have to accept whether they believe it or not. Her voice, is, as it were, the articulation of the muted voice of every sensitive reader or conscientious man. Moreover, she contradicts Birkin when he turns his love-ideology from natural to supernatural, (--- an equilibrium, a pure balance of two single beings - as the stars balance each other, *W.L.*, 133); and brings him down to practical life. Birkin is incapable of relating his theory to life. His dubious attitude towards woman enrages Ursula and her strong and ruthless criticism brought him back to practicality. Finally he looked remorseful. The other female characters, like Hermione Roddice and Gudrun also cannot escape Ursula's criticism. She criticizes Hermione for her insensitive, intellectual attitude to life and to men like Birkin. Hermione's vested interest in discouraging Ursula about Birkin indirectly provokes Ursula to stand for Birkin and against Hermione. Again, Ursula rejects Gudrun's whimsical comment about Birkin that he has no real critical faculty and that "you can't trust him" (*W.L.*, 14). She rejects this finality of Gudrun's, this dispatching of people and things in a sentence, because "it was all such a lie." (*W.L.* 241). Ursula is a considerate woman, more practical than Birkin. Her decision to cut off her relationship with the family and to tender her resignation from her service, at the outset, appears capricious. But no, she severs herself from her family only to reject the feudal system of the family where freedom of speech

and action is always treated as audacity. Her resignation from the job also suggests this urge for freedom from bondage. Ursula is an impartial critic of modern social system in which we live and of the so called modern men and women whom we meet frequently. But unlike most feminists, she is a constructive critic, integrated in thoughts and actions. She performs her task of educating Birkin about the need of the felt experience of life. This she achieves through a subtle role that combines love and discipleship. Ursula appears to rise above even Lawrence, her creator, who seems to have instilled in her all his good qualities and ideas minus his tyrannical attitudes. In that sense, Ursula is a critic of her own creator, Lawrence.

Thus *Women in Love* together with *The Rainbow* can be said to have traced nearly a history of the rise and development of the feminist movement. Terry Eagleton's understanding of the evolution of the feminist movement holds good in this respect. In Eagleton's view, distinct from the public sphere, there was the private sphere, the intimate sphere of family and household in the eighteenth century. This intimate sphere, if not part of the public sphere, provided 'a vital source of impulses and energies for that public arena'. (Eagleton, T., 1984, 115). Although the bourgeois public sphere officially excluded that intimate sphere, they were in other ways deeply attached to each other. The domestic world generated new form of subjectivity which was publicly oriented and which then passed over into the male-dominated public sphere to attain self-reflective formulations. Eagleton observes that 'the ideology of the family serves in the eighteenth century to mask domestic power relations and their interlocking with systems of bourgeois property.' (Eagleton, T., 1985, 117). The development of that

bourgeois society into the modern epoch changes significantly the relations between public sphere and intimate family sphere. "With increasing stratification of the public sphere", he says, "intimate sphere becomes progressively marginalised". (Eagleton 117). State education and social policy take over many of the functions previously reserved to the family, blurring the boundaries between public and private, and stripping the family of its socio-productive role. The intimate sphere, Eagleton says, is in this sense deprivatized, pulled into public society, but only in a notable historical irony, to be reprivatized as a unit of consumption. The family is now no longer the privileged site of subjectivity it once was, and experience within the intimate sphere has itself become commodified. The intimate sphere has been increasingly incorporated into the state. The emergence of women's movement, as Eagleton comments, can be seen as a response to these changed conditions. The feminist demand for the full socialization of the family moves with the domestic ideologies which mask the material evolution. The women's movement tried to reformulate the relation between public and intimate spheres. The marginalization of the intimate realm closely related to the decline of the public sphere has led to a fresh resurgence of that realm in the form of a new counter-public sphere which consists of feminist discourse and practice. Within this new domain, the shared fact of gender works to equalize all participants within it.

This trajectory as traced above can be demonstrated in terms of Lawrence's twin novels, *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*. *The Rainbow* begins with the Brangwen family in the post-feudal pattern, intimate and organic. The Brangwens were vitally related to nature, but "they were a curious family, a law to themselves, separate from the

world, isolated, a small republic set in invisible bounds' (*R.B.*, 103). Although the Brangwen women sometimes were relegated to the modest dower houses at the edge of the estate, they were the 'fighting host', full of aspiration. The men emotionally and intellectually submitted themselves to their women, for they thought that woman was the symbol for that further life which comprised religion, love and morality. Tom Brangwen looked for a woman who would "be my conscience keeper, be the angel at the door way guarding my outgoing and my incoming' (*R.B.* 19). He married Lydia Lensky, a woman of different tongue, whom he could hardly understand. But the language barrier scarcely mattered to their intimate relationship in conjugal life. She remained subservient, but nowhere is she treated as secondary or inferior to her male counterpart. Throughout her married life, she remains the dark source of every vital activity together with superior intelligence and understanding. In the second generation, the situation changed due to increasing industrialization slackening the family's organic relationship with nature and earth. Simultaneously, the role of the women in the family shifted from 'fighting host' to fighting self. Anna Brangwen raises a voice of protest, though a mild one, against the obstinacy of her husband, Will Brangwen. The family now is forced to be marginalized with the advent of formal education. The changed social policy also changes the nature of human activities blurring the boundaries between public and private spheres and stripping the family of its productive role. Ursula Brangwen, the eldest daughter of Anna and Will, focused herself faced with such a crisis in and around her. Being informally educated on the history of the past (through her grandmother Lydia Lansky), she realizes a drastic change in the society where family is no longer

treated as autonomous sphere, with its productive role, as it has been previously considered. What is now at stake, she realizes, is the "very essence of civilized reason." (Eagleton, T., 117). The formal education system, 'only a little side-show of the factories of the town'(R.B., 434), failed to satisfy her. She protests against Skrebensky's war-mongering ideology and rejects him; she stands against the feudalistic attitude of her father and goes out of the family to join the men's world of activity as a school mistress. After her rejection of Skrebensky as a lover, her suffering hurts us, but her struggle for freedom inspires us. At the end of *The Rainbow*, her voice becomes the voice of suffering humanity. But hitherto she is a social and political critic, representating the voice of the author as much as of the readers. In the next novel, *Women in Love*, this voice of Ursula is further consolidated. She finally becomes "all women" representating their cause, a counter-voice to Birkin's. Her demand for equalization in the shared facts of genders, is implicitly established, for Birkin, the failed ideologue, has to accept her view as evinced at the end of the novel.

In the post-war novels, Lawrence's changed attitude towards women exposed him to attacks, the harshest coming from the radical feminists. But the later feminists, comparatively liberal in their attitude towards Lawrence, have tried to rescue him from such charges, drawing on different missing accounts and placing him in his own time and society. Hilary Simpson, in her article, : "Lawrence, Feminism and the War" explains in terms of historical determination, the reason for Lawrence's changing attitude to women, especially during and after the First World War. She observes that a highly industrial nation like England, faced with mass conscription of its active men in

the inter-war period, had to look for an alternative labour force. The employment of women in different jobs, previously held by men, is an alternative process to solve that problem. Consequently, the influx of women in different jobs, gradually changed the social status of women in the society. The new social freedom and financial independence made them more conscious than ever before about their own position in society. This new freedom made itself felt against the earlier moral stringency; unmarried mother was more sympathetically treated, and "conventional notions of a certain reserve as between the sexes have been very largely modified" (Widdowson, P. (ed) 1992, 92). In Simpson's opinion, the experience of the war also marks a turning point in Lawrence's life. In 1914, Lawrence wrote: "woman becoming individual, self-responsible taking her own initiatives: (*Letters*, 22 April). He wanted 'feminization' of experience, the necessity for man to take woman and the feminine side of her nature seriously. But he disliked women's entry into the world of industry and technology, and this change of attitude "exemplifies the drastic revision of the notion of womanliness" (Widdowson, P., 1992, 94). *The Lost Girl*, Simpson says, is "a perfect transition piece clearly spanning Lawrence's pre- and post-War concerns, moving as it does from women's revolt to women's submission" (Widdowson, P., 96).

But *The Lost Girl* itself can be seen as a counterblast against contemporary socio-moral ideas and ideals. The social chaos created due to surplus women population, Lawrence realized, was an *ipso facto* result of the political turmoil during the War and post-War period. Women's absorption into different jobs previously performed by men, as Hilary Simpson has observed, was a vital cause of Lawrence's

disgust and his changing attitude to women. But this cannot explain this change sufficiently. Lawrence himself was in favour of women's participation in the work of the outer-world. Ursula, in *The Rainbow*, left her family-circle and joined a school as a teacher; Madam Rochard in *The Lost Girl*, was the guide and manager of the band of strolling male players, Natch-Ki-Tewara and conducted the band with skill and respect. She is never shown as degraded either morally or socially. *The Lost Girl* is Lawrence's direct attack, not on women but on the industrially civilized people who were responsible for the chaotic social milieu. Women became ferocious to the extent of showing tyranny over men as evinced in a short story "Ticket Please". This may be due to a feeling of insecurity of their jobs and livelihood. By all means, a counter-voice was called for and Lawrence presents it in the figure of Alvina Houghton. Alvina Houghton, dissatisfied as she had been with modern living, joined the Natchas only for Ciccio, her lover. But the low living standard of the Natchas forced her to be out of it to join a nursing job in a Hospital. Here she met Dr. Mitchell, a modern aristocrat, who pressured her to marry him when there was no call from her heart. She was in a dilemma. If she married Dr. Mitchell, she herself would be lost into the labyrinth of Modernism; whereas her acceptance of Ciccio as husband was suggestive of her rejection of everything that was modern. Ultimately, she accepted triumphantly the primitive state of life by marrying Ciccio, a representative of it. Now with this marriage, Lawrence has brought into question the whole system of modern civilization.

To be precise, *The Lost Girl* offers a cross-current of views and ideas between what Lawrence presents and what his readers are accustomed to, a dialectical

presentation of the conflict between Lawrence's unconventional ideas and his readers' conventional ideas. As we go through the superb description of contemporary social milieu, we are satisfied; but when he contradicts this with his own ideas, unfamiliar to us, through Alvina Houghton, we are shocked; our conscious understanding resists us to accept it. It may be simply because the producer, that is, Lawrence, is super-sensitive to the situation, whereas we are tightly bound to convention. But if we consider a vital question, namely, what does he want to say and why? - we may find, like Lawrence, a deep wound at the heart of our modern civilization. The social and political turmoil of the inter-war period, however, provided its women with a freedom, obviously reckless and chaotic; this female autonomy makes an ominous insinuation towards women's insecure and pitiable living condition. Alvina, as she was 'not ordinary' because of her supersensitive perception of life, rejects the modern society, perhaps, to illuminate this side-issue - the pathetic life-style the women had to lead - of our society. Lawrence, through his fictional character, Alvina, makes a direct attack on us, the civilized people, but nowhere does he let Alvina to be treated as secondary. Lawrence's sympathy for Alvina is never sparingly absent in the way he treats her in the novel. On the other hand, if Ciccio is a Lawrentian hero, he becomes so not mesmerizing Alvina to marry him but showing us about what we are deficient of and what we have left behind accepting this civilized life-style. Simultaneously, Alvina seeks those lost-essentials of life into the primitive life-style, casting aside the modern world.

Graham Hough says about Lawrence's 'savage pilgrimage' that "Lawrence's geographical migrations did not inspire Lawrence to form and develop new ideas, rather

he moved to new country because his developing new ideas needed a new landscape and a society to match them”(Hough, G. 1961, 141). While such a comment is not out of place, Lawrence’s migrations at the same time can be said to have enhanced the complexity and variety of his ideas and experiences. The influence that his continental visits exercised on him as much as the influence of the people he met and the different landscapes he passed through helped change his attitude both to life and to art. This changed attitude towards his characters is conspicuous in his leadership novels. *Kangaroo* is a good example of it. True, Lawrence’s Australian admirer Katherine Susannah Pritchard protested against *Kangaroo*’s acceptance as “an authentic picture of Australia” (Kermode, F. 1973, 99), and said that Lawrence “knew very little about it, felt blind to it --- and was especially ignorant about its democratic politics” (Kermode, 99). But later Australian critics contradicted this view by saying that the politics in the novel, though fantasticated and inadequate, are not altogether remote from those of contemporary Australia. “There was a conflict between a socialist movement and a para-fascist ‘digger’ movement, and Lawrence related it weirdly --- to his current speculations about authority in the home and in the state”. (Kermode, F. 1973, 99). Although Lawrence’s home-brewed leadership idea comes out in Australian perspective, his own mode was “back to his own centre-back back, the inevitable recoil” (*Kangaroo*, 308). Richard Lovat Somers, the protagonist of *Kangaroo*, while visiting Australia, developed his interest into the nasty leader-centered male politics. He met Kangaroo, an emotional Jew who believed in fatherly love. Like an idiot or a greedy aggressive politician with a lust for power, Somers entangled himself with the diggers movement

nourishing within himself the idea of 'lord and master'. He determined to domineer over his wife Harriet. But Harriet, more practical, more sensitive and more intelligent than Somers, never wished to surrender her autonomy to him. She flatly rejected his lord-master idea, an impression of Australian male-politics, and ruthlessly attacked him to bring him back to practicality :

"Him, a lord and master ! why, he was not really lord of his own bread and butter; next year they might both be starving. He was not even master of himself, with his ungovernable furies and his uncritical intimacies with people --- he was the most forlorn and isolated creature in the world, without even a dog to his command. He was so isolated he was hardly a man at all, among men. He had absolutely nothing but her. Among men he was like some unbelievable creature - an emu, for example. Like an emu in the streets or in a railway carriage" (*Kangaroo*, 195)

This radical but ironic remark shows Harriet both at her anguish she feels for Somers and her defiance of him. But she knows more about him than anybody else and her apprehension about his ultimate failure was not wrong. Finally Somers, the failed ideologue, compensates for his failure by coming back to Harriet. Now, Somers' submission to Harriet implies a double-edged failure of their creator Lawrence ; first, of his fantastic leader-cum-follower idea and secondly, of his post-war launching of an aggressive campaign against women.

The Plumed Serpent, "in fact, takes up the story of the Lawrences' travels where *Kangaroo* left them" (Hough, G., 1961, 146), but Lawrence himself has disappeared. The central character of the novel is Kate Leslie and her oscillation between acceptance and rejection of Mexico sets the pattern of the whole book. The only representative of the modern idealistic world, Kate Leslie, with disgust about 'mechanical cog-wheel

people' of the civilized Western world, visits the ancient Indian community and their religious rituals in Mexico. Although Lawrence is her creator, the report we get from her is hers, not Lawrence's. It is more important to assess her reports, her experiences and her attitude towards those brutal heroes of the Aztec religion, than Lawrence's own attitude towards her. It may be that Lawrence presents his views and ideas about the aboriginal people and their religion through Kate Leslie, his female representative; but simultaneously his own comment, sometimes biased, about Kate, isolates and detaches him from her and she is sometimes also oppressed by his brutal treatment. It appears that Lawrence occasionally sides with the aboriginals and compels her to bow down to those male representatives in order to fulfil his role as a prophet. If we listen to Kate and believe in her experiences she reports, we can get an insight into the kind of wisdom she gains from them. As an enthusiastic visitor of Mexico but a reluctant recipient of the Quetzalcoatl religion, she with her all but the last words opens up a hatchway from that to which she is about to commit herself. The narrative structure exposes her dual movement, but with a definite progress which is "the opening out of her life from the modern Western woman's mode of separateness, self-assertion, the life of the ego to another mode of profound and inarticulate communion of which the separate activity of the ego is only an incidental part" (Hough, G. 1961, 161). Other characters, like Don Ramon, Cipriano Dona Carlota and Teresa, though they have sufficient independent life of their own, they "exist only to further this movement" (Hough, G. 161).

Kate Leslie, an enthusiastic visitor, oddly encouraged by the mystic primitive religion of Mexico, attends the Mexican bull-fight show along with two Americans. The

people' of the civilized Western world, visits the ancient Indian community and their religious rituals in Mexico. Although Lawrence is her creator, the report we get from her is hers, not Lawrence's. It is more important to assess her reports, her experiences and her attitude towards those brutal heroes of the Aztec religion, than Lawrence's own attitude towards her. It may be that Lawrence presents his views and ideas about the aboriginal people and their religion through Kate Leslie, his female representative; but simultaneously his own comment, sometimes biased, about Kate, isolates and detaches him from her and she is sometimes also oppressed by his brutal treatment. It appears that Lawrence occasionally sides with the aboriginals and compels her to bow down to those male representatives in order to fulfil his role as a prophet. If we listen to Kate and believe in her experiences she reports, we can get an insight into the kind of wisdom she gains from them. As an enthusiastic visitor of Mexico but a reluctant recipient of the Quetzalcoatl religion, she with her all but the last words opens up a hatchway from that to which she is about to commit herself. The narrative structure exposes her dual movement, but with a definite progress which is "the opening out of her life from the modern Western woman's mode of separateness, self-assertion, the life of the ego to another mode of profound and inarticulate communion of which the separate activity of the ego is only an incidental part" (Hough, G. 1961, 161). Other characters, like Don Ramon, Cipriano Dona Carlota and Teresa, though they have sufficient independent life of their own, they "exist only to further this movement" (Hough, G. 161).

Kate Leslie, an enthusiastic visitor, oddly encouraged by the mystic primitive religion of Mexico, attends the Mexican bull-fight show along with two Americans. The

repulsive scene disgusts her. She leaves the stadium and at the gate meets General Viedma, a Mexican officer widely known as Don Cipriano. Now Kate is a beautiful widow of about forty. "She had been brought up with the English-Germanic idea of the intrinsic superiority of the hereditary aristocrat. Her blood was different from the common blood, another finer blood" (*The Plumed Serpent*, 888. Hereafter by page number). She, as a sensitive woman, is "used to all kinds of society" (638), and "watched people as one reads the pages of a novel, with certain disinterested amusement" (638). She is a reader, mainly of people, country and life-style, and visited so many countries. Mexico appears to her to be cruel, down-dragging and destructive. In spite of her repeated comments about the evil impression of the country on her and her firm determination not to stay long in the country, she gradually begins to enter into the heart of Mexico, Sayula in Jalisco. The information of the Spanish newspaper that "the gods of Antiquity Return to Mexico" (647), rouses her interest in the mystic religion of the ancient Indians. In Sayula, Kate finds the new-old religion in action. She enthusiastically joins the crowd of Mexican Indians round the drummer and from a broadsheet learns that they are singing the valediction of Jesus and the welcome of the new-old God Quetzalcoatl in Mexico. It appears that Don Ramon is the hierophant of the revived Quetzalcoatl mysteries and Cipriano is his devoted disciple. She meets Dona Carlota, Ramon's wife, a devoted catholic, who is connected with some charitable works. Carlota appears to Kate to be a woman in her own right who loves Ramon, but is horrified by his and Cipriano's desperate attempts to violate Christianity. She is in the book realistically drawn with her own spirit of freedom.

Hitherto, Kate is our chief reporter. But henceforth the book begins to lose the grip of its construction; we hear more about the humpty-dumpty of the mystic new - old religion and “desert Kate’s consciousness for the first time and observe the actions of Ramon and his companions directly without her mediation” (Hough, G., 1961; 150). This chaos of the religious performances goes on for more than a hundred pages. Considering this section of the novel, H.T. Moore said that “*The Plumed Serpent* is the most ambitious failure of his (Lawrence’s) novels” (Moore, H.T., 1974, 503). After the artistic perfection of the first two-thirds of the novel, as Aldous Huxley comments, the rest of it has fallen apart because of Lawrence’s lack of belief in it. “Doubt had crowded in on Lawrence” and “had to be shouted down. But the louder he shouted, the less was he able to convince his readers.” (Quoted from, Moore, H.T., 1974, 504). To be precise, in Huxley’s opinion, Lawrence writes in this section of the novel about what he does not believe firmly. And in this section of the novel, Kate Leslie is forced to be the object at the cost of her subjectivity. She falls a prey to the mystic religious rituals of the aboriginals. Despite her ceaseless struggles, she is increasingly entangled with them. She saves Ramon’s life by killing his enemies, but finds herself forced to be the goddess Malintzi, the wife of Cipriano, the living Huitzilopochtly of the Mexican aboriginals. It is to her “the finality of death”(816). “She could conceive now her marriage with Cipriano; the supreme passivity, like the earth below the twilight, consummate in living lifelessness, the sheer solid mystery of passivity”(816). But Kate Leslie is a woman of great spirit and free understanding about life. She is neither a marionette of Lawrence, nor a puppet at the hands of the Mexicans. ‘She desperately protests to be free :

“Oh! she cried to herself, stifling. “For heaven’s sake let me get out of this, and back to simple human people. I loathe the very sound of Quetzalcoatl and Huitzilopochtli. I would die rather than be mixed up in it any more. Horrible, really, both Ramon and Cipriano. And they want to put it over me, with their high-flown bunk, and their Malintzi, Malintzi! I am Kate Forrester, really. I am neither Kate Leslie, nor Kate Tylor. I am sick of ‘these men’ putting names over me. I was born as Kate Forrester, and I shall remain Kate Forrester.” (857).

This is her protest against both Lawrence, her creator, and the patriarchal social system, primitive as well as modern. Kate is sick of ‘these men’ who are not only Mexican aboriginals but who might also have been the modern men including Lawrence himself for forcing her to assume roles. She is victimized, but she never surrenders; she never mutely accepts anything destructive of her personal autonomy. It is neither Ramon, nor Cipriano, who is able to convince her of the new form of passivity in conjugal life. It is from Teresa that she learns something. Kate learns from Teresa that there is something beyond love in married life that can make one more devoted and more intimate to the other in their life. This new understanding makes her unsettled :

‘She was aware of a duality in herself, and she suffered from it. She could not definitely commit herself, either to the old way of life or to the new. She reacted from both. The old was a prison, and she loathed it. But in the new way she was not her own mistress at all, and her egoistic will recoiled’ (897).

Kate now often thinks if Teresa is a greater woman than herself. She is thus shaken within herself because Teresa was proved to be a wise woman, ‘wise enough to take a lesson’(903). Kate’s final weak appeal to Cipriano, “you won’t let me go” implies neither simply her surrender to Cipriano, nor her rejection of him, but her surrender to the new wisdom about the primitive form of conjugal life, which she has acquired

having to come to terms with the aboriginal woman, Teresa.

The feminist criticism, as is shown above, began from women's situation in society where they were defined as "The Second Sex" and manipulated by a "Sexual Politics". It now seeks to challenge these assumptions thrown up and long nourished by a social system. From this standpoint, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, itself registers such a feminist challenge. Constance Reid, the female protagonist of the novel gets married to Clifford Chatterley to be renamed as Lady Chatterley. But later on, she willingly abandons her ladyship putting into question the upper-class patriarchal socio-moral codes of conduct. She violates the sanctity of sacred and socially inviolable tie of Christian marriage, because the marriage itself, she thinks, has violated its true significance to sensual life. She meets Oliver Mellors, her husband's gamekeeper, a man of superior physical vitality but of lower social status. Her sexual intercourse with him saves her from the bored state of life which heitherto has been "ravished --- without ever being touched, ravished by dead words" (L.C.L., 109). She was 'really awakened to life' with this warm physical touch : a process that at once refutes the socio-moral codes of conduct.

Lady Chatterley's Lover, Lawrence declares, "is a nice tender phallic novel-not a sex-novel in the ordinary sense of the word": (*Letters* ; 15 March, 1928). This assertion of Lawrence about 'phallic consciousness' against 'sex consciousness' has been severely criticized by Simone de Beauvoir in *The Second Sex* (1949). She called him a 'male chauvinist' and charged that he substituted 'a phallic cult' for 'the cult of Goddess Mother' (Beauvoir, 1949, 249). Kate Millett, in her *Sexual Politics* also substantiated

further the same charge with a comment that in Lawrence 'female is passive, male is active' (Millett, K., 1969, 240). But the "phallic consciousness" as Graham Hough observes, "means to assert the primacy of the deepest instinctual forces over the more superficial and personal kinds of attraction more commonly recognized in the civilised world" (Hough G., 1961, 176). Daniel J. Schneider also expresses a similar view when he says that "the phallic consciousness" is "the pre-verbal sympathetic awareness or responsiveness which being rooted in sex, is essentially unitive, a force binding men and women, and men and men, and men and the cosmos together" (Widdowson, P. (ed), 1992, 166). Lawrence's cult of phallic worship is not a way to exert the male supremacy over his female counterpart; rather it is, to him, suggestive of the productive role of sex in life. The phallus, in his opinion, is the symbolic representative of the Holy Ghost, a third force that unites man and woman at a level higher than mere physical plane. It thus provides us with a wisdom beyond gender politics. On the other hand, Catherine Breiliet, an eminent feminist says that "sex doesn't work without an element of theatricality and fantasy and for a woman that means being dominated by a man" (Quoted in Brown, K., 1990, 21). Although this remark is outwardly horrific, it opens up a new region of our understanding that "we simply do not as yet have an adequate vocabulary for comment on female responses to erotica : pornography, for example, is for the most part produced wholly in accordance with male criteria, with women as its material" (Barron, J., in Brown, K. (ed) 1990, 21).

About the apparently obscene passages in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Graham Hough observes that "the nature and quality of sexual experience has a powerful

influence on character and development" (Hough, G., 1961, 187), and in handling of sex, Lawrence "is certainly breaking more than a mere taboo of the printing house." (Hough G. 187). The four-letter words are, in Hough's opinion an integral part of Lawrence's purpose. But simultaneously Hough raises a question that although there is no proper vocabulary to discuss sex, yet by using obscene words to elucidate the tabooed acts and parts of the body, Lawrence has violated the normal code of respectful language. For, "no writer can alter the connotation of a whole section of a vocabulary by mere fiat" (Hough, G., 139). Tony Pinkney, harping on the same string with Hough, says that the use of the obscenities in the novel's central relationship "must be understood as a self-wounding textual device--- whereby a self-insulting structure of modernism --- is brought back into grating conflict with the history it thought it had left for ever behind." (Pinkney, T., 1990, 146). But Lydia Blanchard, while striving for the principle of integration between one discourse and another, says that we are constantly dislocated by *Lady Chatterley*, in particular by the passages of explicit sex, because we are reading the novel within the wrong convention trying to naturalise it in relation to Lawrence's earlier fiction. But the text may also be read "as an exposing of the artifice of generic conventions and expectations" (Widdowson, P., (ed.), 1992, 125). On such a level the text finds its coherence by being interpreted as a narrator's exercise of language and production of meaning. In Blanchard's opinion, "to introduce opposing conventions of genre is to bring about a change in mode of reading and to look for a synthesis at a higher level." (Widdowson, P., pp.125-26). Lawrence's explicit description of the body and its use in intercourse are a way to escape repression of sexuality. Quoting, Barthes,

Blanchard says that the process of understanding a text is not only to pass from one word to another, it is also to pass from one level to another; and to do so with the present novel, is to experience the "rapture of dislocation produced by ruptures or violations of intelligibility" (Widdowson (ed), 132). In sum, the novel is an attempt to see sex in a new way that underlies Lawrence's desire to say it in a new way. Thus *Lady Chatterley* is a study of the tension between "the need to rescue sexuality from secrecy, to bring it into discourse, and the simultaneous recognition that the re-creation of sexuality in language must always --- resist language." (Widdowson, P., 183).

True, Lawrence, in his *oeuvre*, devoted more space for woman keeping in mind the point of her amelioration and fulfilment. He could understand that "--- a woman is not a man with different sex; she is a different world." (*Letters*, 21 Sept., 1914). He was even confident of his task, for he said, "I should do my work for women, better than the suffrage" (*Letters*, 23 December, 1912). But his striving to put sexuality into discourse made him an ambiguous figure with an apparently biased attitude towards women. This is because of his discharge of language that, according to Bakhtin, "exists as ideology" (Booth, W.C., 166) in the sense that its meaning is pre-established by the patriarchal social system. Lawrence's presentment of sex-ideology with language that is patriarchal in origin, often failed to comply fully with the feminist point of view. Lawrence, however, was not blind to this linguistic dispute. In order to avoid this complexity, he turned towards silent physical communion between man and woman, and towards the living activities of every individual, as alternatives of logocentrism. But these alternatives, as they were also put into discourse, were misunderstood by the feminists.

They targeted those alternatives for their scorn. Thus, what we see is that the feminist problem lies not in the presentment of sex and sex-life but in the antilogy, that is, the contradiction in terms of language; a problem still waiting to be solved with the help of something like Lawrence's Holy Ghost, the reconciler of the opposites.

: : : : : :

Chapter IX

POSTMODERN LAWRENCE

After a brief lull during the later thirties and early forties, the revival of Lawrence studies began in the late forties mainly through the initiative of Mark Schorer in his "Technique as Discovery" (1948), Leavis in his *Scrutiny Essays* (1950-52), H.T. Moore in his biography, *The Intelligent Heart : The Story of D.H. Lawrence* (1954), revised in 1962 as *The Priest of Love* and Leavis in his *D.H. Lawrence : Novelist* (1965). That revival got a further impetus from the famous trial of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in 1960. Much of the work on Lawrence upto the early seventies was celebratory "either receiving its charge from F.R. Leavis's view of Lawrence as the modern continuator of the English 'great tradition' passionately articulating life values in a destructive industrial materialistic civilization" or "from the sixties" view of him as a radical mystic, or visionary rebelliously challenging and subverting, as a free individual spirit, the repressions and conventions of bourgeois society" (Widdowson, 1992, 4). *The Twentieth Century Views* edited by Mark Spilka (1963) and the Macmillan Case book on *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* edited by Calin Clarke (1963) represent the celebratory tone as well as the critical directions of the period. Spilka, in his book, tried to emphasize the necessity to establish a connection between the New Criticism and the Lawrence revival but enthusiastically declared that "Leavis's spirit haunts the whole anthology" (Spilka, 14). To begin with, Leavis's 'morally committed formalism' has released younger British and American New critics into a situation where "intelligently

sympathetic criticism can concentrate on Lawrence's achievement without blinking at his faults and which is formally imaginative and acute yet amenable to the prophetic possibilities of art." (Widdowson, 4). Spilka's anthology mostly represents that 'moral formalism' established by Leavis and finds Lawrence's works 'mature, serious, complex' evincing "his fierce engagement with wasteland culture, his urgent sense of modern death-drift and his creative attempt to transcend it" (Widdowson, 4). On the other hand, Colin Clarke's anthology which includes S.L.Goldberg, Wilson Knight, Moynahan, H.M. Dalesky, George H.Ford, Ronald Grey, Frank Kermode and Cloin Clarke himself, sets itself in opposition to Leavis's unitary conception of Lawrence's celebration of positive life-forces by bringing out another 'demonic Lawrence' ambiguously fascinated by corruption, disintegration and dissolution. But this new emphasis is not, however, a negative one. It is "a more complex evidence of Lawrence's ability to tap into the psycho-history of twentieth century civilization" (Widdowson, 5). Besides, a number of apparently diverse approaches to Lawrence in the seventies tried to establish the sense of the individual as Romantic hero; the artist as Man of Passion not merely as a tribute to Lawrence but as a potent ideology in the post-war period. But Lawrence's dualistic understanding or vision of life, both positive and negative, are meaningfully and categorically synthesized by Spilka, when he comments on Vivas's approach to Lawrence :

If as Vivas holds that vision enables us to grasp 'the specific process of disintegration of which we are victims', it may also help us individually if not collectively to reverse that process. The moral formalists, those who have rescued Lawrence from comparative oblivion, suggest that it will. More important, the works themselves

suggest it through images of quickness, aloneness, wholeness, balance, tenderness, communion, resurrection and restoration - through images, that is, of promise. (Spilka, 12, quoted from Widdowson, 6).

D.H.Lawrence abhors dogmatism and metaphysical absolutism and nowhere is it more apparent than in his novels that represent one of the century's most powerful critiques of industrial capitalism. Although he upholds the notion of free spirit and integrity, contradicting and rejecting the collective political thoughts and actions, his vision ultimately works on behalf of those very forces it so bravely challenges. And perhaps it is for this unorthodox approach to life, love, sex and politics that Lawrence, an immensely popular figure in the sixties, was severely attacked by the feminists and Marxists of that period. Sex and sexuality, the key issues of the sixties were later reinflected as gender; and Lawrence "who had been perceived as a guru of sexual liberation, became the phallocratic oppressor of gender politics" (Widdowson, 10). Similarly from 1968 onward, the liberal/socialistic interest in class-relations was subverted by the hard class-politics and theories of ideology of the new left, and "Lawrence, the proletarian writer hero and prophet of life, became the deracine intellectual and proto-fascist mythologer of cultural politics" (Widdowson, 10). Now, in the nineties, as consensual agreement about Lawrence gradually becomes a far cry, he is the victim as well as the source of 'postmodern depolitisation'.

However, before getting into the depth of postmodern Lawrence-study, a brief sketch of the general tendency of postmodernism is perhaps necessary. As a fundamental effect of Marxist and feminist criticism, there develops a new turn called 'postmodern' in both literature and literary criticism. Although the term postmodern

was used by a number of writers in the 1950s and 1960s, the concept of postmodernism may be said to have taken shape around mid 1970s. At that time, an atmosphere of openness prevailed, fostering a mentality to accept plurality in all respects. It is said to be in the nature of things, cultures, language and texts. The legitimacy of this stance was established in two directions : first, "each discipline produced more and more conclusive evidence of the existence of postmodernism with its own area of cultural practice; secondly, each discipline drew progressively upon the discoveries and definitions made in other disciplines" (Connor, 1989, 6; Hereafter by page number). This new tendency is a great stride forward on the line of Lawrence who wished synthesis of philosophy and fiction, past and present, and reality and imagination in art. In his assumption of the future novel, 'the monster with many faces', Lawrence said :

If you look into the past for what next books, you can go back to the Greek philosophers. Plato's dialogues are queer little novels. It seems to me it was the greatest pity in the world, when philosophy and fiction got split. They used to be one, right from the days of myth. Then they went and parted, like a nagging married couple with Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas and that beastly Kant. So the novel went sloppy and philosophy went abstract dry. The two should come again - in the novel." (*Phoenix*, 520).

To some postmodernism in literature is break or a break through, but for many it is "a selective intensification of certain tendencies within modernism itself"(109). Fiedler's influential essay "Cross That Border - Close That Gap" (1969) provides "an early definition of postmodernism as a movement of merging a deliberate complication of the idea of generic integrity"(109). The gap evoked in the title above symbolically defines the gap between high culture and mass culture. Fiedler argues that the

contemporary writing contradicts the generic integrity of high culture either purging or repudiating all contaminations by internal parody. He approves of the sense of a new hospitality to the popular demand in fiction. Baudrillard says that postmodernism is always a "question of proving the real by the imaginary, proving the truth by scandal, proving the law by transgression, proving work by strike, proving the system by crisis and capital by revolution" (quoted in Connor, 58). He describes postmodernism as a system that energizes itself by the consciousness of decay and disaster to be de-energized at the same time by the relentless dominion of the code of simulation. The real, he comments, is hyperrealized, but "the hyper-real is the abolition of real not by violent destruction but by its assumption, elevation to the strength of the model"(60-61). Ihab Hassan observes a new tendency, the eloquence of silence with its two contradictory accounts : the negative, autodestructive, demonic and nihilist one, and the other, positive, self-transcendental, sacramental and plenary. Alan Wilde observes that in postmodernism "a world in need of mending is superseded by one beyond repair"(116), and the fiction, he admires does not aim to abstract the world through structures of imaginative control but is modestly engaged in experiencing the world modifying the disorder of appearances through a generous absorption in them. This view contradicts Hassan's which describes the postmodern era as "a radical decomposition of all central ideas about authorship, audience, the process of reading and criticism itself"(113). Brian Machale on the other hand points up ontological concern of postmodernism as against the epistemological one of modernism. This reminds us of Lawrence' ontological/elemental/vital preoccupation as against his abhorrence of

abstraction/dogmatism :

We know too much. No, we only *think* we know such a lot We are Hamlet without the prince of Denmark. We cannot *be*. 'To be or not to be' — it is the question with us now. And nearly every Englishman says, 'Not to be'. So he goes in for Humanitarianism and such like forms of not being. (Moore, H.T. (ed) *Letters* Vol.I, 180).

This idea is further incarnated in another remarkable letter where Lawrence says : "I don't so much care about what the woman feels --- in the ordinary usage of the word. I only care about what woman is - what she IS, inhumanly, physiologically, materially" (*Letters*, 282). Lawrence here rejected the 'old stable ego' of his characters and hinted at another ego, according to whose action "the individual is unrecognisable and passes through as it were, allotropic states — states of the same single radically unchanged element" (*Letters*, 282). It is this concern with the radical state of being problematized in his novels, that gives them a postmodern turn in the sense that they proclaim to be non-metaphysical, non-teleological and non-totalitarian.

Machale calls postmodern fiction to be a 'carnavalesque interweaving of styles, voices and registers which allegedly disrupts the decorous hierarchy of literary genres" (Connor, 126). He enthusiastically defines literary postmodernism as "a riotous cacophony of conflicting discourses or 'heterotopia' of incompatible geographics"(126). What Machale speaks of fiction corresponds to what Frederic Jameson speaks of theory : "The blurring of all disciplines and discursive styles of history, philosophy, social theory and literary criticism into an undecidable amalgam that must simply be called 'theory' as one of the prime features of the postmodern intellectual scene"(202). The most influential formulation of this new turn is, however, found in the works of Ludwig

Wittgenstein and Mikhail Bakhtin both of whom “deny that language has any abstractly essential nature and argue that it must be thought of instead as a diverse range of social games and practices” (203).

In the light of the above ideas, Lawrence studies received further impetus. The prevalent idea that ‘Lawrence’s text is dynamically contradictory’ (Widdowson, 20) is interpreted now in terms of postmodern concept of indeterminacy. Garret Stewart, in his thought-provoking article “Lawrence ‘Being’ and the Allotropic Style” observes some kind of ambiguous intricacy as “the essence of Lawrentian narrative at the level, at least of situation and psychology (Spilka, M., 1977, 332). Ambivalence and imprecision are generally termed as failures in art, but in Lawrence, they are part of a radical enterprise that thrives by “distorting conventional verbalization in order to render pre-conscious and unconscious material” (Spilka, 334). Lawrence, with the intention to lead us elsewhere into his own particular area of preoccupation, “distorts not words, not grammar, but the conventional signals for emotions” (Spilka 334). But the distortions do not operate sub-stylistically eluding linguistic analysis, on the contrary, there is a “natural latitude within both definition and syntax, a plasticity of usage and ligature that promotes, whether deliberately or not for a given writer, what we call ambiguity, that Lawrence definitely frees up and maximizes and exploits” (Spilka, 334). Stewart asks us to consider Lawrence’s language from the psychological standpoint rather than from rhetorical one because it would not be adequate enough to convey the erotic imagination that is at the heart of his work. Lawrence’s language remains rhythmic, often half inarticulate, as if a pulse and not an expression. In Stewart’s opinion, Lawrence has

produced a literary style that contests its own rules and that itself is “the most graphic test case of the self-critique of verbalisation” (Spilka, 339).

According to Daniel J. Schneider, Lawrence knew the central point of Nietzschean thought that language is a network of arbitrary signs and conventions and that all language is metaphorical. When Lawrence says that one can go wrong in the mind, in words, but not in ‘the blood’ or in the intuitive wisdom of the ‘Holy Ghost’, he echoes the postmodern view of language’s indeterminacy and rejects logocentrism. Schneider observes that Lawrence exploits three alternative ways to overcome logocentric falsification : first, he attempted to invent a new type of language and a new kind of narrative structure that would lay bare the realities which conventional language obscures or falsifies; secondly, he insisted on wordless physical communion, that is, the ‘civilisation of touch’; and thirdly, he tried to be sure that the language acquired by conscious ego is “put into its true place in the living activity of men”(*Fantasia*, 76). Lawrence believed that one can escape the prison house of language, provided one knows the true place of mind and knowledge in one’s life, for “no words, no ideas can convey the breath of life” (Widdowson, 168).

As far as the individual novels are concerned, critics upto 1960s generally looked for evidences of coherence, growth and moral wisdom, but “recent criticism emphasizes not the integrity of the text but ambiguities, eddies of meaning and disturbing subtexts” (Rylance, Rick, 1996, 1). Frank Kermode observes that Lawrence developed a new style in *Sons and Lovers* capable of embodying his new theme. The novel, Kermode argues, is shaped not so much by an unfolding narrative but by a pattern of symbolic and

structural variations from episode to episode. Lawrence's method of 'over-painting' is also well adapted to his way of depicting reality which stresses uncertainty, flux, repetition and plurality often at a psychological level below consciousness. Literature, in the postmodern era, is no more in need of systematic meanings; it is uniquely able to articulate diverse ideas and therefore unsettle all conclusions. Critics shift their attention to the "narrative's textual or political unconscious" (Rylance, R., 8). Terry Eagleton (1983) observes that the narrative point of view in *Sons and Lovers* is predominantly that of Paul; it must be read as coloured by his particular interests, defences and convictions. For the story given in *Sons and Lovers* from Paul's perspective has important gaps and distortions, most obviously in the presentation of Walter Morel. So, below the apparent text, there is a 'sub-text' "visible at certain symptomatic points of ambiguity, evasion or overemphasis --- which we, as readers are able to write even if the novel itself does not" (Rylance, R. 47). This line of argument explores mainly the unacknowledged biases and repressions which, in shaping the narrative, produce, as Louis Martz observes, "the portrait of Miriam that lies beneath the over-painted commentary of the Paul narrator" (Rylance, R. 57). Paul's point of view about Miriam is full of confusion, self-deception and desperate self-justification, and the image of Miriam "is constantly being cleared and fogged and cleared again" (Rylance, 57). This search for concealed principles of organisation, for the text's blind spots, omissions and biases "is one of the main innovations of recent criticism" (Rylance, 9). Again, post-structuralist thought stresses the precariousness of all truth claims and pay attention to the instability of language in which they are produced. Paul,

in *Sons and Lovers*, does not reveal the truth about Miriam, rather he imposes it on her and perhaps on the readers too by an act of powerful conscious or unconscious will; for careful attention to the detail reveals contradictions. In Daine S.Bond's opinion, the story of the novel that the narrator undertakes to tell, "deconstructs the belief in an unambiguous relation between language and truth"(Rylance, 107). Like Paul's story, the narrator's quest for truth dramatizes an exile from a world of clarity, immediacy and presence to one of obscurity, deferment and absence, suggesting no closure in the traditional sense. Where classic Victorian fiction closes with a marriage settlement, the novel ends "in uncertainty without any clear step towards, either a new family or individual independence" (Rylance, 4).

Roger Fowler finds *The Lost Girl* an interesting text for discourse analysis for its self-consciousness about speech. In this novel, the narrator refers to speech mannerisms when he introduces a character commenting on or implying their social significance. He tries to interpret the meaning of personal forms of speech and significance for a person's attitudes and social position. Values and beliefs in the novel, Fowler comments, are carried by discourse because, "discourse is an interaction between an addressor and an addressee within a specific socio-cultural context" (Brown, 1990, 54). In *The Lost Girl* the modes of discourse carrying different sets of belief can be recognized by characteristic structural differences in the language, differences between styles and registers and the "characteristic linguistic forms for gothic, romance, news reporting, travelogue, scientific report etc." (Brown, K. 54). Paying attention to the "post-structuralist democratization of fiction" where "the author is banished, the reader is

ascendent, the characters are respected as subjectivities, not objectivised" (Brown, 65), Fowler says that *The Lost Girl* is a polyvocal text or *heteroglossic*, to use a Bakhtinian term.

Gamini Salgado, on the other hand, directs our attention to what he calls 'radical in determinacy' — a term ambiguous but appropriate to Lawrence. *Women in Love*, Salgado observes, is a novel that not only accommodates contradictory readings but positively invites and even compels them. The novel is radically indeterminate in its effect on readers in three aspects of Lawrence's language; first, "the persistent tendency of the prose to hanker for an idea or an attribute and its opposite at the same time"; secondly, "a pervasive contrast between vehemence of tone and something which appears variously as either tantativeness or cloudiness of utterance"; and thirdly, 'as an argument that figures so prominently but at the same time is "so persistently devalued, summerised, parodied, dismissed, interrupted and trivialised" (Widdowson, 1992, 138-39). This discursive argument in the novel exists mainly to show its inadequacy as a mode of ordering experience that highlights the problem of finding a suitable language that can "communicate the incommunicable" (Widdowson, 141). The message, if there be any in the novel, is 'snares and delusions' and "the final effect is --- one of having the experience and missing the meaning" (Widdowson, 143). Lawrence's novel, Salgado comments, does not merely deploy a series of paradoxes and contradictions in the service of a larger unity, it is centrally paradoxical because it is shot through with the continuous and continuously felt tensions between the necessity of articulating a vision and its impossibility and sometimes its undesirability. Daniel O'Hara comments that

through the wondrous power of negative Lawrence smashes 'the old idols of ourselves' and its structure is a process of 'repetitive self-cancellation' (Widdowson, 157). David Lodge categorizes the novel as a philosophical adventure story, open-ended but self-defeating. In *Women in Love*, Birkin, the spokesman of Lawrence, is not allowed to win in his arguments and the exiguous plot exists merely to bring the protagonists into contact and conflict. The issues raised here are neither resolved nor contained within the history of their relationships. Consequently, the reader is "bounced bewilderingly, exhilaratingly from one subject position to another and (is) made to feel the force of each" (Brown, K. 1990, 99). Here little attention is given to the practical problems and the plot is so arranged as to leave the protagonists free to choose their own fates.

What we see is a changing pattern of the reception of Lawrence. His fiction established him as a continuator of the great Western tradition in the 1960s; he was found to be a male chauvinist and even a fascist in the seventies; and finally in the late 1980s and 1990s a postmodernist. This contradictory pattern of Lawrence reception is reflected in what Raymond Williams says in his foreword to a volume of essays commemorating the novelist's birth centenary in 1985 :

Quite apart from the deep-rooted attachments to the general positions which underlie the alternative presentations, there is the special problem that Lawrence is taken, again and again, not simply as an exemplary but as a campaigning figure. Indeed, he is often taken as in effect the private possession of this or that tendency. He is at once their justification, their promotional instance and, where necessary - which can produce the most curious results - the stick to beat others with -" (Salgado, G. & Das, G.K., 1988, vii-viii).

Kingsley Widmer refers to three areas in which Lawrence has called forth

ranging and intense responses which go beyond usual literary legacies : “the feminist-misogynist disputes, the obscenity-censorship conflicts and the problematic role as a prophet of enlarged eroticism” (Meyers, J., 1987, 156). Widmer observes that the disputes appear to be based on single-minded proposition that one cannot be both sensitively sympathetic to women and an extreme male-chauvinist. But Lawrence was obviously both and “contributed to a different, a more conflicted awareness of man-woman relations” (Meyers, J., 163). This ambivalence that his essay smacks of is caused perhaps by Lawrence’s text itself. Let us have a look at the concluding line of *Women in Love* where Birkin appears sceptic : “I don’t believe that”. With this utterance Birkin seems to reject the whole ideology of the novel hitherto built up. He desired an additional relationship with Gerald, the representative of the western society, symbolising Birkin’s acceptance of the western society. But Gerald’s death makes it impossible. Finally, Birkin realizes that his thesis of man-to-man relationship is perverse. Again, if we consider Birkin’s conclusion as a reply to the penultimate line, where Ursula says : “you can’t have it, because it’s false, impossible”, then he is rejecting Ursula’s view about his own thesis which is “an obstinacy, a theory, a perversity” (W.L. 444). What this double rejection suggests is that *Women in Love* at once implies “the propagation and the negation of its philosophy of life” (Widdowson, 1992, 23). The novel effectively deconstructs itself in the recognition that the ideology of the novel although it itself is fatally flawed, cannot be avoided.

However, although Lawrence becomes “more complex, more unstable, more

unfinished as the range and sophistication of attention paid to him increases (Widdowson, 24), it is only a sign of his importance as a cultural figure who was out to subvert the tradition he found and recreate it. The vastly differentiated cultural reproduction of Lawrence's work means that "we can make less and less sense of it in any absolute way" (Widdowson, 24). He remains a great cultural figure in his unorthodox and undogmatic way. Postmodern critics succeeded in proving as much.

: : : : : :

CONCLUSION

D.H.Lawrence once said to Rhys Davies : "All you young writers have me to thank for what freedom you enjoy, even as things are, for being able to say much that you couldn't even hint at before I appeared. It was I who set about smashing down the barriers" (Page, N. (ed), 1981, 266). Lawrence undoubtedly helped us extend our understanding of life. He sought to convince us that human activities pulsating with life enrich our dark wisdom rather than polluting it. What life is in its "intuitive wholeness" cannot be perceived by our intellect but by intuition. Lawrence combined the two, the idealized mental life on the one hand and the crude sensual life, on the other, to envision life as an integrated whole, thus rejecting their exclusivity. Vivas, E., for instance, devided Lawrence's 'love ethic', even his whole doctrine in terms of sense and nonsense, and wisdom and corruption. But to speak for Lawrence, were he not a life-long patient of pulmonary diseases, facing impatiently the recurrent social and political crises, he would not frequently have to turn against modern men including his nearest dearest ones. Nor did he have to turn to what he calls 'blood knowledge', his intuitive wisdom. That is why, he is, to some, a target for censure rather than the source of wisdom. For instance, the knowledge that "I am I" communicates to us is pre-mental and intuitive. Lawrence said : "The knowledge that *I am I* can never be thought : only known" (Quoted in Leavis, F.R., 1976, 25). This fundamental wisdom contradicts generalization, thus evading intellectual interpretation. But it carries with it the

knowledge that "I am alive" that implies the superiority of life over everything. But what Lawrence, in his life-long search for the knowledge of self, realized is that "know thyself means at last that you can't know yourself" (*Phoenix* II, 620). It is a wisdom about the dark mystery of life, that eludes intellectual efforts.

Lawrence's urge to "realise the tremendous non-human quality of life" forced him to look into life from another angle. At the earliest stage of his career, he put a question mark against our intellect, for it, in his opinion, "cheats you and juggles you all the time" (Quoted in Kermode, F.; 1973, 25); and he asks us to have resort to our 'physical vision'. Being obsessed with this idea, he engaged wholeheartedly in efforts to illuminate this darker side of life. And to do so, he borrowed freely from whatever he could lay his hand on in European classics, Occult philosophy and even modern Christianity. But he always shed a new light on them. Further he innovated the idea of a mediator, a third force between the opposed aspects of life, like, mind and body, intellect and intuition, death and rebirth, corruption and creation and so on. The mediator, as his study reveals, is but the life-force, the terrifying non-human quality of life;

It is not emotions, nor personal feelings and attachments, that matter. These are only expressive and expression has become mechanical. Behind in all are the tremendous unknown forces of life coming unseen and unperceived as out of desert to the Egyptian driving us and forcing us if we do not submit to be swept away (*C.L.*, 21 Sept., 1914).

Lawrence variously identified this life-force with the rose, the rainbow, the phallus and above all with the Holy Ghost. Human integrity and freedom, as he says, is possible only

when man within himself achieves a dynamic balance between the opposites of life with the help of the Holy Ghost. This implies that, in order to achieve freedom of life, man has to lose it, that is to surrender himself to that unknown force of life, the Holy Ghost.

Lawrence's trinitarian idea is variously reflected in his *oeuvre*. In *The White Peacock* his representation of the cultivated middle-class milieu, a theme somewhat uncommon to his familiar theme of the colliers and collieries, suggests his literary indebtedness to George Eliot. But one theme fundamental to his dark philosophy is his introduction of the Annable episode which helped him to point to the malaise of the modern civilization. A strong advocate of natural life, he could identify in modern age "the decay of mankind - the decline of the human race into folly and weakness and rottenness" (*W.P.*).

Lawrence urges us to be physical both in understanding and in relationships. The man-woman relationship is the supreme one. He says that "the great living experience for every man is his adventure into woman" and "the man embraces in woman all that is not himself and -- from that embrace comes every new action" (*C.L.* 324). In his twin novels *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*, Lawrence provides an artistic representation of this physical vision of life. He here points up the perennial significance of the short-lived sexual relationship between man and woman. Any attempt to idealize it, he says, would destroy its true significance in life. Again, what has gone wrong with rapid industrialization is its counterproductivity in terms of human relationship. It has suffered progressive deterioration, leaving man cruelly alone amidst the multitude. Gerald Crich in *Women in Love* found himself in such a terrible situation. He, however,

tried to save himself from this terror of loneliness by going to Gudrun seeking her more than once, but he never placed this ephemeral pleasure of vital communion at the centre of his life. His incapacity to obtain his wholesome nourishment from this 'sensual' relationship left him unfulfilled.

But the promise of a new lease of life that Lawrence outlined in terms of his whole *oeuvre* was more criticized than celebrated. Lawrence's rejection of the 'old stable ego' of the character, his understanding of life in a new way mainly physical, his leader-cum-follower idea, his representation of the phallus as a symbolic bridge between the sexes, his recommendations to women's salvation, everything aroused a lot of controversy. Perhaps the time was not yet ready. But Lawrence criticism, both feminist and general, about a century later, seems to have accepted him as a cultural figure rather than merely a writer. The readers' response, unencumbered today with the baggage of ideologies, is more open and creative. A postmodern mind, especially, rightly discovers in him a non-metaphysical, non-totalitarian, open-ended possibility of the liberation of human mind. The images of living organisms, like, the lion, the Unicorn, the tiger, the sheep, the lily, the rose, the serpent, structural and thematic in his works, confirm this. Lawrence was always on the side of vitality of life. We can fittingly conclude with what John Middleton Murry, one of Lawrence's best friends and bitter critics, said :

You gave the world a gift beyond price; not a gift of prophecy or wisdom, for truth and falsehood are mingled to utter confusion in your work – but the gift of yourself. --- No man in these latter days has given to men so marvellously or so terrible a picture of Man as you have given. No such picture of Man existed in the world before you came. You were a man of destiny, driven to sacrifice yourself in

order that man might know themselves and the eternal laws they must obey, the laws which, even in denying them, still they obey. (Page, N. (ed) 1981, 296).

: : : : : :

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Principal Works of D.H.Lawrence :

A. NOVELS

The White Peacock, (1911) - Penguin edition 1987 - edited by Andrew Robertson, Cambridge University Press, 1983.

The Trespasser (1912) - Penguin edition 1950 with an introduction by R. Aldington.

Sons and Lovers (1913) - Penguin edition, 1984 with an introduction by Benjamin Demott.

The Rainbow (1915)- Penguin edition, 1976.

Women in Love (1920)- Penguin edition, 1969- Grafton Books, Cambridge edition, 1989 with an introduction by Melvyn Bragg.

The Lost Girl (1920) - Penguin, 1990 - ed. John Worthen, Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Aaron's Rod (1922) - Penguin edition, 1989.

Kangaroo (1924) - Penguin Books, 1950 with an introduction by R.Aldington.

The Boy in the Bush (with M.L.Sinner - 1924) - Penguin edition, 1991.

The Plumed Serpent (1926) - Penguin edition 1990.

Lady Chatterley's Lover (1928) - Penguin edition 1969. - Jaico Publishing House, Bombay in arrangement with William Heinemann Ltd. 1960.

The First Lady Chatterley (1972) - Penguin edition 1973.

John Thomas and Lady Jane (1972) - Penguin edition, 1989.

B. SHORTER FICTION

The Prussian Officer and Other Stories (1914)

England, My England (New York, 1921; London, 1924)

The Lady Bird (1923)

St. Mawr and The Princess (1925)

Sun (1926) - Unexpurgated edition, Paris 1928.

Glad Ghosts (1926)

"*Rawdon's Roof*" (1928)

The Woman Who Rode Away and Other Stories (1928)

The Escaped Cock (Paris, 1929) - First trade edition, London 1931, entitled "The Man Who Died"

The Virgin and the Gipsy (1930)

Love Among The Haystacks and Other Pieces, With a Reminiscence by David Garnett (1930).

The Man Who Died (1931) - Penguin edition 1950 with an introduction by R. Aldington.

The Lovely Lady, (1932)

"*A Modern Lover*" (1934)

(Lawrence's short stories are published complete in three volumes by Viking. The Penguin Collections : *Love Among the Haystacks*; *England, My England*; *The Woman Who Rode Away*; *The Prussian Officer*; *The Princess* and *The Mortal Coil* together include all the short stories);

Complete Short Novels, (ed) K. Sagar and Partington Melissa, Penguin, 1990.

C. POEMS

Amores : Poems (1916)

Look ! We Have Come Through (1917)

New Poems (1918)

Bay : A Book of Poems (1919)

Tortoise (New York 1921)

Birds, Beasts and Flowers (1923)

Nettles (1930)

The Triumph of Machine (1930)

Last Poems, Edited by R.Aldington and G.Orioli, (Florence 1931)

The Ship of Death and Other Poems (- a selection from *Last Poems*, (1933)

Selected Poems (1934) - Selected by R.Aldington.

The Complete Poems, (ed.) Vivian De Sola Pinto and F.Warren Roberts (Heinemann, Viking 1964).

Complete Poems - Penguin 1989.

D. TRAVEL

Twilight in Italy (1916) - Penguin edition, 1950 with an introduction by R. Aldington.

Sea and Sardinia (New York - 1921; London, 1923) - Penguin edition, 1950 with an introduction by R.Aldington.

Mornings in Mexico (1927)

E. PLAYS

The Widowing of Mrs. Holroyd, (1914) - with an introduction by E.Bjorman.

Touch and Go (1920)

David (1926)

A Collier's Friday Night (1934).

The Complete Plays of D.H.Lawrence (Heinemann, 1965; Viking 1966)- Oxford University Press - 1972.

F. HISTORY

Movements in European History, by Lawrence Davidson (D.H. Lawrence - 1921) - Illustrated edition, with epilogue, 1925; Revised edition - 1926).

G. ESSAYS

Psychoanalysis and The Unconscious (New York - 1921, London 1923)

Fantasia of The Unconscious, (New York - 1922, London - 1924)

Studies in Classic American Literature, (New York 1923, London 1924)

Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine and Other Essays, Philadelphia 1925, London, 1934)

"Sex Locked Out"(- Privately printed in 1928).

My Skirmish With Jolly Roger (New York, 1929)

Pornography and Obscenity (1929)

Assorted Articles (1930)

Apropos to Lady Chatterley's Lover (1930)

Apocalypse (Florence - 1931)

Etruscan Places (1932)

Phoenix; The Posthumous Papers of D.H.Lawrence, ed. Edward D. McDonald, (Heinemann; Viking) 1936.

Phoenix II; Uncollected, Unpublished and Other Prose Works by D.H.Lawrence, ed. W.Roberts and H.T.Moore, (Heinemann, Viking, London 1968).

H. LETTERS

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

Collected Letters (2 vols) ed. H.T. Moore, London & New York, 1962.

The Cambridge Edition of the Letters of H. Lawrence (7 vols) Cambridge University Press (1979-1993).

II. BOOKS ABOUT D. H. LAWRENCE

Adam, Michael, *D.H. Lawrence and the Way of the Dandelion*, The Ark Press, Penzance, Cornwall, 1975.

Albright, Daniel, *Personality and Impersonality; Lawrence, Woolf and Mann*, Chicago University Press, 1978.

Aldington, Richard, *D. H. Lawrence*, Chatto and Windus, London, 1930.

Aldington, Richard, *D.H. Lawrence : An Appreciation*; Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1950.

Aldington, Richard, *Portrait of a Genius, But ---*, William Heinemann, London, 1950.

Aldington, Richard, *D.H. Lawrence : A Complete List of His Works together with a Critical Appreciation*, Norwood, 1976.

Aldington, Richard, *An Indiscretion*, Philadelphia, 1979, (First published at The University of Washington Book Store, Seattle, 1927).

Alldritt, Keith, *A Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence*, London, 1971.

Andrews, Wyndham Thomas (Ed) *Critics on D.H. Lawrence : Reading in Literary Criticism*, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1971.

Arnold, Armin, *D.H. Lawrence and German Literature*, Mansfield Book Mart, H. Heinemann, Montreal, 1963.

Balbert, Peter, *D.H. Lawrence and the Psychology of Rhythm*, Mouton, The Hague, 1974.

Balbert, Peter & Morcus, P.L. (Ed.), *D.H. Lawrence : A Centenary Consideration*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1985.

Balbert, Peter, *D.H. Lawrence and Phallic Imagination : Essays on Sexual Identity and Feminist Misreading*, Macmillan, 1989.

Banerjee, Amitava, *D.H. Lawrence's Poetry : Demon Liberated*, Macmillan, 1990.

Beal, Anthony, *D.H. Lawrence*, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh and London, 1961.

Bell, Michael, *D.H.Lawrence : Language and Being*, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Ben - Ephraim, Gavriel, *The Moon's Dominion : Narrative Dichotomy and Female Dominance in Lawrence's Earlier Novels*, Fairleigh Dickenson University Press, London, 1981.

Bennett, Michael, *A Visitor's Guide to Eastwood and the Countryside of D.H.Lawrence*, Nottinghamshire County Council, Nottingham, 1972.

Black, Michael, *D.H.Lawrence : The Early Fictions*, Macmillan, 1986.

Black, Michael, *D.H.Lawrence : The Early Philosophical Works*, Macmillan, 1991.

Black, Michael, *D.H.Lawrence : "Sons and Lovers" : Land-marks of World Literature*, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Bloom, Harold (Ed.), *D.H.Lawrence : Modern Critical Views*, Series 1, Chelsea HO, US, Biblios, 1991.

Bloom, Harold (Ed) *D.H.Lawrence's "Sons and Lovers" : Modern Critical Interpretations*, Chelsea HO, Biblios, 1991.

Boadella, David, *The Spiral Flame : A Study of the Meaning of D.H.Lawrence*, Ritter, Nottingham, 1956.

Boulton, James, T. & Preston Peter (Ed). *D.H.Lawrence : The Centre and the Circle*, University of Nottingham, D.H.Lawrence Centre, 1992.

Brett, Dorothy, *Lawrence and Brett : A Friendship*, Sunstone Press, Santa Fe, 1974.

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

Brian, John, *Supreme Fictions : Studies in the Work of Will. Blake, Carlyle, W.B.Yeats and D.H.Lawrence*, Mc Gilt Queen's University Press, 1974.

Britton, Derek, *Lady Chatterley : The Making of the Novel*, University of Edinburg, London, 1988.

Brown Keith (Ed), *Rethinking Lawrence*, Open University Press, 1990.

Brunsdale, Mitzi, *German Effect on D.H.Lawrence and His Works*, Utah Studies in Literature and Linguistics, Vol.13, 1978.

Buckley, Brian and Margaret, *Challenge and Renewal : D.H.Lawrence and the Thematic Novel*, Chrysalis Press, 1993.

Burgess, Anthony, *Flame into Being : Life and Works of D.H.Lawrence*, Heinemann, 1985.

Burns, Aidan, *Nature and Culture in D.H.Lawrence*, Macmillan Press Ltd., London, 1980.

Butler, Gerald J., *Henry Fielding and Lawrence's Old Adam : A Reading of Restoration and Eighteenth Century British*, E.Mellen Press, Canada, 1992.

Bynner, Witter, *Journey with Genius*, London, 1953.

Callow, Phillip, "Sons and Lovers" : *The Young Lawrence*, Bodley Head, London, 1975.

Carol, Dix, *D.H.Lawrence and Women*, The Macmillan Press Ltd., London, 1980.

Carswell, Catherine, *The Savage Pilgrimage*, Cambridge University Press, 1987, (First Published by Chatto and Windus, London, 1932).

Carter, Frederick, *D.H.Lawrence and the Body Mystical*, Denis Archer, London, 1932.

Cavitch, David, *D.H.Lawrence and the New World*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1969.

Chambers, Jessie, *D.H.Lawrence : A Personal Record*, E.T. Frankcass, London, 1965.

Champion, Neil, *D.H.Lawrence*, Wayland, 1989.

Choudhury, Sirajul Islam, *The Enemy Territory; A Study of Evil in D.H. Lawrence*, Dacca University Press, Dacca, 1981.

Clark, L.D., *Dark Night of the Body*, University of Texas Press, Austin, 1964.

Clark, L. D., *The Minoan Distance : The Symbolism of Travel in D.H.Lawrence*, University of Arizona Press, Tucson, 1980.

Clarke, Collin, *River of Dissolution : D.H.Lawrence and English Romanticism*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1969.

Clarke, Collin, (Ed.), *D.H.Lawrence's "The Rainbow" and "Women in Love" Casebook*, Macmillan, London, 1969.

- Cooke, Sheila M., *D.H.Lawrence and Nottinghamshire*, Nottingham Co., Library, 1980.
- Cooke, Sheila M. (Ed), *D.H.Lawrence : A Finding List*, Nottingham Co., Library, 1980.
- Coombes, H. (Ed.), *D.H.Lawrence : A Critical Anthology*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1973.
- Cooper, Andrew (Ed), *D.H.Lawrence 1885-1930 : A Celebration;* D.H.Lawrence Society, Nottingham, 1985.
- Copley, Ian, *A Turbulent Friendship : D.H. Lawrence and Peter Warlock*, Themes Pub., 1983.
- Corke, Helen, *Lawrence and Apocalypse*, William Heinemann, London, 1933.
- Corke, Helen, *D.H.Lawrence : The Croydon Years*, University of Texas Press, Austin, 1965.
- Cowan James C., *D.H.Lawrence's American Journey : A Study in Literature and Myth*, Case Western Reserve University Press, Cleveland, 1970.
- Cowan James, C., (Ed.) *D.H.Lawrence : An Annotated Bibliography*, Northern Illinois University Press, De Kalb, 1981.
- Cure-Sazdanic, Iljana, *D.H.Lawrence as Critic*, Delhi, 1969.
- Cushman, Keith, *D.H.Lawrence at Work*, University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, 1978.
- Cushman, Keith, *D.H.Lawrence's Literary Inheritors*, Macmillan Academic and Professional, 1991.
- Daiches, David, *D.H.Lawrence*, Philadelphia, 1979.
- Daleski, H.M., *The Forked Flame : A Study of D.H.Lawrence*, Faber and Faber, London, 1965, Uni. of Wisconsin, 1987.
- Darroch, Robert, *D.H.Lawrence in Australia*, Macmillan Company of Australia Pty.Ltd., Melbourne, 1981.
- Davey, Charls, *D.H.Lawrence : A Living Poet*, Brentham Press, 1985.

Davis, Joseph, *D.H.Lawrence at Thirroul*, Collins, Australia, 1990.

Delany, Paul, *D.H.Lawrence's Nightmare*, Basic Books, New York, 1978.

Delavany, Emile, *D.H.Lawrence and Edward Carpenter : A Study in Edwardian Transition*, Heineman, London, 1971.

Delavany, Emile, *D.H.Lawrence : The Man and His Work*, Heinemann, London, 1972.

Deva, Som, *A Critical Study of Sons and Lovers*, Literary Publication Bureau, Beharipur, Bareilly, 1969.

Draper, R.P., *D.H.Lawrence; Profiles in Literature*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1969.

Draper, R.P. (Ed.). *D.H.Lawrence : The Critical Heritage*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1970.

Ebbatson, Roger, *Lawrence and The Nature Tradition*, Harvester Press, Brighton, 1980.

Eisenstein, Samuel A., *Boarding of the Ship of Death : D.H.Lawrence's Quester Heroes*, Mouton, The Hague, 1974.

Eliot, George, *Lawrence D.H. : Architecture of Self*. University of California, Barkely, 1972.

Ellis David & Mills, Howard., *D.H.Lawrence's Nonfiction : Art, Thought and Genre*, Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Ellis David and Zordo, Ornella De (Ed). *D.H.Lawrence : Critical Assessments*, Helm Information, 1992.

Fabes, Gilbert Henry, *D.H.Lawrence : His First Education*, Folcroft, Lib, 1971.

Farr, Judith (Ed). *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Sons and Lovers : A Collection of Critical Essays*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970.

Fedder, Norman J, *The Influence of D.H.Lawrence on Tennessee Williams*, Mouton, The Hague, 1966.

Fernihough, Anne, *D.H.Lawrence : Aesthetics and Ideology*, Oxford University Press, 1993.

- Feshawy, Wagdy, *D.H.Lawrence : A Critical Study*, Dar-al-Sakata, Cairo, 1975.
- Finney, Brian, *Lawrence's "Sons and Lovers" : Critical Studies*, Penguin, 1990.
- Fjagesund, Peter, *Apocalyptic World of D.H.Lawrence*, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo, 1992.
- Ford, George Henry, *Double Measure : A Study of the Novels and Stories of D.H. Lawrence*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1965.
- Foster, Jane and Kazan, Jean, *D.H.Lawrence : Symbolic Landscape*, Kazan Paperback, Joe's Press, 1993.
- Foster, Joseph, *D.H.Lawrence in Taos*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, 1972.
- Frederic, Wulfsbery, *D.H.Lawrence fra Nottinghamshire*, Francis Bull, Oslo, 1937.
- Freeman, Mary, *D.H.Lawrence : A Basic Study of His Ideas*, University of Florida Press, Gainesville, 1955.
- Gilbert, Sundra M., *Acts of Attention : The Poems of D.H.Lawrence*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1972.
- Goodheart, Eugene, *The Utopian Vision of D.H.Lawrence*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1963.
- Goodman, Richard, *Footnote to Lawrence*, The White Owl Press, London, 1932.
- Goome, Andor Harvey (Ed). *D.H.Lawrence : A Critical Study of the Major Novels and Other Writings*, Harvester Press, Sussex, 1978.
- Gordon, David J. *D.H.Lawrence as a Literary Critic*, Yale University Press, Cambridge, 1966.
- Greenhalgh, Michael John, *Lawrence's Uncollected Stories 1907-13 : A Critical Commentary*, Paperback, M.J. Greenhalgh, 1988.
- Gregory, Horace, *Pilgrim of the Apocalypse*, Viking Press, New York, 1933.
- Gutierrez, Donald, *Lapsing Out : Embodiments of Death and Rebirth in the Last Writings of D.H.Lawrence*, Farleigh Dickinson University Press, Rutherford, 1980.

- Hahn, Emily, *Lorenzo : D.H.Lawrence and the Women Who Loved Him*, J.B.Lippincott, Philadelphia, 1975.
- Hamalian, Leo, *D.H.Lawrence : A Collection of Criticism*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1973.
- Heizinger, Kim A., *D.H.Lawrence in His Time, 1908-15*, Bucknell University Press, 1983.
- Hilton, Enid, *More Than One Life : Nottinghamshire Childhood with D.H.Lawrence*, A Sutton Publication, 1993.
- Hobsbaum, Philip, *A Reader's Guide to D.H.Lawrence*, Themes and Hudson, London, 1981.
- Hochman, Baruch, *Another Ego : The Changing View of Self and Society in D.H.Lawrence*, University of South Carolina, Columbia, 1970.
- Holbrook, David, *Where D.H.Lawrence Was Wrong About Women*, Bucknell University Press, 1992.
- Holderness, Graham, *Who's Who in D.H.Lawrence*, Hamish Hamilton, London, 1976.
- Hough, Graham, *Two Exiles : Lord Byron and D.H.Lawrence*, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, 1956.
- Hough, Graham, *The Dark Sun : A Study of D.H.Lawrence*, Duckworth, London, 1956, Polican Books, 1961.
- Howe, Marguerite Beede, *The Art of Self in D.H.Lawrence*, Ohio University Press, Athens, 1977.
- Humma, John, B., *Metaphor and Meaning in D.H.Lawrence's Later Novels*, University of Missouri Press, 1990.
- Hyde, G.M., *D.H.Lawrence and the Art of Translation*, Macmillan Press Ltd., 1981.
- Hyde, G.M., *D.H.Lawrence : A Revolution*, Macmillan Press Ltd., 1990.
- Ingram, Allan, *Language of D.H.Lawrence*, Macmillan Educ., 1990.
- Inniss, Kenneth, *D.H.Lawrence's Bestiary*, Mouton, The Hague, 1971.

- Jaensson, Knut, *D.H.Lawrence*, Tidens, Stockholm, 1934.
- Jarrett-Kerr, Martin (Father William Tiverton), *D.H.Lawrence and Human Existence*, Rockliff, London, 1951.
- Joost Nicholas & Sullivan, Alvine, *D.H.Lawrence and The Dial*, Southern Illionis University Press, London, 1970.
- Kalnins, Mara (Ed), *D.H.Lawrence : Centenary Essays*, Bristol Classical, 1986.
- Keily, Robert, *Beyond Egotism : The Fiction of Joyce, Virginia Woolf and D.H. Lawrence*, Harvard University Press, 1980.
- Kelsey, Nigel, *D.H.Lawrence : Sexual Crisis, Studies in 20th Century Literature*, Macmillan Academic & Professional, 1991.
- Kenmare Dellas, *Fire Bird : A Study of D.H.Lawrence*, Barrie, London, 1951.
- Kermode, Frank, *Lawrence*, Fontana Press, London, 1973.
- Kingsmill, Hough, *D.H.Lawrence*, Methuen, London, 1938.
- Lawrence, Ada & Gelder, G.Stuart, *Young Lorenzo : Early Life of D.H.Lawrence*, Florence, 1932.
- Lawrence, Frieda, *Not I But the Wind*, Rydal Press, Santa Fe, 1934.
- Leavis, F.R., *D.H.Lawrence : Novelist*, Chatto and Windus, London, 1955.
- Leavis, F.R. *Thought Words and Creativity : Art and Thought in Lawrence*, Chatto and Windus, London, 1976.
- Littlewood, J.C.F., *D.H.Lawrence I : 1885-1914*. Longman for the British Council, Harlow, 1976.
- Lockwood, M.J., *The Study of the Poems of D.H.Lawrence*, Macmillan, 1987.
- Luhan, Mabel Dodge & Knopf, Alfred, *Lorenzo in Taos*, New York, 1932.
- Mackey, Douglas A. *D.H.Lawrence : The Poet Who Was Not Wrong*, Borgo Press, U.S. 1990.

Maddox, Brenda, *Married Man : Life of D.H. Lawrence*, Sinclair-Stevenson, 1994.

Malani, Hiran Khanchand Sepahi, *D.H.Lawrence : A Study of His Plays*, New Delhi, Arnold, Heinemann, 1982.

Mandell, Gail Porter. *The Phoenix Paradox : A Study of Renewal Through Change in Collected Poems and Last Poems of D.H.Lawrence*, Carbondale, 1984.

Marshall, Tom, *The Psychic Mariner : A Reading of the Poems of D.H.Lawrence*, Heinemann, London, 1970.

Martin, Graham, *D.H.Lawrence's Rainbow*, The Open University Press, Bletchley, 1971.

McEwan, Neil, *York Notes on D.H.Lawrence's "Women in Love"* Longman, 1991.

McEwan, Neil, *D.H.Lawrence's "Selected Short Stories" Notes and York Notes*, Longman, 1991.

Mensch, Barbara, *D.H.Lawrence and the Authoritarian Personality*, Macmillan Press Ltd. 1991.

Messenger, Nigel Philip, *How to Study D.H.Lawrence's Novel*, Macmillan Press Ltd., 1989.

Meyers, Jeffrey, *D.H.Lawrence and the Experience of Italy*, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.

Meyers, Jeffrey (Ed), *D.H.Lawrence and Tradition*, Athlone Press, London, 1985.

Meyers, Jeffrey (ed.) *The Legacy of D.H.Lawrence*, Macmillan, Basing Stroke, Hampshire, 1987.

Meyers, Jeffrey, *D.H.Lawrence : A Biography*, Papermac, 1993.

Miko, Stephen John, *Toward "Women in Love" : The Emergence of a Lawrentian Aesthetic*, Yale University Press, New Heaven, 1972.

Miller, Henry, *World of Lawrence*, Capra Press, Santa Barbara, 1980.

Milton, Colin, *Lawrence and Nietzsche : A Study in Influence*. Aberdeen University Press, 1987.

Moore, H.T., *Life and Works of D.H.Lawrence*, Twayne, New York, 1951.

Moore, H.T. *The Intelligent Heart*, Farrar, Straus and Young, New York, 1954.

Moore, H.T.(Ed.) *A D.H.Lawrence Miscellany*, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, 1959.

Moore, H.T. and Francis Warren. *D.H. Lawrence and His World*. Themes and Hudson, London, 1966.

Moore, H.T., *The Priest of Love : A Life of D.H.Lawrence*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York, 1974.

Moore, H.T. and Roberts, W. *D.H.Lawrence : Literary Lives*, Themes and Hudson, 1988.

Moynahan, Julian, *The Deed of Life : The Novels and Tales of D.H.Lawrence*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1963.

Murfin, Ross C. *Swineburne, Hardy, Lawrence and the Burden of Belief*, Chicago University Press, 1978.

Murfin, Ross C. *The Poetry of D.H.Lawrence*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 1983.

Murry, Middleton, *Reminiscence of D.H.Laawrence*, Jonathan Cape, London, 1933.

Murry, Middleton, *D.H.Lawrence : Son of Woman*, Jonathan Cape, London, 1954.

Nahal, Chamanlal, *D.H.Lawrence : An Eastern View*, A.S.Barnes, New York, 1970.

Nehls, Edward, *A Composite Biography of D.H.Lawrence*, 3 Vols., University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1957, 1958, 1959.

Neville, George Henry, *A Memoir of D.H.Lawrence : The Betrayal*, edited by Carl Baron, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1981.

Nin, Anaies, *D.H.Lawrence : An Unprofessional Study*, Neville Spearman, London, 1961.

Nishimura, Koji, *D.H. Lawrence and His World*, Chuo Koven Sha, Tokyo, 1970.

- Niven, Alastair, *D.H.Lawrence : The Novels*, Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Niven, Alastair, *D.H.Lawrence : The Writer and His Work*, Longman, Eng., 1980.
- Olson, Charls, *D.H.Lawrence and the High Temptation of the Mind*, Black Sparrow Press, Santa Barbara, 1980.
- Orr, John, *Making of the 20th Century Novel : Lawrence, Joyce, Faulkner and Beyond*, Macmillan, 1986.
- Pace, M.K. & Kazan, Jean, *D.H.Lawrence : Infinite Sensual Violence*, Joe's Press, 1994.
- Page, Norman (Ed), *D.H.Lawrence : Interviews and Recollections* (2 Vols), Macmillan Press Ltd., London, 1981.
- Panichas, George, *Adventure in Consciousness : The Meaning of D.H.Lawrence's Religious Quest*, Mouton, The Hague, 1964.
- Patmore, Derek. *D.H.Lawrence and the Dominant Male*, The Covent Garden Press, London, 1970.
- Peterson, Richard F. & Cohn, Alan M. *D.H.Lawrence : An Exhibit*, Morris Library, Southern Illionis University, Carbondale, 1979.
- Philip Neil (Ed) *D.H.Lawrence : The Heart of Man - An Illustrated Selection*, Bloomsbury, Pub. 1989.
- Pinion, F.B., *A D.H.Lawrence Companion*, Macmillan Press Ltd., London, 1978.
- Pinkney, Tony. *Lawrence : New Readings*; Harvester, Wheat Sheaf, 1990.
- Pinto, Vivian de Zola, *D.H.Lawrence : Prophet of the Midland*, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, 1951.
- Polhimus, Robert, M. *Erotic Faith : Being in Love from Jane Austen to D.H.Lawrence*, University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Potter, Stephen, *D.H.Lawrence : A First Study*, Jonathan Cape, London, 1930.
- Prakash, Om, *Sons and Lovers : A Critical Study*, Prakash Book Depot, Bareilly, 1972.

- Prakash, Ravendra, *D.H.Lawrence : Sons and Lovers - A Critical Study*, Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Agra, 1972.
- Prasad, Madhusudan, *D.H.Lawrence : A Study of his Novels*, Prakash Book, Bereilly, 1980.
- Prasad, Suman Prabha, *Thomas Hardy and D.H.Lawrence : A Study of Tragic Vision in Their Novels*, Arnold Heinemann, New Delhi, 1976.
- Preston, Peter & Hoare, Peter, *D.H.Lawrence and the Modern World*, Macmillan, 1989.
- Preston Peter, *D.H.Lawrence Chronology*, Macmillan Author Chronologies, Macmillan, 1994.
- Pritchard, R.E., *D.H.Lawrence : Body of Darkness*, Hutchinson University Library, London, 1971.
- Pugh, Bridget, *The Country of My Heart : A Local Guide to D.H.Lawrence*, Nottinghamshire Local History Council, Nottingham, 1972.
- Robert, B. Partlow & Moore, H.T., *International D.H.Lawrence Conference : Lawrence Today*, Carbondale, 1979.
- Roberts, K.R. *D.H.Lawrence : An Approach to His Poetry*, Schofield, 1982.
- Roberts, Warren, *A Bibliography of D.H.Lawrence*, Cambridge University Press, London, New York, 1982, (First Published by Rupert Hart Davis, London, 1963).
- Robinson, Jeremy, *Passion of D.H.Lawrence*, Crescent Moon P., 1992.
- Rolph, C.H. (Ed.) *The Trial of Lady Chatterley*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1961.
- Ross, Charls, *The Composition of "The Rainbow" and "Women in Love"*, University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, 1979.
- Ruderman, Judith, *D.H.Lawrence and the Davouring Mother*, Duke University Press, Durham, 1984.
- Russel, John, *Style in Modern British Fiction : Studies in Joyce, Lawrence, Forster Lewis and Green*; John Hopkins University Press, 1975.

Rylance, Rick, *Sons and Lovers; New Case Books*, Macmillan Press Ltd., London, 1996.

Sagar, Keith, *The Art of D.H. Lawrence*, Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Sagar, Keith, *D.H. Lawrence : A Calender of His Works*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1979.

Sagar, Keith, *The Life of D.H. Lawrence*, Methuen, London, 1980.

Sagar, Keith (Ed), *A D.H. Lawrence Handbook*, Manchester University Press, New York, 1982.

Sagar, Keith (Ed), *D.H. Lawrence and New Mexico*, Peregrene Smith University Press, 1984.

Sagar, Keith, *Life, into Art*; Penguin, 1985.

Sale, Roger, *Modern Heroism : Essays on D.H. Lawrence*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1975.

Salgado, Gamini, *D.H. Lawrence : Sons and Lovers*, Arnold Edward, London, 1966.

Salgado, Gamini (Ed), *D.H. Lawrence : Sons and Lovers - A Casebook*, Macmillan, London, 1969.

Salgado, Gamini, *A Preface to Lawrence*, Longman, London, 1985.

Salgado, Gamini, *The Spirit of D.H. Lawrence : Centenary Studies*, Macmillan, Hampshire, 1988.

Schneider, Daniel, J., *D.H. Lawrence : The Artist as Psychologist*, University Press of Kansas, Jan., 1986.

Schneider, Daniel, J. *The Consciousness of D.H. Lawrence*, University Press of Kansas, Sept., 1986.

Schorer, Mark, *The Phoenix is My Badge and Sign : Lawrence in the War Years*, Stanford University Library, 1968.

Scott, Sanders, *D.H. Lawrence : The World of the Major Novels*, The Viking Press, New York, 1973.

- Seligmann, H.J. & Seltzer, T., *D.H.Lawrence : An American Interpretation*, New York, 1924.
- Seltzer, Adele & Seltzer T., *D.H.Lawrence : The Man and His Work*, New York, 1924.
- Shaw, Rita Granger, *Notes on Lawrence's "Sons and Lovers"*, Cliffs Notes, US, 1965.
- Shing, Tajinder. *Literary Criticism of D.H.Lawrence*, Sterling, New Delhi, 1984.
- Siegel, Carol, *Lawrence among the Women : Wavering Boundaries in Women's Literary Traditions*, University Press of Virginia, 1992.
- Simpson, Hilary, *D.H.Lawrence and Feminism*, London, 1982.
- Sinzelle, Claude M. *The Geographical Background of the Early Works of D.H. Lawrence*, Didier, Paris, 1964.
- Sitesh, Aruna, *D.H.Lawrence : The Crusader as Critic*, Macmillan, Delhi, 1975.
- Sklar, Sylvia, *The Plays of D.H.Lawrence : A Biographical and Critical Study*, Vision Press, London, 1975.
- Sklenicka, Carol, *D.H.Lawrence and The Child*, University of Missouri Press, Columbia, 1991.
- Slade, Tony, *D.H.Lawrence*, Evans Brothers, London, 1969.
- Smith, Anne, (Ed.) *Lawrence and Women*, Vision Press, London, 1978.
- Smith, Frank Glover, *D.H.Lawrence : The Rainbow*, Edward Arnold, London, 1971.
- Spear, Hilda D., *York Notes on D.H.Lawrence's "Sons and Lovers"*, Longman, 1991.
- Spear, Hilda, D. *York Notes on D.H.Lawrence's "Rainbow, The"* Longman, 1991.
- Spencer, Roy, *D.H.Lawrence Country : A Portrait of His Early Life and Background*, Cecil Woolf, London, 1979.
- Spender, Stephen, *D.H.Lawrence : Novelist, Poet, Prophet*, Weidenfield and Nicolson, London, 1973.
- Spilka, Mark, *Renewing the Normative D.H. Lawrence : A Personal Progress*, University of Missouri Press, 1992.

Squires, Michael & Jackson Dennis (Ed), *D.H.Lawrence's "Lady" : New Look at "Lady Chatterley's Lover"*, University of Georgia Press, 1985.

Squires, Michael & Cushman, Keith, (Ed.), *Challenge of D.H.Lawrence*, University of Wisconsin, 1990.

Squires, Michael, *D.H.Lawrence's Manuscripts*, Macmillan, Academic & Professional, 1991.

Stewart J.I.M., *Writers of the Early Twentieth Century : Hardy to Lawrence*, Oxford History of Eng. Literature, Oxford University Press, 1990.

Stoll, John, E. *The Novels of D.H.Lawrence : A Search for Integrity*, University of Missouri Press, Columbia, 1980.

Swigg, Richard, *Lawrence, Hardy and American Literature*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1972.

Talon, Henry, A., *D.H.Lawrence : Sons and Lovers*, Lettress, Moderness, Paris, 1965.

Tedlock, E.W., *Frieda Lawrence : The Memoirs and Correspondence*, Heinemann, London, 1961.

Tedlock, E.W.(Jr.), *D.H.Lawrence : Artist and Rebel - A Study of Lawrence's Fiction*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, 1963.

Tedlock, E.W. (Jr.), *D.H.Lawrence and Sons and Lovers : Sources and Criticism*, New York University Press, 1965.

Terenbaum, Elezabeth Broody. *The Problematic Self : D.H.Lawrence and Malraux*, Harverd University Press, 1977.

Tilak, Raghukul, *D.H.Lawrence : Sons and Lovers*, Arati Book Centre, New Delhi, 1968.

Tindall, William York, *D.H.Lawrence and Susan His Cow*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1939.

Tiverton, Father William, *D.H.Lawrence and Human Existence*, Rockliff, London, 1951.

Tonks, Jennifer Michaels, *D.H.Lawrence : The Polarity of North and South, Germany and Italy in His Prose Works*, Bouvier, Bonn, 1976.

Trease, Geoffrey, *The Phoenix and the Flame*, Matheuen, London, 1973.

Trilling Diana (Ed) *Portable D.H.Lawrence*, Penguin Books, 1980.

Vivas, Eliseo, *D.H. Lawrence : The Failure and the Triumph of Art*, Northwestern University Press, 1960.

Weeks, Mark Kinkead, (Ed), *Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Rainbow : A Collection of Critical Essays*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NI, 1972.

Weis, Daniel, A., *Oedipus in Nottingham*, University of Washington, 1962.

West Anthony, *D.H.Lawrence*, Arthur Barker, London, 1950.

West, Rebecca, *D.H.Lawrence*, Martin Secker, London, 1930. (Later on by Folcroft Press, Folcroft, 1969)

White, William, *D.H.Lawrence : A Checklist*, Wayne University, Detroit, 1950.

Wickramasinghe, Martin, *The Mysticism of D.H.Lawrence*, Colombo, 1951.

Widdowson Peter (Ed), *D.H.Lawrence*, Longman, London and New York, 1992.

Widmer, Kingsley, *The Art of Perversity : D.H.Lawrence's Shorter Fiction*, University of Washington Press, Seattle, 1962.

Williams, Raymond, *English Novel from Dickens to Lawrence*, Hogarth Press, London, 1984.

Wilt, Judith, *Ghosts of the Gothic : Austen, Eliot and Lawrence*, Princeton University Press, 1980.

Worthen, John, *D.H.Lawrence and the Idea of the Novel*, Macmillan, London, 1979.

Worthen, John, *D.H.Lawrence : A Literary Life*, Macmillan, 1989.

Worthen, John, *D.H.Lawrence : The Early Years (1885-1912)*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Wymark, Olwen, *Lessons and Lovers : D.H.Lawrence in New Mexico*, French, 1986.

Young, Kenneth, *D.H.Lawrence : Writers and Their Works*, Longman, Northcote HO, Publishers.

Yudhishtar, *Conflict in the Novels of D.H.Lawrence*, Barnes and Noble, New York, 1969.

III. Related Studies

Beauvoir, Simone de, *The Second Sex*, Penguin, London, 1972.

Bergson, Henry, *Creative Evolution*, Macmillan Press, London, 1964.

Bradbury, Malcolm, and McFarlane, James (ed), *Modernism : 1890-1930*, Penguin Books, New York, 1976.

Connor, Steven, *Postmodernist Culture : An Introduction to Theories of the Contemporary*, Basil Blackwell Ltd., Oxford, 1989.

Eagleton, Mary, *Feminist Literary Criticism*, Longman, New York, London, 1991.

Eagleton, Terry, *The Function of Criticism*, Verso Lon, 1981.

Ford, Boris (ed). *The Pelican Guide to English Literature*, (Vol.7), Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1961.

Foucault, Michael, *The History of Sexuality* (Vol.2), Penguin Books Ltd., 1984.

Freud, Sigmund, *Case Histories* (Vol.8), Pelican, 1977.

Hazell, Stephen (ed) *The English Novel : Developments in Criticism Since Henry James*, (Case Book), Macmillan Press, London, 1978.

Hudson, Derek (ed) *English Critical Essays : Twentieth Century* (Second Series), Oxford University Press, 1958.

Lerner, Laurence, *The Truth Tellers : Jane Austen, George Eliot and D.H.Lawrence*, Chatto and Windus, London, 1967.

Long, William,J., *English Literature*, Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi, 1977.

Lukcs, George, *The Destruction of Reason*, The Merlin Press, London, 1980.

Millett, Kate, *Sexual Politics*, Grandana Publishing Ltd., London, 1971.

Morson, Gary Saul (ed), *Bakhtin : Essays and Dialogues in his Work*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, London, 1986.

Sartre, Jean-Paul, *Being and Nothingness*, Washington Square Press, U.S.A., 1966.

Shaffer, Jerome A., *Philosophy of Mind*, University of Connecticut Prentice Hall of India, Pvt.Ltd., 1982.

Showalter, Elaine (ed) : *The New Feminist Criticism : Essays on Women, Literature Theory*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1985.

Spilka, Mark, (ed), *Towards a Poetics of Fiction*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, London, 1977.

Watt, Ian, *The Victorian Novel*, Oxford University Press, 1971.

Wellek, Rene and Austin, Warren, *The Theory of Literatruere*.

Williams, Raymond, *The English Novel from Dickens to Lawrence*, London, 1970.

Woolf, Virginia, *A Room of One's Own*, The Hogarth Press, London, 1954.

Young, Robert, *Freedom, Responsibility and God*, The Macmillan Press, London, 1975.

: : : : : :