

### 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"<sup>(16)</sup>. 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.

: : : : : :