University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Student Work

8-1-1972

Isolation and integration: Thematic elements in the fiction of DH Lawrence

Merrilee. Moshier

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork
Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation
Moshier, Merrilee., "Isolation and integration: Thematic elements in the fiction of DH Lawrence" (1972). *Student Work*. 3217.
https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/3217

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

UNO LIBRARIES
LIBRARY.UNOMAHA.EDU

ISOLATION AND INTEGRATION:

THEMATIC ELEMENTS IN THE FICTION OF D. H. LAWRENCE

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of English

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Merrilee C. Moshier

and

Donna M. Northouse

August 1972

UMI Number: EP74616

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI EP74616
Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.
All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Accepted for the faculty of the College of Graduate Studies of the University of Nebraska at Omaha, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts.

Thomas P. Walsh English
Chairman Department

Graduate Committee

Bruce G. Baker English
Name Department

Shelton Hendricks Psych.

5276/102

CONTENTS

Chapter 1. Introduction.................................... 1

Chapter 2. The Individual and his Environment.............. 12

Chapter 3. The Community of Man............................ 66

Chapter 4. The Religion of Life............................ 132

Chapter 5. Conclusion...................................... 181

List of Works Consulted.................................... 187

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

D. H. Lawrence asserts in his essay "The Spirit of Place" that the state of mind of an individual determines whether he can discover his personal freedom. This freedom is not a political one,[1] but a personal, mental one in which the individual's being grows toward wholeness and integration. Certain aspects of one's environment may facilitate this development, says Lawrence:

> Men are free when they are in a living homeland, not when they are straying and breaking away. Men are free when they are obeying some deep, inward voice of religious belief. Obeying from within. Men are free when they belong to a living, organic, believing community, active in fulfilling some unfulfilled, perhaps unrealized purpose.[2]

Man finds freedom in his environment within nature, in his relationship with mankind, in a personal religious belief. This paper is a study of the various manifestations of the success and failure of Lawrence's characters to discover the freedom of complete integration.

The approach is a simple one; Lawrence's characters are discussed within the limitations imposed by his vocabulary and by virtue of the enormous body of literary criticism written by Law-

[1] Lawrence introduces the idea that it is not the country, the "homeland," in which men live that allows them to be free in Studies in Classic American Literature (New York: The Viking Press, 1961), 6.

[2] Ibid.

rence. The characters are tested by the ideas of the author. It would seem more rewarding to examine Lawrence in relation to his own philosophies, for his essays and his fiction are closely interwoven. In the Foreword to Fantasia of the Unconscious, Lawrence discusses this procedure:

> This pseudo-philosophy of mine--"pollyanalytics," as one of my respected critics might say--is deduced from the novels and poems, not the reverse. The novels come unwatched out of one's pen. And then the absolute need which one has for some sort of satisfactory mental attitude towards oneself and things in general makes one try to abstract some definite conclusions from one's experience as a writer and as a man. The novels and poems are pure passionate experience. These "pollyanalytics" are inferences made afterwards, from the experience.[3]

This is not an exhaustive definitive study of all of D. H. Lawrence's writings. His poetry has been excluded, as have his dramas. What has been chosen is a selection of his shorter fiction and his major novels. His lesser novels (The White Peacock, The Trespasser, The Lost Girl, Aaron's Rod, Kangaroo, The Plumed Serpent) have been excluded for various reasons. The White Peacock and The Trespasser are omitted largely because they are products of his youth, written before he had finely-polished his style and themes. The books suffer from a general sloppiness. Lawrence's later novels exhibit various tangents that he was interested in as he roamed the world, in search of some manifestation of inner peace. The Lost Girl and Aaron's Rod suffer from vagueness of theme, the former from one of pure brotherhood and the latter from an intense religious quest. Most critics feel that

[3] Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious (New York: Viking Press, 1960), 57.

in his major novels (Sons and Lovers, The Rainbow, Women in Love, and Lady Chatterley's Lover) that his primary themes and characters are most succinctly developed.

Lawrence states the crux of the situation of the artist and his fiction in his essay, "Why the Novel Matters": "A character in a novel has got to live, or it is nothing."[4] How fully the characters in his fiction live is the measure of their success as human beings. Lawrence's fiction reflects his own thoughts on living, for the vital force of his philosophy stems from his belief in the ability of the individual to attain wholeness of being. As he states, "To be alive; to be man alive; to be whole man alive; that is the point" of living.[5] Lawrence praises the art of fiction, for as a creative record of life, it allows the artist to give "full play" to all that is important in living:

> And only in the novel are all things given full play, when we realize that life itself, and not inert safety, is the reason for living. For out of the full play of all things emerges the only thing that is anything, the wholeness of a man, the wholeness of a woman, man alive, and live woman.[6]

Thus, for Lawrence, fiction relates very closely to real life, and a study of his major fiction will unfold his major beliefs on living, with its central focus on the importance of men and women becoming integrated, full human beings. A definition of certain terms will help clarify any further analysis.

[4] Phoenix, ed. Edward D. McDonald (New York: Viking Press, 1936), 537.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., 538.

Of primary importance is the meaning of the words "isolation" and "integration" in the manner employed in this study. The isolated man and woman are those who negate the potential life force in their beings. They thus fail to establish any vital relations with a "living homeland," other human beings, or a God. Typical of this class of non-beings are the characters in The Virgin and the Gipsy, whom Lawrence terms as "non-believers," non-believers in life. One of the saddest facts of twentieth century life, according to Lawrentian thought, is that "so much of a man walks about dead and a carcass in the street and house, today: so much of women is merely dead."[7] By their too egotistical existences, they remain isolated from any real knowledge of themselves, others, God, or the Cosmos.

In direct antithesis is the integrated being. He or she is the life-believer, alive to his or her emotions, others, God, and the Cosmos. They succeed in living because of their ability to transcend the ugly force of egotism and establish loving relations with those around them. The process of integration is never easy or fully satisfied. Yet, for Lawrence, hope of fulfillment is an inspirational goal for living. Mere existence is not enough; Lawrence is very existential in his insistence that a person must act, and not just be, to become an integrated being. As he states, "Man is born unfulfilled from chaos, uncreated, incomplete, a baby, a child, a thing immature and inconclusive. It is for him to become fulfilled. . . ."[8]

[7]Ibid.

[8]"Life," Phoenix, 694.

In achieving wholeness of being, as Graham Hough points out, Lawrence places major emphasis on the attainment of balance between the conscious and unconscious portions of the individual's psyche.[9] Lawrence's two essays, "Fantasia of the Unconscious" and "Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious," attempt a detailed study of the complex nature of the individual's psyche, with particular emphasis on the unconscious. The unconscious is difficult, perhaps impossible, to define. But, Lawrence attempts to describe it in his own terms, even though he feels that the unconscious is indefinable. Generally speaking, he describes the unconscious as "the spontaneous life motive in every organism" which "begins where life begins."[10] In the following passage from "Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious" he further states how the unconscious relates to the conscious:

> But life is a general force, whereas the unconscious is essentially single and unique in each individual organism; it is the active, self-evolving soul bringing forth its own incarnation and self-manifestation. Which incarnation and self-manifestation seems to be the whole goal of the unconscious soul: the whole goal of life. Thus is it that the unconscious brings forth not only consciousness, but tissue and organs also. And all the time the working of each organ depends on the primary spontaneous-conscious center of which it is the issue--if you like, the soul-centre. And consciousness is like a web woven finally in the mind from the various silken strands spun forth from the primal centre of the unconscious.[11]

In its soul-like function, Lawrence exults the unconscious as the

[9] The Dark Sun (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1968), 226.

[10] Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious, 13.

[11] Ibid., 42.

source of all living in the individual's psyche. It is a force which derives from the unknown, an area of the psyche which a person is incapable of fully understanding because of its mysterious nature.

In his essay "Life" Lawrence enunciates the "first and greatest truth of our being" in the following words: "We are not self-contained or self-accomplished. At every moment we derive from the unknown."[12] The unknown embodies man's unconscious as a spiritual, creative force, the root of all living, which Lawrence sometimes envisions as the Holy Ghost. The process of growth, Lawrence explains in this same essay, is as mysterious as the living facts of birth and death, and one must trust in the unknown or the unconscious to grow into wholeness. Imagistically, in Lawrence's fiction, the unknown is often symbolized by darkness.

The conscious portion of the self, as represented by the symbol of light in Lawrence's work, is that portion of the psyche of which the individual is aware. Lawrence associates the idea of consciousness with a person's awareness of self and life around him. It is the individual's responsibility to seek the touchstone of his life in his unconscious segment of being, bringing this segment forward into consciousness to form the integrated self.

Forces active in a person's environment can disrupt the balance between the consciousness and unconsciousness. According to Lawrence, the clashing of the natural order with industrialism results in one of the most devastating effects on the human psyche.

[12] Phoenix, 695.

Many of Lawrence's themes and characters are closely connected with the mining industry. His attitude toward the mining industry is virtually completely critical, often irrationally so. Lawrence offers no alternative suggestion for the energy provided by coal; he merely deplores the havoc wrought upon mankind. Mark Kinkhead-Weekes discusses Lawrence's attitude toward industry:

> He (Lawrence) is not against prosperity, nor is he against the greater scope and freedom that come with it. But his imagination is horrified by the sprawling ugliness which speaks to him of a loss of the sense of organic life and beauty; and even more appalled by the possibility of people losing the sense of their own individuality, and giving or selling themselves to organizations, systems, machines--becoming instrumental. For Lawrence, there is no substitution for individual living, fulfilled in the personal relationships which tap the total personality.[13]

Man is surrounded by a continual battle of forces in his environment; he is constantly juggled back and forth by these forces which frustrate his intellect, which stunt his psychic growth, and which threaten to annihilate him. The mining industry is one of these vile forces. Lawrence finds nothing but condemnation for the mining industry.

This condemnation is closely connected with a constant subtle approval of the life one can live amid the natural world. To Lawrence, the real England is closely connected with Nature. His definition, however, of the natural landscape is a special one, for it involves much more than mere landscape:

[13]Introduction to Twentieth Century Interpretations of the Rainbow (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971), 6.

> To me it seemed, and still seems, an extremely beautiful countryside just between the red sandstone and the oak-trees of Nottingham, and the cold limestone, the ash-trees, the stone fences of Derbyshire. To me, as a child and a young man, it was still the old England of the forest and agricultural past; there were no motor cars, the mines were, in a sense, an accident in the landscape, and Robin Hood and his merry men were not very far away.[14]

The key words here in Lawrence's definition of the real England are "stone fences" and "agricultural." Neither, technically, are parts of the overall landscape, but to Lawrence, they are part of the overall picture in his mind's-eye of the real England. It is, actually, a relative matter for the stone fences and the farms are more natural to Lawrence than the pits. The pits are unnatural because to work in them, men must, by day, descend into the darkness of the earth and work in an occupation which ruins the face of the earth. Freedom and integration of being are difficult to achieve; the mining industry which turns men into machines and perpetuates the festering desire for mere acquisition[15] destroys possibilities for freedom. Through a close relationship with nature, through a denial to participate in the mining industry, man can achieve a fullness of being. This idea of the environmental forces surrounding mankind will be discussed in Chapter Two.

Another of the forces hindering man's integration of being is war. War confounds man's search for wholeness for it serves, in most instances to destroy man's individuality. By forcing man

[14] "Nottingham and the Mining Countryside," Phoenix, 133.

[15] "Nottingham and the Mining Countryside," Phoenix, 138.

to perform as a machine, not as a human, war thwarts man's psychic growth. The responses of various characters in Lawrence's fiction to their war environment will conclude the analysis in Chapter Two.

Besides living within the natural environment, of equal importance is the necessity for participation in the community of man. The term, community of man, is self-explanatory. It is both one's immediate circle of friends and the entire population of mankind. What is important about the community is that one, in order to achieve integration, must establish relationships within the community. In his essay "Whitman," Lawrence delineates the evils of isolation and importance of integration within the community:

> The soul is not to pile up defences round herself. She is not to withdraw and seek her heavens inwardly in mystical ecstasies. She is not to cry to some God, beyond, for salvation. She is to go down the open road, as the road opens, into the unknown, keeping company with those whose soul draws them near to her, accomplishing nothing save the journey, and the works incident to the journey, in the long life-travel into the unknown, the soul in her subtle sympathies accomplishing herself by the way.[16]

One cannot exist alone in the cosmos. One must establish some sort of connection with human beings and strive to perpetuate the connection. The gamut of human relationships as presented by Lawrence will be discussed in Chapter Three.

Lawrence's deeply individualistic interpretations of religion and God forms the content of the fourth culminating chapter. Lawrence believes that the individual has the

[16] Studies in Classic American Literature, 173.

responsibility to follow the voice of God within him, as stated in "Spirit of Place," a voice which transcends any conventional interpretation of God. Lawrence strongly repudiates any institutional religion. None of his fictional clerics or members of an institutional religious sect attain true integration or wholeness of being. Lawrence criticizes modern Christianity mainly for its advocation of a bodiless love;[17] his unique interpretation of religion is a combination of both pagan and Christian elements. A study of his apocalyptic myth, The Man Who Died, will most fully illuminate Lawrence's religion of life.

Lawrence's distinct religious fervor derives mainly from a strong faith in life, in the ability of humans to gain rebirth to a better way of life. His religion of life stresses the fact of the "Risen Lord"[18] and applies it to men and women's everyday living. As Graham Hough explains, Lawrence believes that to attain fullness of being, one must experience a "subjective realization of God,"[19] or the consummation of both flesh and spirit. The content of Chapter Four marks the culmination and completion of the study of the individual in his or her search for integration and emphasizes Lawrence's hopeful faith in the religious abilities of the strong individual to become reborn. The following study of Lawrence's philosophy of wholeness, may be best introduced by the following "prayer" Lawrence utters in

[17] D. H. Lawrence, Apocalypse (New York: Viking Press, 1966), 76.

[18] Lawrence discusses this idea very explicitly in his essay, "Resurrection," Phoenix, 737-739.

[19] The Dark Sun, 228.

Apocalypse:

> What man most passionately wants is his living wholeness and his living unison, not his own isolate salvation of his soul. Man wants his physical fulfillment first and foremost, since now, once and only once, he is in the flesh and potent. For man, the vast marvel is to be alive. . . . We ought to dance with rapture that we should be alive and in the flesh, and part of the living, incarnate cosmos. . . . My soul knows that I am part of the great human soul, as my spirit is part of my nation. I am my own very self, I am part of my family. There is nothing of me that is alone and absolute except my mind, and we shall find that the mind has no existence by itself, it is only the glitter of the sun on the surface of the waters.[20]

[20] Apocalypse, 199-200.

CHAPTER TWO

The Individual and his Environment

"Men are free when they are in a living homeland," states Lawrence in his essay, "Spirit of Place." Man's environment certainly plays an important role in the development of man's wholeness of being, and environment plays an active role in the fiction of Lawrence. The environmental forces, both natural and artificial, can bring on harmony or chaos, respectively, for man's being. An analysis of three major aspects of environment, industry, nature and war, will elucidate its relevance for the development or disintegration of the Lawrentian character.

In his early short stories through the later major novels Lawrence stresses the theme of the industrial, or the artificial, versus the natural, or that which complements human nature. To Lawrence, the environmental force that most constantly thwarts man's progress toward wholeness is the mining industry. For him, the real England is not the sprawling, open pits of the coal mines that stipple the landscape; the real England is the England of his boyhood, before the onslaught of industry. He yearns for the England of "no motor cars,"[1] an England free of the iron

[1]Lawrence, "Nottingham and the Mining Countryside," in Phoenix, 133.

manacles of industry. Industry is a real vehicle for chaos, with its destruction of the natural beauty of the countryside and its disastrous effects on man's being. In one succinct statement, Lawrence summarizes this situation well: The industrial problem arises from the base forcing of all human energy into a competition of mere acquisition."[2] Thus, industry betrays the "spirit of man," for it turns the simple, lively "cottagers" into lifeless "town-birds" and competing "rats."[3] It transforms any living homeland into a veritable wasteland.

The mining industry provides the backdrop for the majority of Lawrence's novels and a number of his short stories. In front of this gruesome backdrop interact Lawrence's characters, all of whom respond to their environment in various ways. Some characters triumph over the stronghold of the mining industry and reach some level of integration; some characters live forever within the confines of industry and suffer in isolation of being. An analysis of various Lawrentian characters and their relations to their industrial environments will further define the isolation-integration theme of Lawrence's work.

Some of Lawrence's best short stories deal with the psychological conditions of the working man and wife both before and after the fall from the natural life. Some few members of this class of humanity do not let their environment beat them, but most are fallen men and women. There are only three major char-

[2]Ibid., 138.

[3]Ibid.

acters from the short stories who succeed in transcending the detrimental forces of industry. Tom Vickers of "A Modern Lover," Ephraim of "Strike-Pay," and Alfred Durant in "Daughters of the Vicar," are all men who retain their natural virility and strength in spite of the fact that they live close to industry.

In the first story cited, it is no wonder that Murial, the woman caught between two suitors, rejects the "modern lover," the intelligent Mersham, for the old Adam-figure, Tom Vickers, "an old fashioned, inarticulate lover."[4] Somewhat following the pattern of the ideal Lawrentian lover, Vickers is a man who is ruggedly handsome, crude, animalistic, and most important, alive and flowing in his life force. In contrast, Mersham is intellectually handsome, refined, rational, and not fully alive to any instinctual life force. These men are perfectly characterized in this simple short story as two prototypes of Lawrentian lovers, the sensual one and the intellectual one, and the problem of the triangle situation is neatly solved when the woman rejects the intellectual, or rational, and affirms the passionate in her own nature by joining with Vickers. In this first story of The Complete Short Stories Lawrence gives little evidence of the destructive force industry can have on a person's being; Vickers remains strong in character throughout the whole story.

[4]D. H. Lawrence, The Complete Short Stories, Vol. I (New York: Viking Press, 1967), 17. All future references to the short stories will refer to this edition.

The other heroic collier, Ephraim in "Strike-Pay," is a man who exerts his masculinity by refusing to let his nagging mother-in-law control the money or "strike-pay." In this story, Lawrence quite clearly demonstrates the ugliness and misery that life in industry brings a man and his family. The environment from the very beginning of the story is quite depressing. The men are on strike, Ephraim has just lost his miserable strike-pay of half a sovereign, and the only pleasures in life for the colliers are the drink and camaraderie at the local pub. Ephraim has one added pleasure--the love and service of his sweet wife. The mother-in-law appears to be in league with industry in trying to demoralize and dominate this man. Ephraim goes home "with a sense of death, and loss, and strife" (I, 51), after losing his strike-pay. On the way home, he is further depressed by the sight of a "navvy" who drowned with his horse in a drainage ditch. The horrible picture of the man "stifled dead in the mud" (51) symbolically represents the broader condition of the colliers drowning their spirit and being in the gloomy pit. Ephraim finds life disgusting and is utterly depressed due to the frightening conditions of life in a pit-town. But Ephraim is able to live on, at least, due to one supreme moment in the familiar environment of his own cottage where he triumphs over the mother-in-law and receives the love and service of his wife. Ephraim remains somewhat a strong, forceful individual and does not succumb to the forces of death which he feels so keenly. But still the reader leaves him at the end of the story with a feeling of the dismal environment of life in the mining town.

The third and most fully developed character is Alfred Durant, the strong collier who escapes from the "unformed, unknown chaos" (I, 173) that his mother carried with her, to a life in "true darkness" (182) with Louisa Lindley, the second daughter in "Daughters of the Vicar." Durant is definitely the superior to both the unfeeling, cold Vicar and the weak, little husband of Mary Lindley, Mr. Marny, since only he is a strong, virile, feeling individual. In this more than any other short story, Lawrence illustrates the joys of life even in the pit. In speaking of Durant and his occupation, he states:

> He was not unhappy in the pit . . . the day passed pleasantly enough. There was an ease, a go-as-you please about the day underground, a delightful camaraderie of men shut off alone from the rest of the world, in a dangerous place, and a variety of labour, holing, loading, timbering, and a glamour of mystery and adventure in the atmosphere, that made the pit not unattractive to him when he had again got over his anguish of desire for the open air and sea (166).

In his essay, "Nottingham and the Mining Country," Lawrence extols the feeling of "togetherness" that men experience under the butty system. But Durant, like Lawrence in his own life, senses the impoverishment of pit life and at the end of the story leaves for Canada with Louisa, his wife, (similar to Lawrence's exodus from the Nottingham mining country) where their beings can flourish in plenty of "open air and sea."

Lawrence deals with the problem of industrialism and materialism from his earliest novels to his latest novel, Lady Chatterley's Lover. From the very beginning, he seems to be concerned with characters whose lives were fulfilled in spite of the everpresent

industrial background. *The Rainbow* is essentially a family chronicle of the Brangwen men and women; the story is composed of their experiences, both successful and unsuccessful in the "living homeland." Ursula Brangwen is a girl whose family has roots both in the agricultural world and in the industrial world. The last half of the novel deals with her experience, her choices, and her eventual fulfillment.

The Brangwen family has always lived close to nature at the Marsh Farm. It is likely that Ursula is also close to nature even though some members, such as her Uncle Tom Brangwen, become firmly entrenched in the claws of industrialism. Ursula's role in the living homeland manifests itself in an absolute rejection of the industrial world. Like Lawrence, Ursula cannot accept one single facet of the industrial world. Despite this deplorable picture of the total desolation of the mines, Ursula is a free agent in the living homeland. She realizes that there is a continual battle within the environment, yet she somehow remains free. The freedom that she feels is due partially to her response to nature and also to her identification with natural objects. When in nature, Ursula feels its influence upon herself and recognizes its siren call; she must escape her worldly weights and transcend those who hold her down:

> Waves of delirious darkness ran through her soul. She wanted to let go. She wanted to reach and be amongst the flashing stars, she wanted to race with her feet and be beyond the confines of this earth. She was mad to be gone . . . And how could she start . . . and how

> could she let go? She must leap from the known into the unknown.[5]

Ursula and Anton dance, and Ursula is strangely roused by the moon. "She wanted the moon to fill in to her, she wanted more, more communion with the moon, consummation. But Skrebensky put his arm around her and led her away" (300). The moon reveals to Ursula what has previously been unknown to her; she and Skrebensky are incompatible and unequal in the natural world. Skrebensky does not understand the moon's power on Ursula, yet he instinctively feels he must shield her, must draw her away, so he put "his arm around her" and leads her away. Ursula and the moon later expose his inadequacies. Critic Mark Spilka elucidates this powerful moment: "A short while later she pins him down upon her, under an incandescent moon, and breaks his soul in her fierce desire to reach the blazing unknown: moon and woman together test, expose, penetrate and destroy his inadequate manhood."[6] The moon is her symbol, a female symbol, and it pinpoints to her that she is searching for something, perhaps the "blazing unknown." This something, she ultimately discovers, is herself.

Ursula has a great faith in the supremacy of nature, despite the impinging growth of the industrial world. Lawrence's vision in The Rainbow is a surprisingly optimistic one, one much brighter than shown in his later novels. The rainbow symbol is a manifes-

[5] (New York: The Modern Library, 1915), 298, 299. All further references to this edition of The Rainbow will be hereafter cited in the text.

[6] The Love Ethic of D. H. Lawrence (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1955), 114.

tation of that optimism. Lawrence feels that the rainbow exemplifies a perfection by combination:

> My idea of Eternity, I can best illustrate by the rainbow: it is the meeting half-way of two elements. The meeting of the sun and of the water produce, at exactly the right place and moment, the rainbow. In it is everything, and that is eternal . . . the Nirvana . . . just that moment of the meeting of two elements. No one person could reach it alone without that meeting.[7]

As H. M. Daleski points out, the rainbow in the conclusion marks and symbolizes her achievement.[8] Ursula's symbol is a natural one.

At Nottingham University Ursula grows weary with Anglo-Saxon literature and French; she decides instead to study botany. Her oneness with nature largely influences this decision. So deep is her appreciation of nature that "this was the one study that lived for her. She had entered into the lives of the plants. She was fascinated by the strange laws of the vegetable world. She had here a glimpse of something working entirely apart from the purpose of the human world" (411).

Because of her constant striving, Ursula's role in the living homeland is a constant searching one; her life is a quest.[9] The part of The Rainbow dealing exclusively with Ursula is largely episodic. These episodes contain various examples of her search for fulfillment. She is not fulfilled at the Marsh, nor with

[7] Dorothy Brett, Lawrence and Brett (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1933), 267.

[8] The Forked Flame (London: Faber and Faber, 1965), 125.

[9] For an excellent article dealing with Ursula's quest for self, see A. L. Clements, "The Quest for Self: D. H. Lawrence's The Rainbow." Thoth (Spring, 1962), 90-100.

Anton Skrebensky in her first encounter with him. In her role as a school teacher, she discovers the job to be a horrid battle of pettiness which she must reject. The relationship with Anthony Schofield is a superficially rewarding one, but she realizes that she can find no real fulfillment with him because he has no soul. Her ultimate rejection of Anton Skrebensky arises from the fact that their relationship is deadly to her; she can find no complete satisfaction, either spiritual or physical, with a man whose outlook on life is so different from hers.

The industrial world is an anathema to Ursula. She has no relationship with anything or with anyone that is a part of the industrialism that she sees everywhere around her in the Midlands. Still, the rejection of industry by Ursula results in an eventual transcendence for her of its limitations. Ursula's soul is degraded by the industrial world. Because of this degradation, she must turn away from it. Her life is a constant search for fullness, for self, which she finds with the aid of nature in spite of the limitations that industry imposes upon the people of the Midlands. Ursula becomes involved in a lesbian relationship with Winifred Inger. She eventually realizes the worthlessness of such an attachment and subsequently introduces Winifred to her Uncle Tom Brangwen, who is a colliery owner. Lawrence's hatred of colliery owners is made clear by his description of Tom Brangwen: "The fine beauty of his skin and his complexion, some almost waxen quality, hid the strange, repellent grossness of him, the slight sense of putrescence, the commonness which revealed itself in his

rather fat thighs and loins" (327). When questioning her uncle about the men who must descend into the earth everyday, she is depressed both by what she sees in the men and what she hears from her uncle:

> "Why are the men so sad?"
> "Are they sad?" he replied.
> "They seem unutterably, unutterably sad," said Ursula out of a passionate throat.
> . . . "They believe they must alter themselves to fit the pits and the place, rather than alter the place to fit themselves. It is easier," he said.
> "And you agree with them," burst out his niece, unable to bear it. "You think like they do--that living human beings must be taken and adapted to all kinds of horrors. We could easily do without the pits."
> He smiled, uncomfortably, cynically (328).

The explanation given to her repels her and nauseates her. She refuses to accept any explanation because she recognizes the dehumanization of the workers. Tom Brangwen is to be loathed because of his connection with the machines which remove any individuation from the workers. Ursula strongly feels their plight because of her struggle for individuation. In a sense, Tom Brangwen is her enemy.

The final lines of the novel further elucidate Ursula's identification with the miners. She has just recovered from a long illness which began with the miscarriage of Skrebensky's child. She has rejected Anton forever, and the strength required by her action desolates her. Ursula, recuperating in bed, sees a rainbow out of her window, and once again she feels at one with the miners. These final lines synthesize Ursula's search for individuation with the miner's similar plight:

> 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 built up in a living fabric of Truth, fitting to the over-arching heaven (467).

Ursula realizes that someday the world will transcend the grime of industrialism and will be made clean by the Rainbow. Ursula has faith in the supremacy of nature, as Lawrence does in this stage of his writing. The end is the Lawrentian vision that the world can triumph over the miseries and the struggles of industrialism, of materialism, as Ursula can triumph over industrialism and over her past mistakes. The message is essentially one of hope.

Much more frequently does Lawrence portray the failures of men and women to live full lives in the midst of industry. Of his short fiction, "Her Turn," "The Odour of Chrysanthemums," "A Sick Collier," "The Christening," and "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman," all set in the mining-town milieu, show how the ugly forces of industry can corrupt the life forces of men and women. An often repeated theme is the isolation between man and wife due to the wife's frustrated drive for security and the man's equally frustrated drive for love and service.

A common figure is that of the collier's wife corrupted by her lust for money and security and as a result she ruins both her own being and that of her husband. Lawrence very graphically presents this situation in a simple short tale of marital prob-

lems, "Her Turn." The story centers on one major incident, and a common one for Lawrence's fiction: a domineering wife demands her poor husband's pay so that she may buy a new mangle to add to "the array of crockery, linoleum, mattress, mangle, and other goods crowding the house and yard" (I, 43). Mr. Radford desires escape "from the nagging materialism of woman"[10] but is only capable of retreating to the garden where he picks up a tortoise, and stands "with bent head, rubbing its horney head" (44). A man can not get much lower.

In "The Odour of Chrysanthemums," Lawrence in a much more poignant matter reveals the "utter, intact separateness" (II, 300) which can exist between a man and woman in marriage. Elizabeth Bates is another typical Lawrentian miner's wife whose main concern is not the welfare of her husband but money. At the news of her husband's accident, the fretful wife's first thoughts are: "If he was killed--would she be able to manage on the little pension and what she could earn?--she counted up rapidly" (294). Only when she touches the dead, heavy, unresponding body of her husband does she realize the permanent, irreparable gap between them, and that "they denied each other in life" (301). In this excellent story Lawrence vividly describes the ugliness of the pit town and the degenerative effect it has on the lives of its inhabitants. Poor salaries, long working hours, poor living conditions, ugly towns, large families to support--such awful condi-

[10]"Nottingham and the Mining Countryside," 136.

tions cause the miner's women to turn into nagging materialists, much to the women's own dismay in some cases as in Elizabeth's.

Another story expressing the same basic theme is "The Sick Collier," in which Lawrence presents the situation of a desolate marriage. This time the collier becomes ill and bedridden, cut off from the necessary companionship of his comrades, and in a fit of madness blames his helpless condition on his wife. The wife's major concern is that it does not get around the town that her husband has these crazy spells, "for if it gets about as he's out of his mind, they'll stop his compensation" (I, 273). The all too familiar drive for money crops up in yet another collier-wife's behavior and not in any extremely original way in this eight-page rendition.

In only one story of the industrial milieu does the male figure become the dominating, destructive member of the family--the father in "The Christening." The story centers on the absolute aloneness that each member of the family feels: "everybody was separated in feeling" (I, 278). The three daughters and one son are equally as isolated from each other as from their father. Their stiffling environment is quite conducive to their barren states of being. The hellish pit "in the centre [of town] . . . steaming its white smoke and chuffing as the men were being turned up" (275), casts its spell over all the town's inhabitants. The depressive atmosphere is felt from the very centre of town to the ugly kitchen of the Rowbatham's so called high-class cottage. Although Mr. Rowbatham is considered by even the town's minister

as a "well-to-do old collier" (278), Lawrence, through the technique of irony, reveals his truly sick and depraved nature. Not only is he suffering in body (from locomotive ataxy, a disease which often sets in during the final stages of syphilis) but also in mind. This man may have made a financial success of himself, but as a man and father he is a true failure. Again, Lawrence shows his disdain for the person who succumbs to the lust for material success only to become an isolated, wretched non-individual. In this story the evil becomes intensified since the man has made "only half-individuals" (282) of his children: "They never lived; his life, his will had always been upon them and contained them" (282).

In "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman," Lawrence dramatizes quite well both sides of the marital situation with imaginative mythical overtones. Emily, "the desperate woman," is a modern day Medusa who desires escape from the "weird underground" (III, 610) of the mining town. Emily Pinnegar is the most humanistically portrayed of all Lawrence's collier-wives. She is not the typical nagger but a woman who is frustrated by the lack of proper attention and love given by her collier-husband. Yet the reader feels sympathy for her husband, Mr. Pinnegar, a depraved man hardened by his life in the pits to the extent that as he says, "All I ask of you [his wife] is to do your duty as a housewife" (622). Emily is hardly the type to respond to this type of treatment by a man, so she leaves him for the compassionate Jimmy. Yet she remains tainted for life by the Hades-like town, so much

so that Jimmy "could feel, so strongly, the presence of that other man about her . . . in some subtle, inexplicable way, he was actually bodily present, the husband" (629). Both Mr. and Mrs. Pinnegar have been destroyed by their non-living existence in the mining town to the extent that neither can retain any sort of individual identity. At the end of the story, Pinnegar continues his meager day-to-day survival in the "weird underground," while Emily moves in an "aura" still "hopelessly married to him" (629). Jimmy is left, pathetically enough, wondering: "Which of the two would fall before him with a greater fall--the woman or the man, her husband?" (629). By all implications, each has already fallen so far that the question becomes irrelevant.

Gerald Crich, Lawrence's "Industrial Magnate" in Women in Love, responds negatively to the natural environment; he has no actual respect or reverence for the landscape. The only real connection that Gerald has with the environment is in the mines that his family owns, the mines that he operates. Gerald does nothing to preserve the land. He, in fact, perpetuates the "accident in the landscape"; he furthers the ruin of the natural environment.

Crich is the son of a great humanitarian; his father loved the mines and the miner and sought to make their lives as pleasant as possible. His attempts at humanitarian reforms were negated by his wife who saw the workers as parasites, and their demands as threats to his existence. His attempts were nullified by Gerald who made a conscious choice between the father's humanitarian path

and the "new and terrible purity"[11] which the industry became.

Lawrence not only criticizes the festering wounds of the pits, but also the towns that were built by the mining companies for the workers. Lawrence mourns for what might have been; imagination could have been used and the desolate towns might have become centers of beauty. Instead, there are squalid squares of tawdry buildings.

> If the company, instead of building those sordid and hideous squares, then, when they had put a tall column in the middle of the small market-place, and run three parts of a circle of arcade round the pleasant space, where people could stroll or sit, and with handsome houses behind! . . . If only they had done this, there would never have been an industrial problem. The industrial problem arises from the base forcing of all human energy into a competition of mere acquisition.[12]

Gerald serves as the initiator of one of the industrial problems, for he builds these ugly colliery villages that Lawrence deplores. "They were hideous and sordid, during his childhood they had been sores in his consciousness. And now he saw them with pride. Four raw new towns, and many ugly industrial hamlets were crowded under his dependence" (214-215). Gerald makes no attempt to alleviate the ugliness of the pits by constructing pleasing homes; beauty is not important to him.

The machines are important to Gerald. He takes over his father's position in the company and institutes a "great reform." Critic Yudhishtar clarifies Gerald's attitude toward the new way

[11](New York: The Viking Press, 1960), 224. All further references to this edition of Women in Love will be cited in the text.

[12]"Nottingham and the Mining Country," 138.

of running the mines:

> Everything in the world, he believes, has its function, and its goodness or otherwise depends on how well it performs this function. If a miner is a good miner, he is perfect, complete. He himself, Gerald thinks, must be a good director of industry and there he will have fulfilled his life.[13]

Electricity is introduced, efficiency experts are hired, and engineers diligently plan to smooth out any wrinkle that may warp the surface of the harmonious organization that Gerald relies upon. Gerald also abolishes the butty system, a system which required a deep, magnificent harmony of communication between the miners. This system, which operated throughout times of physical danger and triumphant success, was the most important aspect of work to the miners; they relied on this for a release from the perils of the pit. When Gerald destroyed this, when the machines took over, the intimacy and joy of work were destroyed.

Gerald changed the original tradition of the butty system; the change also transformed the men's attitudes.

> The men were satisfied to belong to the great and wonderful machine, even whilst it destroyed them. It was what they wanted. It was the highest that man had produced, the most wonderful and superhuman. They were exalted by belonging to this great and superhuman system which was beyond feeling or reason, something really godlike. Their hearts died within them, but their souls were satisfied (223).

Gerald commits the worst sin possible, for he removes the humanity from the men by transforming them into machines. The men begin to follow Gerald in his perverse religion of the Machine.

[13]<u>Conflict in the Novels of D. H. Lawrence</u> (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1969), 193.

The destruction of the mining tradition nearly results in Gerald's own destruction. He makes chaos out of a previously harmonious tradition. Through this chaos, he grows indifferent to his men. "But he had long ceased to hate them . . . They were not important to him, save as instruments, nor he to them, save as a supreme instrument of control" (224). His indifference is worse than his hate, for indifference is completely devoid of feeling. Gerald's indifference to the men grows into a fear. He has made the system flawless; it can operate without him. Gerald nearly destroys his place in the cosmos because he is no longer needed. "He was afraid , in dry mortal fears, but he knew not what of" (224). Because he has successfully completed his mission in the industrial world, he feels empty. This emptiness of purpose causes him to reach out to Gudron.[14] Unconsciously Gerald realizes what he has done, for he consciously feels that authority is one of "the right thing(s) in the world" (219). Now his authority and his position are merely titular. The machines have the real authority.

The industrial age, as Lawrence shows, has wrought along with material "progress" a terrible destruction of the natural order. Lawrence places great importance on living in tune with the natural order. Love and appreciation of beauty that can be found in Nature, others, and God are two of the major staples of the ideal Lawrentian character. As Lawrence states, "the human

[14]Yudhishtar, 194.

soul needs actual beauty more than bread."[15] Lawrence condemns the industrial age for its ugliness: "It was ugliness which really betrayed the spirit of man . . . meanness and formless and ugly surroundings, ugly ideals, ugly houses, ugly relationship between workers and employers."[16] All of the various characters living in the industrial milieu of Lawrence's fiction are suffocating their true beings, whether they do it consciously or unconsciously, and Durant and Emily are the smartest--they leave this type of environment. Typical of those who succumb to the forces of an industrial environment are the children of Mr. Rowbatham who do not have the strength or courage to leave. The last words of their story reveal the true deficiency in their characters:

> The day after the christening he [the father] staggered in at the doorway declaring . . . "the daisies light up the earth, they clap their hands in multitudes in praise of the morning." And his daughters shrank, sullen. (I, 282)

The strength of Nature intimidates their death-like natures and they are beyond rebirth.

In two nouvelles, The Virgin and the Gipsy and St. Mawr, Lawrence quite forcibly demonstrates the value of living the natural life, or being in communion with beauty. Living in such a manner brings an individual closer to self-fulfillment. Generally speaking, a person can experience beauty in three basic ways: through a proper relation with his surroundings, with others, and with his God. For the purposes of this chapter on the role of

[15] "Nottingham and the Mining Countryside," 139.

[16] Ibid.

environment in the development of a man's being, the study of these two nouvelles will be limited to Lawrence's approach to man's natural surroundings. The characters of the gipsy in The Virgin and the Gipsy and Lou in St. Mawr offer ideals for all mankind to follow in the way they integrate their beings with their environments.

Nature for Lawrence serves a double role as both a separate, living entity and as a symbolic representation or a basic mode of perception through which Lawrence encompasses other aspects of his themes. According to the first function, Nature contains the instinctual mystery and beauty which can enhance the being of a person who communes with it. With the second function Lawrence, according to the romantic tradition, often portrays Nature as a reflection of a man's psychological state.[17] The following will analyze these two works according to this pattern.

The Vicar of The Virgin and the Gipsy is a perfect example of the man dead to life in his supreme isolation. He serves as the direct antithesis to the gipsy. The vicar leads a stagnant life of retreat in his ivory tower of a parsonage where there is no "fresh air." The gipsy leads a dynamic life alive to nature and his own life force, not held down by any four artificial walls, and travels where his desires take him. A quite romantic character, the gipsy is the teacher of life for not only the young,

[17] For a discussion of Lawrence's place in the romantic tradition in literature, see Herbert Lindenberger, "Lawrence and the Romantic Tradition," in D. H. Lawrence Miscellany, ed. Harry T. Moore (Carbondale: University of Southern Illinois Press, 1959), 326-341.

virginal Yvette, but for all humans who have failed to become alive to their environment and others. Through narrative techniques Lawrence stresses the importance of Nature--every chapter is filled with beautiful nature description, so much so that Nature almost becomes a major character. Nature is a living force for the gipsy who lives in strong union with it. At the opposite pole are the "life unbelievers,"[18] the Vicar, Aunt Cissie, and the grandmother, who live cut off from Nature and any natural life force. The vicar's two daughters, Lucille and Yvette, have had the good fortune of living away from the deadly Vicarage; thus, they are set off from the rest of the family. Symbolic of the movement one person made from isolation to integration is the ever-present, haunting memory of Yvette's mother, "She-Who-was-Cynthia," who wisely abandoned the Vicar and her family to find true fulfillment, it is implied. Yvette is caught between the two poles; she desires escape from her tower but she does not know how until the gipsy teaches her at the end of the story. Yvette resembles her mother in both looks and feeling. Like her mother must have felt, "She hated with the cold, acrid hatred of a child the rectory interior, the sort of putridity in the life" (43). She loves the outdoors and the company of others, and often escapes to both. She discovers the gipsy living close to Nature, a "free-born" being who, symbolically enough, offers fire to warm the hands of her cold self. Yvette, also possessing a "free-born quality" (90),

[18]The Virgin and the Gipsy (Alfred A. Knopf: New York, 1970), 40. All future references to this nouvelle will be made to this edition parenthetically in the text.

identifies with the gipsy and by this identification comes to better knowledge of herself. In the Vicarage, she is lost to herself: "Inwardly she was hard and detached, and unknown to herself, revengeful" (95).

Following the first function of the role of Nature, in this nouvelle the dynamic backdrop motivates the internal action of Yvette's character growth. "The voice of water" (101), as prophesized by the gipsy woman, will bring her salvation, so that the catastrophic flood at the end of the nouvelle which destroys the old order comes as no real surprise. Nature and Yvette in a sense become one, for during the flood Yvette is described as being "barely conscious: as if the flood was in her soul" (107). Nature serves a symbolic purpose, too, for the rising waters represent the cleansing that is going on in Yvette's soul.

"The sun was shining in heaven . . ." (115) begins the last, anti-climactic chapter of Yvette's story, and it is the beginning of a new day for her. Beyond her climactic encounter with the gipsy, Yvette has gained a better knowledge of herself. Even though he soon leaves her, Yvette does not regret knowing him, for as the gipsy has advised her, she is "braver in the body" (118). One important thing that the gipsy has taught her is that Nature is more than just an external reality; man can internalize the spirit and beauty he finds in Nature to make himself "braver in the body." In this minor but importent work, Lawrence shows not that one should live a hermit-like life of retreat in Nature, but by communing with the beauty and mystery in Nature, he may

enhance his own being. Living close to Nature becomes not an end in itself, but the means for an individual to grow closer to his own true nature, and even to others and God. Following the isolation-integration theme, Yvette represents the individual growing in self-awareness, away from isolation as represented by her father and toward integration as represented by the gipsy.

In the second nouvelle, St. Mawr, the spirit of place is especially important in an analysis of the major character, Lou Carrington. This small work contains a number of Lawrence's recurring motifs: the disillusionment with twentieth century life, reverence for the mysterious and primitive in life as embodied by the horse St. Mawr, a satirical attack on class snobbery and the aristocracy, criticism of the Bloomsbury-type artist, criticism of the domineering woman, to name a few. Basically, the story revolves around the growth in self-awareness of Lou Carrington. At the beginning she is introduced as a young, beautiful, fairly wealthy girl, American in birth, European in upbringing, who "didn't 'belong' anywhere."[19] How she arrives at the end as the woman who finally finds where she belongs is the basic substance of the story. Again, there is the movement from isolation to integration in character growth, and in this story particularly "place" plays an important role.

Towards the beginning of her story, Lou rashly enough marries a young, handsome Australian "artist," Rico Carrington, the em-

[19] St. Mawr and The Man Who Died (New York: Alfred P. Knopf, 1953), 3. All future references to St. Mawr will be made to this edition.

bodiment of the isolated man. She soon becomes quite weary of both him and her life with him. Rico has no real personality; he shows a number of different faces to fit the occasion. Everyone loves him for his extremely good looks, good manners, and good clothes. Even his art is artificial; his forte is doing portraits of the wealthy aristocracy. Rico has no real relations with others, Nature, God, or even himself. Lou soon senses the "central look of powerlessness in him" and the fact that his whole appearance is merely a "bluff" (15). But they act out the ritual of being happily married for a while. Neither is at home anywhere--they are too cut off from each other, the society of others, and any natural environment. Lou throughout most of the story feels a sense of deadness surrounding her wherever she goes. Her mother, the person she comes closest to in feeling, even disappoints her. Lou soon becomes weary of the sense of emptiness and bitterness which exists in her domineering mother.

Rico and Lou hope by traveling to run away from their dissatisfactions with each other and their universe, and they travel frantically. Both belonged nowhere even before they married. They met in Rome, had a love affair in Capri, where they eventually "reacted badly on each other's nerves" (4). "Lou was popped into a convent nursing-home in Umbria, and Rico dashed off to Paris" (4) and then to Melbourne. Lou next visited America but came away "disheartened," and finally arrived in Paris with her mother, where she met up with dear Rico. Here they are married, but they leave immediately for London to live with Lou's mother,

Mrs. Witt. The life of the aristocracy soon bores Lou, so off they all go to Mrs. Witt's "cottage" (27) in Shropshire. While there they do a lot of motoring because of Rico's desire for an active social life, a distraction from his own self-dissatisfaction, all of which Lou finds "innerly wearisome" (31). Lou wants an answer to life--the reason for it all, and she can find it in no one or nothing around her. As one last stab to sustain some measure of sanity and to save the beautiful and mysterious St. Mawr, Lou leaves her "powerless" husband and heads with her mother for America.

In one outstanding passage the symbolic meaning that natural surroundings can represent is quite discernable. The following expresses quite vividly Lou's relief at finally leaving England, and this is also the voice of Lawrence speaking:

> To go South! Always to go South, away from the arctic horror as far as possible! That was Lou's instinct. To go out of the clutch of greyness and low skies, of sweeping rain, and of slow, blanketing snow. Never again to see the mud and rain and snow of a northern winter, nor to feel the idealistic, Christianized tension of the now irreligious North (127).

The land of the South will hopefully warm Lou's being and vitalize her spirit. Thus, the cold, arctic North represents death and the warm South stands for life in Lou's mind, symbolic of the struggle between the desire for thanatos and eros in her own being. The tension in Lou's life may also be viewed as the struggle between the natural and the unnatural. Lawrence very succinctly states the problem in the following reference to Lou's reaction when she sees the Gulf of Mexico:

> The Gulf of Mexico was blue and rippling, with the phantom of islands in the south. Great porpoises rolled and leaped, running in front of the ship in the clear water . . . The marvelous beauty and fascination of natural wild things! The horror of man's unnatural life, his heaped up civilization! (128)

These two exclamations sum up very well the dilemma of man living in modern civilization. If one can return to the natural, he can survive as a whole individual. This is why Lou set sail for Southwest America--to find a reason for living. In the Southwest she finally does find her place--a rugged ranch which has not been successful for a long chain of inhabitants, but for which Lou feels kinship. The first homesteader, a schoolteacher, went in debt in his attempt to cultivate the wild land. The next owners, a trader and his sophisticated, New England wife, prided themselves for their brave but eventually futile attempt to conquer the land, for the tameless land beat them out of their money and ownership of it. Only Lou understands the land, "the spirit of place." She both loves and hates it:

> The underlying rat-dirt, the everlasting tussle of the wild life, with the tangle and the bones strewing. Bones of horses struck by lightening, bones of dead cattle, skulls of goats with little horns: bleached, unburied bones. Then the cruel electricity of the mountains. And then, most mysterious but worst of all, the animosity of the spirit of place: the crude, half-created spirit of place, like some serpent-bird for ever attacking man, in a hatred of man's onward-struggle towards further creation. (152)

Here most clearly Lawrence portrays the other role of Nature in his fiction, its role as an active, living force, outside man, but with which man can communicate. The land brings Lou to life--for the first time she desires to live. She identifies herself with its "wild" spirit and her union with it will strengthen her

being, she hopes at the end. In the midst of this wild, untamed land, free from the constraints of a modern civilization, Lou can build her own special universe and grow to her true self.

By the end of the nouvelle, Lou stands as a supreme example of the person who has grown to some sort of self-awareness and will continue to do so, due to the special nature of her environment. James C. Cowan summarizes well her virtues in character:

> One index to Lou's maturation is that, rather than becoming fixated at one stage of development, she is able to relinquish even the source of her inspiration to the fulfillment of his own instinctual being [that of St. Mawr] and to continue her own creative growth in the life newly opened to her . . . It is to this fierce spirit [of the land] that Lou now must turn in service . . . The wild spirit needs Lou for the creative evolution of the new order. Lawrence's conclusion is an affirmation which . . . he has earned.[20]

The affirmative note at the end of this story is also praised by the renowned critic, F. R. Leavis in the following:

> . . . the life she proposes on the ranch with its history and its symbolic value, in the "wild America" is the antithesis of that represented by the Bloomsbury world she lived in with Rico. And we still feel that she truly apprehends, in this antithesis, something positive, a possibility of creative life . . . .[21]

As in The Virgin and the Gipsy, Lawrence presents another pair of characters who represent quite decisively the isolation-integration theme. Rico and Lou, never truly married in spirit, exist at extreme poles of living. The lifeless Rico will have to come to Lou and the land if he ever desires reunion with this new woman who

[20] D. H. Lawrence's American Journey (Case Western Reserve University Press: Cleveland, 1970), 96.

[21] D. H. Lawrence: Novelist (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1968), 256.

has found a place where she belongs.

Lawrence's deep concern for the natural environment is one of his foremost themes in his major novels as well as in his short fiction. Although he paints vivid portraits of various industrial characters, Lawrence is not forever pinpointing isolated characters who find themselves alone in the cosmos because of a deep irreversible interaction with the industrial world. He is, however, also concerned with those characters who are extraordinarily close to nature, whose very lives are bordered by a profound appreciation, reverence, and observation of the natural environment. Paul Morel in _Sons and Lovers_ is a figure whose day to day existence is replete with contacts with nature.

The portrait of Paul is painted against a rather grim background of an industrial community. His father is an instinctual, emotional man whose life is governed by the pits and the camaraderie associated with the pits; his mother is a proud woman who made a grave error by marrying Walter Morel. She has no real relationship with her husband and consequently has turned to her children, most particularly her sons, for fulfillment. In this environment young Paul grows up; he repeatedly turns to Nature for his own fulfillment.

Paul Morel's response to the natural environment is essentially a _sacramental_ response. As he wanders through the countryside surrounding Nottingham, he constantly measures the land by the natural yardsticks, by flowers in particular. Although he is by no means blind to the blighting of the countryside by the mines, he

chooses instead to observe the flowers.

> "I say," said Paul, turning shyly aside, "your daffodils are nearly out. Isn't it early? But don't they look cold?"
> "Cold!" said Miriam, in her musical, caressing voice.
> "The green on their buds--" and he faltered into silence timidly.
> . . . "Won't you lie down?" said Mrs. Leivers.
> "Oh no; I'm not tired," he said. "Isn't it lovely coming out, don't you think? I saw a sloe-bush in blossom and a lot of celandines. I'm glad it's sunny."[22]

Paul notices objects of nature that neither Mrs. Leivers nor Miriam notice; he is constantly pointing out to others various facets of nature that previously had been hidden to them. Because of his special power of awareness, he makes others aware of the environment and disseminates a feeling of reverence for nature. He most particularly spreads this special awareness to Miriam, who is a sensitive girl living amidst nature on Willey Farm. His awareness is contagious:

> Again, going down the hedgeside with the girl, he noticed the celandines, scalloped splashes of gold on the side of the ditch.
> "I like them," he said, "when their petals go flat back with the sunshine. The seemed to be pressing themselves at the sun."
> And then the celandines ever after drew her with a little spell. Anthropomorphic as she was, she stimulated him into appreciating things thus, and then they lived for her (148).

Paul's response to nature is a maximal one as long as his own vitality is intact. After he has given his mother an overdose of morphine to relieve her of her suffering permanently, his response to Nature is minimal because of the extreme emotional

[22]D. H. Lawrence, Sons and Lovers (New York: The Viking Press, 1958), 144. All further references to this edition will hereafter be cited in the text.

conflict he has been enduring.

> He was most himself when he was alone or working hard and mechanically at the factory. In the latter case there was pure forgetfulness, when he lapsed from consciousness. But it had come to an end. It hurt him so, that things had lost their reality. The first snow-drops came. He saw the tiny drop-pearls among the grey. They would have given him the liveliest emotion at one time. Now they were there but they did not seem to mean anything (410).

Paul's mother has been the center of his life. Her illness and her death have been a shock to him; the fact that he has hastened her demise has nearly destroyed him. Paul's motives for murdering his mother are numerous. Perhaps the primary, or most likely reason is that he cannot bear to watch her suffering; her grasp on life is strong even though her cancer is far advanced. Paul cannot bear the anguish of prolonging both his and her misery. Another motive, far less obvious, is that Paul, acting as the lover, not the son, cannot bear to watch his mother grow old. As pointed out by Daniel A. Weiss, Paul constantly views his mother as a young person, nearly his own age and refuses to see her real age. "One of his great wishes has been that she remain young and uncorrupted, virginal. As the terminator of life, death is also the preserver of life. . . ."[23] A final motive is that Paul has finally become aware of his mother's role in his life. He unconsciously realizes that as long as his mother is alive, he will never be a complete, integrated person. He seeks fulfillment with Miriam and finds another Gertrude Morel. He seeks fulfillment with Clara

[23] Oedipus in Nottingham (Spokane: University of Washington Press, 1962), 44.

Dawes and finds a relationship devoid of any spiritual depth. It is as if his mother were preventing his having a completely fulfilling relationship both spiritually and physically. Once his mother has been removed from his life, his life momentarily loses meaning. His old responses to the natural environment are gone. The final paragraph of the novel indicates that Paul will return to life and will be able to find fulfillment.

> 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 (420).

Paul's relationship with the natural environment is an extraordinarily intimate one, largely because of his deep response to it. Nature is particularly close to him, for it serves as a guideline throughout his life. It continually serves as a test of truth, a yardstick by which he can measure himself and others.

Paul's first relationship with a female other than his mother is with Miriam Leivers. Miriam and Paul share a similar relationship with nature, for both respond to nature's beauties, particularly flowers in a similar way. As Mark Spilka points out, ". . . flowers are the most important of the 'vital forces' in _Sons and Lovers_. The novel is saturated with their presence, and Paul and his three sweethearts are judged, again and again, by their attitude toward them, or more accurately, by their _relations_ with them."[24] Paul's relationship with Miriam has been a long, often tortuous one. For one reason or another, Paul finds not

[24]Spilka, 45.

fulfillment with Miriam but constant frustration. Miriam's attitude about flowers allows Paul to realize the truth about their relationship. Miriam forces herself upon the flowers as she forces herself, though in an entirely spiritual, non-physical manner, upon Paul. Her attitude toward Paul is a maternal, demanding one.

> One after another she turned up to him the faces of the yellow, bursten flowers appealingly, fondling them lavishly all the while.
> "Aren't they magnificent?" she murmured.
> "Magnificent! It's a bit thick--they're pretty!"
> She bowed again to her flowers at his censure of her praise. He watched her crouching, sipping the flowers with fervid kisses.
> "Why must you always be fondling things?" he said irritably.
> "But I love to touch them," she replied, hurt.
> "Can you never like things without clutching them as if you wanted to pull the heart out of them? Why don't you have a bit more restraint, or reserve, or something?" (217-218).

Paul undoubtedly feels that the flowers are magnificent, but won't agree with Miriam; instead, he peevishly criticizes her because her attitude annoys him. Clearly, Paul speaks not of flowers, but of himself. He later terminates their relationship when he says to her, "I don't want another mother" (296). Paul breaks off from Miriam because her love for Paul is one with deadly strings attached. She must possess him just as she must possess the flowers.[25]

Paul gradually drifts away from Miriam Leivers and grows close to a completely different sort of woman. Clara Dawes is an older woman, a suffragette, who is separated from her brutish husband. Paul's relationship with Clara is virtually a completely

[25] Spilka, 47.

physical one; they have no intellectual common ground, and have no spiritual connections. Nature is still close to Paul's life even in a non-spiritual relationship. Nature still serves as a measuring device; just as it helped to clarify Miriam to Paul, nature helps to reveal Clara to Paul. While Miriam is generally associated with flowers, Clara is associated with water. Paul and Clara first make love on a river bank, as closely as possible to the water. Paul also realizes the nature of their relationship through Clara's association with the water. He watches her as she stands in the sea and realizes how little she means to him. In the enormous sea she "grew smaller, lost proportion, seemed only like a large white bird toiling forward" (357). She nearly vanished in Nature, a pale comparison, as she "was dazzled out of sight by the sunshine." He realizes that she is a mere mortal adrift in the sea, not the special creature he mistook her for.[26] He discovers that she means nothing to him. "What does she mean to me, after all? She represents something, like a bubble of foam represents the sea. But what is _she_? It's not her I care for" (358). Paul has finally discovered that Clara is not what he was searching for, just as Miriam was not. It is because he is integrated with Nature that Paul makes such a discovery. Nature remains extremely close to his life, acting as a restorative when he is ill, acting as a means to measure his own growth. Paul is essentially integrated with nature, and because of this har-

[26]Maurice Beebe, "Lawrence's Sacred Fount: The Artistic Theme of _Sons and Lovers_," _Texas Studies in Literature and Language_, IV(1962-3), 546.

mony, he can eventually lead a complete and fulfilling life.

In immediate contrast to the character of Paul Morel, there is Gerald Crich in Women in Love. Crich is a character who remains forever isolated from the natural environment. His relationship with the environment is generally a forceful or destructive one. Not only do his machines threaten to become the masters of the landscape, but also he attempts time and time again, in the daily course of his life, to master the natural resources, and the inhabitants of the landscape.[27] Upon one occasion, Ursula and Gudrun Brangwen watch Gerald swimming in Willey Water:

> From his separate element he saw them and he exulted to himself because of his own advantage, his possession of a world to himself. He was immune and perfect. He loved his own vigorous, thrusting motion, and the violent impulse of the very cold water against his limbs, buoying him up (40).

Lawrence does not present Gerald as a man in harmony with his environment, as a man who behaves in the water as if he were a part of it; instead, Lawrence presents Gerald as the master of Willey Water, as one who possesses the water. He is totally out of harmony with the water.

Gerald is also the master of Shortlands, the great estate that every year gives a water party for the public. At one particular party Crich's sister Diana is drowned, Gerald dives repeatedly into the icy depths of the water to save Diana and her husband, but though he is master of the water and responsible for the water, he cannot be the savior for his sister, partly because

[27] Angelo P. Bertocci, "Symbolism in Women in Love," in D. H. Lawrence Miscellany, ed. Harry T. Moore (Carbondale: S. Illinois Press, 1959), 88.

his right hand is bandaged and virtually useless. Diana is doomed because Gerald has hurt his hand which was trapped in machinery at the colliery. His mastery is a short-lived one for the machines have impeded his attempt at saving his sister. The machines eternally breed destruction.

Gerald Crich's isolation and total lack of harmony with the natural environment are extended beyond the machines and the water. He is also not harmonious with the animals of the natural environment. In the chapter "Rabbit" Gudrun comes to Shortlands to give art lessons to Gerald's small sister, Winifred. When Gudrun arrives Gerald is walking about in the flower beds, looking at the new flowers. "Yet as he lingered before the flower beds in the morning sunshine there was a certain isolation, a fear about him, as of something wanting" (229). As part of the art lessons, Winifred decides to draw Bismarck, her pet rabbit. When Gudrun reaches her arm into the animal's cage and tries to hold it still, its powerful hind claws rip her arm open. Gerald, forever the master of the situation, takes Bismarck forcibly from her and nearly kills the animal.

> The long, demon-like beast lashed out again spread on the air as if it were flying, looking something like a dragon, then closing up again, inconceivably powerful and explosive. The man's body, strung to its efforts, vibrated strongly. Then a sudden, sharp, white-edged wrath came up in him, swift as lightning he drew back and brought his free hand down like a hawk on the neck of the rabbit. Simultaneously, there came the unearthly abhorrent scream of a rabbit in the fear of death. It made one immense writhe, tore his wrists and sleeves in a final convulsion, all its belly flashed white in a whirlwind of paws, and then he had slung it round and had it under his arm, fast. It cowered and skulked. His face was gleaming with a smile (233).

The smile on Gerald's face is a smile of triumph, for he has succeeded in nearly killing the rabbit and has temporarily broken its spirit. Gerald's desire for mastery has permeated his being. He uses this mastery as a sort of favor-winning device in front of Gudrun. He has quelled the rabbit where Gudrun could not; he is temporarily the master of the situation.

In another instance, Gerald uses mastery over animals, which manifests itself in an enormous cruelty, to prove his worth to Gudrun. Gudrun and Ursula witness Gerald's handling of his Arabian mare at a railroad crossing. What they see nauseates both of them, for Gerald forces, time and time again, the hysterical mare to stand as close as possible to the moving train. The mare is repeatedly frightened nearly beyond control but Gerald controls her to do his will. He forces her to do what he wants.

> . . . the mare pawed and struck away mechanically now, her terror fulfilled in her, for now the man encompassed her; her paws were blind and pathetic as she beat the air. The man closed round her, and brought her down, almost as if she were part of his own physique (104).

Even Gudrun, who is both fascinated and repelled by him, feels that his control of the situation is deplorable. Gudrun screams to him "I should think you're proud" (104). And indeed he is, for he has indelibly attracted her attention.

Gerald recognizes his lack of harmony with nature, for he chooses to die in the midst of nature. After having been repelled by Gudrun and disgusted with the intolerable situation of his life, he leaves the small company of people in the Alps, stumbles up into the mountains and sleeps into death. This choice of method

of suicide is significant for it reveals that Gerald realizes the ultimate supremacy of nature over him. Water, in the form of ice and snow, finally masters him.

In Lawrence's last novel, Lady Chatterley's Lover, Clifford Chatterley is the owner, the master of Wragby, the long low house "without much distinction."[28] The only distinction the house has is its park of oak trees that help to serve as a buffer from the pits of Tevershall, the nearby mine. Mark Schorer, in his "Lawrence and the Spirit of Place," has vividly painted a portrait indicating the permanent linking of the woods and the mines in the novel: " . . . in the background black machinery looms cruelly against a dark sky; in the foreground, hemmed in but brilliantly fresh, stands a green wood; in a clearing of the wood, two naked human beings dance."[29] Clifford Chatterley is not only owner of the mines; he is also the owner of the woods. His response to the natural environment is a minimal one, one that extends little beyond possession.

Chatterley has been rather critically wounded in the Great War, and as a result of this injury he is permanently confined to a wheel chair. On occasion, providing the weather is fair and the ground dry, Connie Chatterley and Clifford sojourn in the woods. Clifford studies the oak trees and appreciates their quantity, however decreasing it was, and their quality, as one of his sort

[28] D. H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover (London: Penguin Books, 1971), 13. All further references to this edition will be hereafter cited in the text.

[29] In D. H. Lawrence Miscellany, ed. Moore, 291.

appreciates any possession:

> Clifford loved the wood; he loved the old oak trees. he felt they were his own through generations. He wanted to protect them. He wanted this place inviolate, shut off from the world (43).

He not only wants the trees to belong to him, he also wants the trees to be his alone. He seeks to isolate the woods and, in doing so, deprive the remainder of the world of their beauty, which is possibly the only source of beauty in the blighted mining district.

Clifford's relationship with the natural environment is essentially an unobservant relationship. Unlike Paul Morel in _Sons and Lovers_ who remains forever appreciative of the smallest natural offering, Clifford Chatterley ignores his natural environment. Occasionally he destroys a natural object but takes no note of having done so and feels no remorse. One episode in _Lady Chatterley's Lover_ that illuminates Clifford's coldness is the battle over the wheelchair. Connie and he have been out in the woods (_his_ woods). Clifford's responses to nature quite annoy Connie, for she feels he places unnecessary restrictions and limitations on the beauties.

> The chair puffed slowly on, slowly surging into the forget-me-nots that rose up in the drive like milk froth beyond the hazel shadows. Clifford steered the middle course, where feet passing had kept a channel through the flowers. But Connie walking behind, had watched the wheels jolt over the woodruff and the bugle, and squash the little yellow cups of the creeping-jenny. Now they make a wake through the forget-me-nots.
>
> All the flowers were there, the first bluebells in blue pools, like standing water.
>
> "You are quite right about its being beautiful," said Clifford. "It is so amazingly. What is _quite_ so lovely as an English spring!"

> Connie thought it sounded as if even the spring bloomed by act of Parliament (191).

Clifford tries to force the chair to climb a rather steep and rough hill. When it cannot, he becomes infuriated, feeling not only anger at the failure of the machine, the infallible Machine, but also deep frustration at not being able to walk up the hill himself or even peering into the chair's motor to discover what difficulty has stopped it. He forces the chair to climb a few more feet where it stops and can go no farther.

> Clifford was pale with anger. He jabbed at his levers. The chair gave sort of a scurry, reeled on a few more yards, and came to her and amid a particularly promising patch of bluebells . . . Constance sat on the bank and looked at the wretched and trampled bluebells (196, 197).

Clifford's machine destroys the flowers; Connie notices the damage yet he neither feels remorse over having destroyed them nor notices having done so. He is more angered at the limitations and imperfections of his machine.

Clifford perpetrates the ruin of the natural environment by becoming vitally interested in the mining industry. He previously spent his inactive days either intellectualizing with his companions at Wragby Hall, or by writing his peculiar stories. Clifford becomes interested in the mines partially because of his own need for some sort of vitality, and partially because of his housekeeper's gossip-laden stories about the people of Tevershall.

Clifford's interest in the mines has little to do with the miners; he becomes reactivated largely because of a need for personal power. If he cannot have a physical power, a sexual power, then he can have an industrial power.

> He went down to the pit day after day, he studied, he put the general manager, and the overhead manager, and the engineers through a mill they had never dreamed of. Power! He felt a new sense of power flowing through him: power over all these men, over the hundreds and hundreds of colliers (112).

Physically powerless, he uses the mines as a means to integrate himself with something. What Clifford Chatterley actually does is further isolate himself. As Graham Hough points out,

> Connie hates these new interests and the side of Clifford's nature that they bring out. By all ordinary standards this new activity of Clifford's would seem to be an excellent thing; within the context of the book there is a sharp opposition between the expansion of Connie's nature by the warmth of sexual love and the narrowing of Clifford's by the cold lust for power.[30]

Clifford's machines threaten his own wood as surely as his chair ruined the bluebells. The machines cannot improve or enhance the natural landscape, for to Lawrence there are no redemptive qualities whatsoever in the mining industry. There is only destruction.

> There in the world of the mechanical greedy, greedy mechanism and mechanized greed, sparkling with lights and gushing hot metal and roaring with traffic, there lay the vast evil thing, ready to destroy whatever did not conform. Soon it would destroy the wood, and the bluebells would spring no more (123).

The machines strip the environment of any sort of natural beauty and leave behind great wastes of materials, that will only become more disgusting for they will forever blot out the beauties.

> The utter negation of natural beauty, the utter negation of the gladness of life, the utter absence of the instinct for shapely beauty which every bird and beast has, the utter death of the human intuitive faculty was appalling (158).

[30]*The Dark Sun*, 162.

The woods are in grave danger because of the industrial world. The roots of the trees are in danger because "The vertical shafts of the local mines lead to horizontal corridors fanning out in all directions. The rich soil of Wragby wood is undermined by coal diggings, while its flora and fauna are being reduced at ground level."[31]

Lawrence feels that the machines will expand beyond the wood at Wragby and will eventually destroy all factors of traditional English life.

> The industrial England blots out the agricultural England. One meaning blots out another. The new England blots out the old England. And the continuity is not organic, but mechanical (163).

In the mind of Lawrence, war is closely allied with industry as a destructive force in modern living. War is certainly a dominant characteristic of twentieth century living and Lawrence, in his outstanding prophetic vision, foresaw the doom and disintegrative effect it would have on modern man in his attempt to live a fulfilling existence. Lawrence terms war a "killing process"[32] for all human beings whether they be actively fighting in one or not. For Lawrence, the forces of war and industry bring him a sense of death. His hatred for England reaches its height during the war years when he writes:

> "I can't live in England. I can't stop any more. I shall die of foul inward poison. The vital atmosphere

[31] Julian Moynahan, "Lady Chatterley's Lover: The Deed of Life," English Literary History, XXVI (March, 1959), 77.

[32] Quoted in G. A. Panichas, Adventure in Consciousness (London: Folcroft, 1964), 65.

> of the country is poisonous to an incredible degree: to me at least. I shall die in the fumes of stench. But I _must_ get out."[33]

During World War I, Lawrence and his wife were publicly scorned for their strong anti-war sentiments, and they did leave England in order to save their beings.

War according to Lawrence is man's direct encounter with his own desire to brush with death and beat it. As stated in his famous essay on the nature of war, "The Crown," "as far as there is any passion in the war, it is a passion for the embrace with death. The desire to deal death and to take death."[34] Man has come to find this absurd meaning in death because he no longer values life. As Lawrence says in his "Study of Thomas Hardy," men are afraid to lose themselves to living and choose instead the easier way, death: "to live, we are afraid to risk ourselves. We can only die" (407). The basis of Lawrence's hope for this century's survival is in man's rebirth in being: "life shall sprout up again strong after this winter of cowardice and well-being, sprout into the unknown."[35]

Lawrence describes in his essay, "The Crown," basically two types of human beings who fight wars. The first is that man who is isolated from himself and others by his own too strong ego and for whom war only brings further disintegration. If he happens to

[33]Quoted passage from Mark Schorer, "D. H. Lawrence and 'The Spirit of Place,'" in _D. H. Lawrence Miscellany_, 283.

[34]_Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine_ (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963), 70. All further references to this edition will be hereafter cited parenthetically in the text.

[35]"Study of Thomas Hardy," _Phoenix_, 408.

be victorious, "his ego has only pulled itself in triumph out of the menace and the individual will go on more egoistic and barrenly complacent" (68). Two major figures who typify this class of men are Captain Hauptmann of "The Prussian Officer" and Anton Skrebensky in The Rainbow. The second type is the man who goes on living after his war experience for one of two basic reasons. First, if he is a man who enters war with a soul alive with passion, even if for death, war may

> reduce his soul to its elements, set it free and child-like, and break-down that egoistic entity which has developed upon it from the past. The near touch of death may be a release into life; if only it will break the egoistic will, and release that other flow (68).

Thus man, freed from his too strong ego by war, may live on in true fulness of being. The second way he may survive is if he feels he has been saved by some "unseen goodness. . . . this man will go on in life unimprisoned, the channels of his heart open, and passion still flowing through him" (68). Somewhat representative of the man who survives the war still a human being are Count Johann Dionyss Psanek, one of the major figures of The Ladybird, and Oliver Mellors in Lady Chatterley's Lover.

In both stories, "The Prussian Officer" and The Ladybird, Lawrence portrays two pairs of men who are the direct antithesis of each other. Of the four, only one is a successful individual, the Count. The other three are all destroyed by their own inferior beings, others, and the forces of war acting on their psyches. Isolation-integration again forms a unifying motif throughout these two works since the unsuccessful characters stand separated from themselves and others, and the Count succeeds due to his

ability to reach out to others and to realize his own true life force. An analysis of these characters will form a good introduction to the more fully developed characters of Lawrence's novels.

The setting of "The Prussian Officer" is that of a "modern machine society"[36] torn by war. The character for whom the story is named is the extreme example of the type of man who thrives on military life because of his own domineering ego. As G. A. Panichas describes him,

> The middle-aged Prussian officer, Captain Hauptmann, symbolizes the forces of negation and the denial of life. That he is an officer is perhaps indicative of the unreasonable authority that is invested in a typical victimizer--of the kind . . . that was for many years a dictating force in German life and in the realpolitik of "German militarist bullies," as Lawrence once described them. His penetrating description of this officer is, more than that, a description of an entire way of life, of an ascendant, passionless authoritarianism that lives and thrives by the sheer assertion of "insistent will" and idea, of unquestioned command and brute power . . . (76).

Lawrence describes him as a man "who had always kept himself suppressed. . . . He knew himself to be always on the point of breaking out. But he kept himself hard to the idea of the Service" (I, 98). Thus, the military life serves as a complementary outlet for his suppressed nature, for in the "Service" he can act as the war machine he truly is.

Schoener, the officer's orderly, is his complete antithesis, for Schoener "represents the innocence of healthy instinct that is imminent in life."[37] The Captain is suppressed in his being

[36]Panichas, 76.

[37]Ibid.

due to the forces of his overwhelming ego and self-consciousness. The orderly is a free-moving individual, so unusual in appearance and movement that the officer is both fascinated and repelled by him:

> There was something so free and self-contained about him . . . that made the officer aware of him. . . . To see the soldier's young, brown, shapely peasant's hand grasp the loaf or the wine-bottle sent a flash of hate or of anger through the elder man's blood. It was not that the youth was clumsy: it was rather the blind, instinctive sureness of movement of an unhampered young animal that irritated the officer to such a degree (97).

The suppressed being of the officer strongly envies and both hates and loves the orderly for his "warm, full nature" (98).

The captain forever battles with himself to control his own thinking, the reality of his situation, and war offers for him the perfect distraction. War does not need thinking men but efficient machines. The captain's only reason for living is to perpetuate his own self-control to prevent what he always fears, a nervous breakdown. A nervous breakdown is what he really needs since from it he could gain some sort of cleansing rebirth. He gains his pleasure sadistically enough by physically torturing the body of the orderly, indicative of his own thwarted homosexual tendencies. The orderly's main objective during his fierce encounter with war in the person of the Prussian officer is to "save himself" (105). His killing of the officer symbolizes the orderly's need to rid himself of the evil as represented by the officer, before Hauptmann completely destroys him. Thus, the officer dies an incomplete man, one who never truly lived due to his suppressed being and the conditions of war.

After killing his enemy, Schoener feels cut off from the rest of the Army and free to go "out from everyday life into the unknown and he could not, he even did not want to go back" (111). He rides into the woods, the archetypal symbol of the unknown, and goes "beyond himself. He had never been there before" (113). But he is not a complete man--he never has been fully able to realize himself, cut off in youth by the agonies of war and the cruel treatment of the Prussian officer.[38] While the reader sympathizes with the feelings of the orderly, and despises the officer, neither men are whole individuals. The officer is primarily destroyed by his own ego and the orderly by the conditions of war. As Lawrence states in "The Crown," one of the passions in war is the desire for "the embrace of death," and this is exactly what the orderly finally desires as the only escape from his wretched condition. While the Prussian officer clearly represents the type of non-individual whom Lawrence describes as being a "barren triumpher,"[39] the servant defies classification according to what is set up in "The Crown" as previously discussed. Schoener is neither the strong egoist nor the healthy individual who can survive war; he is too weak a man and too naive to cope with the cruelties of Captain Hauptmann and his environment: "He was so young, and had known so little trouble, that he was bewildered" (105). The final picture

[38]For an interesting study of how the officer and Schoener represent the psyche of one individual, see Ann Englander, "'The Prussian Officer': The Self Divided," Sewanee Review, LXXI (October-December 1963), 605-619.

[39]"The Crown," 87.

of the two dead bodies which "lay together, side-by-side" (110) in the mortuary represents Lawrence's full message on war. As G. A. Panichas conclusively states:

> In the end we, as we view the lifeless bodies of both men, we comprehend the full meaning of Lawrence's message. We also become aware of his prophetic vision of a disintegrating and effete world that would suffer the same fate as the Captain and his orderly, in a war that, needlessly sapping the human capacity for life, would bring nothing but human destruction and waste. . . . (78)

The war atmosphere of The Ladybird is also stiffling. The dreadful reality of World War I is dominant even in the world of Lady Beveridge and her daughter Daphne, two aristocrats living physically comfortable but mentally painful existences. The evocative first paragraph of the story presents the effects of war as the central focus of the tale:

> How many swords had Lady Beveridge in her pierced heart! Yet there always seemed room for another. Since she had determined that her heart of pity and kindness should never die. If it had not been for this determination she herself might have died of sheer agony, in the years 1916 and 1917, when her boys were killed, and her brother, and death seemed to be mowing with wide swaths through her family. . . .[40]

Another central theme of the tale, as pointed out by F. R. Leavis, is the problem of love--how men and women can practice love in the midst of "this malady of modern civilization."[41] There is a variety of love relations being revealed in the nouvelle, but still the fact of war affects the tone and action of the tale, and war

[40]Four Short Novels of D. H. Lawrence (New York: Viking Press, 1965), 41. All future references to The Ladybird will be to this edition.

[41]Leavis, 63.

makes a strong impact on each of the major characters' psyches.

At the outset of the story, Daphne and Lady Beveridge are presented as two aristocratic women whom the war has certainly touched--Lady Beveridge is determined to make the best of the situation by giving "'just a little bit of myself to help the others '" (41), as she tells Daphne. Daphne, more of a realist than her mother, feels helpless and when she sees the suffering around her, it makes her "'wish for the end of the world'" (49). Count Dionys, a Bohemian aristocrat and friend of Lady Beveridge, is visited by mother and daughter in a London Hospital. We first find him a despairing man due to his horrible war experiences: "'Why am I here? Why am I here? Why have I survived into this?'" (53) he beseeches Daphne. Basil, Daphne's soldier husband, returns from the war "like death; like risen death" (78). Only Daphne and Basil transcend by their dynamic living psyches the horrible conditions of a war society; Lady Beveridge and Basil, dead to any psychic forces, become completely destroyed in psychic power by the end of the tale.

Count Dionys stands as the antithesis to Basil. The Count is a man of "darkness" and growth, Basil is a man of lightness and sterility. Basil is revealed as a failure of a man in various ways. He comes back from war with death upon him and fails to inspire true love for himself in his wife. Love is mere "worship" (79) for him, and Daphne finds his devotion for her repugnant. It is not clear what exactly his war experiences were, but it is evident that war certainly had a negative effect on him. Basil

is one of those types of men whom war makes an egotist. Basil's evaluation of war is a very egotistical and idealistic one. The following conversation illustrates this quality:

> "Things have turned out for the best?" asked the Count, with an intonation of polite enquiry.
> "Yes. Just for me personally, I mean--to put it quite selfishly . . . And I feel it's been dreadful, but it's not been lost. It was like an ordeal one had to go through," said Basil.
> "You mean the war?"
> "The war and everything that went with it."
> "And when you've been through the ordeal?" . . .
> "Why, you arrive at a higher state of consciousness and therefore of life. And so, of course at a higher plane of love . . ." (84-85)

The perceptive Count merely mocks such an illogical attitude.

While war has made the Count all the more disgusted with the world of men, he grows in both physical and psychic strength throughout the tale. He becomes another ideal Lawrentian figure in his superior understanding of war, love, men and women--all life in general. His attitude toward war reflects Lawrence's personal sentiments. The Count claims that "we have all lost the war. . . . all Europe" (95) just as Lawrence saw no good in war. The Count's claim that Europe has committed suicide "morally" (96) echoes Lawrence's pure disgust with all war. Yet the Count rejuvenates his being, just as Lawrence did after World War I, and he brings new life to Daphne, his kindred soul of the darkness. The Count has grown in selfhood from the isolation of the hospital ward toward integration with his universe. He plans to leave England and return to Germany to become reunited with his family. In spite of the destruction which surrounds him, he will continue to flourish in his own unique being. On the occasion of their final

separation, he encourages Daphne to believe in him. "I shall be king in Hades when I am dead. And you will be at my side" (108). He utters a true Lawrentian statement to all: "A man can only be happy following his own inmost need" (109). As portrayed in the tale, Count Dionys is also a king among men on earth.

D. H. Lawrence's novels also contain various military figures, of lesser and greater importance to the overall development of the story. Gerald Crich, the "industrial magnate," is a former army officer. Arthur Morel, Paul's brother, enlists in the army, and his family is appalled. Clifford Chatterley becomes permanently disabled because of the Great War.

Anton Skrebensky, in The Rainbow, is as isolated as any of Lawrence's many characters. His isolation results from several causes, the primary one being that he does not care to know himself. The individual has no importance to him; in Lawrence's eyes, Skrebensky has no importance to anyone because of these views. He is a young subaltern whose relationship with Ursula Brangwen is a clarifying one for her. Because of his attitudes, she establishes hers more firmly and is nearer her own self-realization.

The military attitude to which Skrebensky adheres jolts Ursula's views. After a lengthy discussion about the nature of war, Ursula decides, "I hate soldiers, they are stiff and wooden." Skrebensky, a soldier, reacts to this, misunderstanding her objection to soldiers.

> "I would fight for the nation."
> "For all that, you aren't the nation. What would you do for yourself?"
> "I belong to the nation and must do my duty by the nation."

> "But when it didn't need your services in particular--when there is no fighting? What would you do then?"
> "Nothing. I would be in readiness for when I was needed."
> The answer came in exasperation.
> "It seems to me," she answered, "as if you weren't anybody--as if there weren't anybody there, where you are. Are you anybody, really? You seem like nothing to me" (293).

Skrebensky's attitude toward individuals is particularly utilitarian if one intends, in Lawrence's eyes, to further oneself as a human being, as a self-fulfilled individual, this attitude is blasphemous. Ursula reacts strongly to his attitude concerning the individual. Because he, as an individual, considers individuals to be nothing, then Ursula can only consider Skrebensky to be nothing. One cannot maintain an identity and "be in readiness." One can only be in readiness for oneself.

Skrebensky does not understand Ursula. He does not realize that his attitudes doom their relationship, for he does not understand the struggle for individuation under which Ursula lives. No chance exists for any long-lasting compatibility. These attitudes that Skrebensky subscribes to are only clarified by the war. When war is declared, Skrebensky devotes his energy to preparations he must make before leaving England for South Africa:

> He went about at his duties, giving himself up to them. At the bottom of his heart, his self, the soul that aspired and had true hope of self-effectuation lay as dead, still-born, a dead weight in his womb. (308)

A mistake is made not only by denying the importance of his own soul, which does have potential, but also by failing to realize the importance of Ursula's soul. If Skrebensky had attempted to understand Ursula's quest for self, perhaps he might have discovered his own self. But none of these possibilities occur. War

is declared and the rest, the individuals, are ignored.

In his essay, "The Crown," Lawrence feels that the men who emerge from a war victoriosly are those who enter with a soul vibrative with passion; these men are not afraid to lose themselves to living.[42] Skrebensky cannot emerge victoriously from a war because he has no soul, and Ursula recognizes his lack of soul. As Panichas outlines, Skrebensky

> personifies a devitalized spirit of life and lacks any positive understanding of the values of responsible participation in the changing rainbow of human relationships.[43]

Lady Chatterley's Lover contains another character who has experiences in the war. In the war, Mellors has worked his way up from an enlisted blacksmith to the cavalry in Egypt; when he leaves the army he is a lieutenant. He has always remained close to nature, even amidst the desolation of war. As Clifford Chatterley points out, Mellors "always was connected with horses, a clever fellow that way." He was in the army for some years, going to India with his colonel. Clifford tells Connie that "it isn't easy for a man like that to get back to his own level. He's bound to flounder." Clifford feels sure that Mellors is a misfit and has been ruined for any purpose in society because of the war. What Clifford does not realize is that Mellors leaves the army unscathed; it is Clifford who has been ruined because of the war. Mellors easily fits in with the environment, with the living homeland after his military experiences; Clifford does not. Mellors is the type

[42] Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine, 70.

[43] G. A. Panichas, 69.

of man who "will go on in life unimprisoned, the channels of his heart open. . . ."

After the war, Mellors helps to revitalize the land which has been desecrated. The woods around Wragby had once been full of pheasants; the pheasants had all been killed during the war. The gamekeeper will raise new pheasants to replenish the natural inhabitants of the woods. Even the woods themselves were decimated during the war:

> The whole knoll, which rose softly on the right of the riding, was denuded and strangely forlorn. On the crown of the knoll where the oaks had stood, now was bareness; and from there you could look out over the trees to the colliery railway, and the new works at Stacks Gate (43).

Mellors serves as guardian over the woods, over one of the few touches of humanity left in the mining area. Mellors is integrated with the living homeland; he aids in solving the problems confronting the environment by guarding over nature, by checking the onslaught of destruction.

Although Mellors remained in the army for a number of years, he objected strenuously to it. His objection is a simple one, "no, it was stupid, dead-handed higher authority that made the army dead: absolutely fool-dead. I like men and men like me. But I can't stand the twaddling bossy impudence of the people who run this world" (289). He recognizes the ludicrousness of the situation. Mellors is not the type of man, outlined by Lawrence in "The Crown," who emerges from military life with an enormous ego. Mellors is the type of character who will survive the war still a human being. He recognizes the right of the individual and the in-

justice of authority. Although Clifford mistakes his confidence in himself for arrogance, Mellors has a fullness of being. He knows the worth of the individual in the world and lives an integrated life as fully as he possibly can. Mellors does not do a great amount of good for a great number of people, but he does save one soul from oblivion. Because he lives a full life, because he saves Connie's soul, his life is worthwhile.

CHAPTER THREE

The Community of Man

"Men are free when they belong to a living, organic, believing community active in fulfilling some unfulfilled perhaps un-realized purpose,"[1] says Lawrence in his "Spirit of Place." Environment, as previously analyzed, plays an important role in the development of integration in the Lawrentian character. Besides the aspects of environment studied in Chapter Two, there remains to be considered the individual's very important social environment: the existence of others in relation to the individual. Lawrence places primary emphasis on the necessity for man to exist within a "living community" of men. In the essay, "We Need One Another," he constantly reiterates the fact stated in the title. People without each other are reduced "next to nothing": "this reducing of ourselves to our elemental selves, is the greatest fraud of all."[2] It brings man emptiness and makes people into egoists, Lawrence claims. Lawrence by no means denies the importance of individuality; in fact, to belong to no class and be a person unto oneself, he strongly advocates.[3] But, as he states,

> . . . we have our very individuality in relationships.

[1] Studies in Classic American Literature, 6.

[2] Phoenix, 189.

[3] Panichas, Adventure in Consciousness, 45.

> . . . It is in the living touch between us and other people, other lives, other phenomena, that we move and have our being. Strip us of our human contact and of our contact with the living earth and sun, and we are almost bladders of emptiness.[4]

Relationships with others are what give an individual his or her soul. As Lawrence says, a soul "is something that forms and fulfills itself in my contact. My living touch with people I have loved or hated or truly known."[5] So it is living in meaningful relation with others and the Cosmos that can bring the individual wholeness of being. This wholeness is what Lawrence feels twentieth century men and women lack; instead they are fragmented beings. A study of the various relations of Lawrence's fictional men and women in their various degrees of fulfillment will explicate Lawrence's statements on the twentieth century social milieu.

Three basic relations important in our study of the Laurentian individual's search for fulfillment are man to woman, man to man, and man to humanity. He places primary importance on the relation of man to woman: ". . . the relationship of man to woman is the central fact in actual human life."[6] Next in importance is the relation of man to man. Other relationships such as fatherhood, motherhood, sister, brother, friend "come a long way after."[7]

Before directly analyzing the fiction in regard to those who have achieved isolation and integration through man to woman rela-

[4]Phoenix, 190.

[5]Ibid., 192.

[6]Ibid., 193.

[7]Ibid.

tions, an explanation of terms is necessary. Especially important is the meaning of sex in Lawrentian terms. First, Lawrence makes it quite evident that sex must be "the whole of the relationship between man and woman."[8] He despises the crude, modern interpretation of sex; his is a reverent one "of which sex-desire is only one vivid, most vivid manifestation."[9] The sex relation "is far greater than we know,"[10] for it requires a greater respect of man for woman and woman for man. The relation can flow and develop without the sex-desire, for it involves appreciation of the whole being of a person. And most important, "it is necessary to have the contact alive and unfixed."[11] The relationship has to happen naturally, "almost unconsciously."[12] People who attempt to manipulate others or treat them "deliberately"[13] only turn themselves into isolated non-beings. In particular, the man must be rid of any concept of himself as a conquering hero. As Lawrence says, he is not a "soul isolated and alone in the universe, facing the unknown in the eternity of death."[14]

[8] Ibid., 194.

[9] Ibid., 195.

[10] Ibid., 194.

[11] Ibid., 191.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid., 192.

The woman exists equally with him. Lawrence's concept of sex is a very complex one, and a full analysis of the often subtle man to woman relations will further explicate it.

Most of Lawrence's fiction dwells on the various relations possible between men and women. One is the dead love between man and woman as in "The Primrose Path," "The Undertone," "The Shades of Spring," and between Gerald and Gudrun in _Women in Love_. Another is the vital, living relation between a man and woman moving toward a permanent union in marriage as in "The Horse-Dealer's Daughter," "In Love," _The Captain's Doll_, between Rupert and Ursula in _Women in Love_, and between Connie Chatterley and Oliver Mellors in _Lady Chatterley's Lover_. These works and others reflect Lawrence's perceptive insights into the reasons for failure and success between men and women in their diverse relations. Most of his unsuccessful characters fail to realize their potential fullness of being because they remain forever isolated to their own egos and cannot establish the human relationships all men and women need for self-fulfillment. Each character is unique in his or her particular situation, yet Lawrence establishes basic reasons for failure or success through the thematic import of the whole of his fiction. An analysis of a few outstanding works will delineate these reasons.

Lawrence first states in his article "We Need One Another," that a man-woman relationship has to be "alive and unfixed," as previously quoted, and that it has to happen unconsciously

or naturally. As he reiterates in another essay on love, "Nobody Loves Me," "The way to kill our feeling is to insist on it, harp on it, exaggerate it."[15] Feelings must be sincere and natural. If they are forced, they become artificial, for it is impossible to love one at all times, and, thus, if one tries, he or she will begin truly to hate the other person.

In the story, "New Eve and Old Adam," Lawrence portrays the failure of a married couple to love each other fully, primarily because they, among other reasons, expect love from each other, but neither is willing to give it freely. Their forced love soon serves to corrupt them and their marriage. They merely play a game at love by pretending to love, only to face up finally to their own disastrous relation. At the onset of their story, it is revealed that Pietro and his wife, Paula, have done nothing but fight the last three months of their one-year old marriage. Paula's lamentful cry is, "You don't love me. I pour myself out to you, and then--there's nothing there--you simply aren't there"(I, 77). In return he feels that there is "no core to the woman"(87) and finds it difficult to think of her as a "separate person from himself"(80). Yet neither is in the right; both are non-individuals who are dying to their real selves by suppressing the unconscious feeling deep within their psyches. The wife runs away to her symbolic Richard, no real person, as an escape from the intimacy which she fears

[15] Phoenix, 206.

with her husband. All the husband can do is retreat into his world of business.

In the final pages of Part II of the story, Lawrence summarizes the problem between them and so many people who cannot love. He describes the wife as a woman who wants "her life for herself" but by disengaging her husband's roots, would "live perfectly free of herself, and not at her source, be connected with anybody" (82). In her desire for isolation she will never fulfill herself, for as Lawrence reiterates in his essays on love, a person needs deep human relations to find self-fulfillment. Her husband's problem is a similar one. By suppressing his feelings and forcing life to follow his will or reason principle, he cuts off his real life principle or flow at the root.[16]

When at the end of story he receives Paula's impersonal invitation for him to return to her to "come to tea" (83), Pietro disappoints the reader by going. Although his feelings are ones of resistance, with his "consciousness he would go" (82). When he does return, she treats him as a mistress would treat a man, not as a wife would treat her husband. Both remain fragmented beings because of their failure to integrate their true, unconscious feelings into their daily living. Pietro has no individuality and his escape to find meaning only through his already dead relation with his wife or his

[16]In Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious, Chp. VI, "Human Relations and the Unconscious," Lawrence analyzes the problem of suppression of the unconscious.

business has failed. Paula is capable of loving and caring about only herself which corrupts her real life principle.

Another woman egoist is Hilda, the female figure of "The Shades of Spring." Hilda is a woman living in her own isolated dream world, cut off from any human contacts. The situation of the story parallels that of "A Modern Lover": an old lover retruns to his one time beloved only to discover that love never did and never could exist between them. Hilda is very womanly, but also very destructive in her selfish attempts to manipulate men's feelings towards her. In this sense Hilda is one of a long line of Lawrentian "magna maters"[17] who bring men destruction. Hilda's actions imply that she has no concern or need for others, quite contrary to Lawrentian philosophy. In the following words she states her feelings: "'The man doesn't matter so much . . . . It is one's self that matters'" (I, 205). Hilda is not willing to marry either the intellectual man, Syson, or the primitive "keeper" of the forest, for then the man would have to matter. This Siren-type woman wishes to perpetuate her "beautiful" but selfish dream world in which men fall at her feet in adoration. Hilda could never be worthy of a successful marriage because she could never give or herself and establish an intimate relation with a man.

Another love principle of Lawrence is that the individual cannot have "fixed ideas" about the other because "as a fixed object, even as an individuality or a personality, no human

[17]A term used by Lawrence in reference to the destructive woman, found in Apocalypse, 139.

being, man, or woman, amounts to much."[18] A prime example of a man who fails to love because of his fixed ideas of what his wife should be for him is the collier-husband in "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman." He makes his wife "desperate" to leave him because he fails to discern her true individuality. He only expects her to do her duty as a "housewife" (III, 622) and, thus, to please him. Through his own selfish desires he cuts off any love that may have developed between them. The collier is one of the mechanical, "automatic, static"[19] men who Lawrence despises. His industrial way of life has cut off his natural vitality, and he remains hopelessly dead to his true self and the possibilities of love.

Another character of Lawrence's fiction who fails to appreciate the individuality of a marriage partner is Lina M'Leod of "The Blue Moccasins." A woman of forty-five, she marries a young, innocent twenty-four year old clerk at her local bank, Percy Barlow, in an attempt to capture some moments of youthful passion she never experienced in her "manless" (III, 827) life. The fact that they are never truly married is indicated by all the "Miss M'Leod" references to the actual Mrs. Barlow. She succeeds at mesmerizing Mr. Barlow for a while with her rare, mature beauty till he is "like a man in a dream, or in a cloud . . . in his will, in body, he"

[18] "We Need One Another," 192.

[19] "Education of the People," Phoenix, 655.

(830-831) is asleep. She treats him as she would "a very perky red-brown Pomeranian dog that she had bought in the street, but which had turned out a good bank-manager" (831-832). It takes the real love of young, attractive Alice Howells to awaken Mr. Barlow, much to his wife's contempt for both of them. Alice presents a direct threat to "Miss M'Leod's" power over her husband, and the desolate wife loses her domineering position in the end. Miss M'Leod's position, symbolic of her empty, isolated existence, expresses her fear of facing the fact of her aging body. Mr. Barlow finally realizes her true nature after his awakening, as he exclaims to Alice,

> "That woman's never been real fond of anybody or anything, all her life--she couldn't, for all her show of kindness. She's limited to herself, that woman is, and I've looked up to her as if she was God. More fool me!" (842)

He is now wise enough to see this woman for the parasite she is, and he leaves her dominance for the "open, dark doorway" (842) to Alice. It is implied that with Alice he may develop the human feelings which marriage should bring.

Two more married couples dead to each other and themselves are Mr. and Mrs. Sutton of "The Primrose Path," and Mr. and Mrs. Renshaw of "The Overtone." The relation between the Suttons is a much more violently negative one; the Renshaws are more domesticated and sophisticated in their actions. But both relationships fail due to similar problems--each individual is afraid of him or herself and unable to establish any meaningful relations with others. Their relations are not

"alive and unfixed" but rather dead and static. Lawrence warns men not to"marry the woman and have done with it"[20] which is the exact attitude of Mr. Sutton.

One of the most demonic and egotistical of Lawrence's male figures is Mr. Sutton. He expects life to unfold for his own satisfaction without any giving of himself on his part. He bullies women and sees in his wife only "something impersonal, the female, not the woman" (II, 438). Their deadly passions are too self-centered and bring no satisfaction or peace of soul to either husband or wife. His wife realizes this: "She was playing with passion, afraid of it, and really wretched because it left her, the person, out of count (439). The husband also feels no real person in himself, for he is "afraid, quite stupefied with fear, fear of life, of death, of himself" (431). In this quite powerful short story, Lawrence forcibly demonstrates how selfish passion can pervert and poison those who feel it. Mr. and Mrs. Sutton will never be happy or content till they become confident in their own beings and no longer fear each other. Sex, as Lawrence states, involves "the whole of the relationship between man and woman," and when it is merely grounded in passion, as it is for the Suttons, it becomes perverted along with its possessors.

Mr. and Mrs. Renshaw feel passion at times for each other, but they fail to communicate it. The husband has never fully

[20]"We Need One Another," 191.

recovered from his wife's refusal to make love with him at one important time for him early in their marriage. Now in his early fifties, he has always sensed her feeling of repugnance towards him. They do not communicate well in any important way--physically, spiritually, or any other equally subtle way. Like the Suttons, they are afraid of each other.

Beautiful sun and moon imagery is used to enhance the theme of forlorn love.[21] In the crucial scene six months after their marriage, Lawrence uses moon imagery to express the husband's passion for his wife:

> And he watched the moon, and he watched her light on his hands. It was like a butterfly on his glove, that he could see, but not feel. And he wanted to unglove himself. Quite clear, quite, quite bare to the moon, the touch of everything he wanted to be. And after all, his wife was everything--moon, vapour of trees, trickling water and drift of perfume--it was all his wife (III, 750).

The sun imagery in the following lamentation enhances the wife's sense of forlornness:

> He has never bared the sun of himself to her--a sullen day he had been on her heart, covered with cloud impenetrable . . . . He could never let the real rays of his love through the cloud of fear and mistrust (753).

They both fail to establish what Lawrence terms "dynamic polarity" or "a circuit of force always flowing."[22] Their life flows never meet, and they remain isolated, unfulfilled non-individuals to themselves and each other.

[21]Lawrence discusses the symbolic meaning of the sun (the male principle) and the moon (the female principle) in Apocalypse, 43.

[22]Fantasia of the Unconscious, 140.

Love Among the Haystacks, one of Lawrence's less analyzed nouvelles, serves as an excellent transition between the short stories which demonstrate failure in love and those which show success. The opposing love relationships of two brothers and their women form the dramatic movement of the story. The nouvelle holds an interesting, ironic twist, for the couple who apparently start off well fail, and the one who do not immediately "fall in love" establish a true man-woman relation. Through the romantic event of their story, Lawrence echoes his basic thoughts on love between men and women, particularly the idea that sexual passion is only one aspect of love, and appreciation of a person's full individuality is more important.

At the beginning of the story, we learn that both brothers are "fiercely shy of women"[23] so that their future experiences will be initiatory ones. The older brother, Geoffrey, is not as "careless and debonair" (3) as his brother Maurice and he lacks self-confidence. Geoffrey's experiences, his growth into fullness of being, form the major positive theme of the work. At the beginning he is in danger of "sinking into a morbid state, from sheer lack of living or interest" (7). Maurice immediately initiates a deeply passionate relationship with Paula, a vigorous, young, flirtatious Polish girl. Lawrence has the reader believing that Maurice will surpass his brother who has no woman with whom to associate. About half-way through the tale, Geoffrey encounters a young, vagabond-type woman,

[23] _Four Short Novels of D. H. Lawrence_, 5. All following references to this edition are hereafter cited parenthetically in the text.

with whom he feels immediate "kinship" (19). They understand each other and thus Geoffrey's sexual relationship is a much deeper, more satisfying one than Maurice and Paula's purely sensual one. The latter's relationship is described in merely sexual terms, while Geoffrey's is described in much broader terms, although sexual desire is part of it. His desire for her involves a need to complete his own being: "With her to complete him, to form the core of him, he was firm and whole. Needing her so much, he loved her fervently" (34). Lydia's influence helps cure Geoffrey of his lack of self-confidence, and her decision to live on with him in the permanent bond of marriage brings him closer to fulfillment. Lawrence reaffirms the value of marriage through the ideal development of Geoffrey's character in relation to Lydia.

Paula, one of the many destructive Lawrentian woman, does not enhance Maurice's being; in fact, at times she treats him with contempt in her usual, coy, flirting way. By the end of the nouvelle, the brothers and their women present a sharp contrast. Effective eye imagery is employed to demonstrate the differences in the way each couple communicates or fails to do so: "Paula watched eagerly for the eyes of Maurice, and he avoided her . . . . And Geoffrey smiled constantly to Lydia, who watched gravely" (39). It is further implied at the very end that Geoffrey and Lydia keep "faith one with the other" (39), while Maurice and Paula are too flighty and immature to develop any lasting, deep relationship. Although they marry, this is no guarantee that they will truly love each other.

Theirs is a mere sexual arrangement which will soon grow stale for both.

Many characters in Lawrence's short fiction, like Geoffrey and Lydia, find self-fulfillment in various ways and to various degrees. Of the short fiction, "The Thorn in the Flesh," "The Horse-Dealer's Daughter's Daughter," "White Stockings," "In Love," The Fox, and The Captain's Doll demonstrate various types of successful men-women relations. What Lawrence philosophizes on love in Fantasia of the Unconscious, Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious, "We Need One Another," and "Study of Thomas Hardy," in particular, will be related to the thematic import of these works. The Captain's Doll will be further analyzed for what it says about man's relation to other men.

One striking short story, "The Horse-Dealer's Daughter," treats a major theme of Lawrence's fiction: how love can bring rebirth to those who participate rightly in it. The relation between Mabel and Dr. Ferguson is like an ebbing flow of water, representing a "coming together" and a "going asunder."[24] This tale exemplifies well the idea of separateness in union, "the very foundation of Lawrence's relationships, and this inherent tension of attraction-repulsion"[25] establishes the basis for their union. This tension reveals the psychic experiences of the characters in the story who act in love.

One of the basic rhythms of the work is the struggle between

[24]Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious, 22.

[25]Thomas H. McCabe, "Rhythm as Form in Lawrence: 'The Horse-Dealer's Daughter,'" PMLA, V. 87, N. 1 (January 1972), 65.

thanatos and eros as defined by the characters of Mabel and Dr. Ferguson. Mabel lives in a very death-like atmosphere, alone with her three desolate brothers who "have no inner freedom" (II, 441) themselves. Mabel is a mere shell of a human being unconsciously approaching her perverse death-fulfillment:

> She thought of nobody, not even of herself. Mindless and persistent, she seemed in a sort of ecstasy to be coming nearer to her fulfillment, her own glorification, approaching her dead mother, who was glorified (447).

The only place she feels secure is at her mother's graveside where "she feels in immediate contact with the world of her mother" (448). Dr. Ferguson is mesmerized by the sight of her in the cemetery, and he feels strongly attracted to her, much against his own will. He saves her life in two ways: first physically, by dragging her out of the suicidal pond, and then spiritually, by awakening her to her feelings and own real self. She, too, brings him new life: "his life came back to him, dark and unknowing but strong again" (457). The love process is a very unconscious one, as Lawrence repeatedly advocates. In fact, Dr. Ferguson "had never intended to love her" (453), but after experiencing the dramatic sensation of physical passion and touch, he feels that he loves her. This he confesses naturally to her.

The love between them is a whole love, the closest to perfection in Lawrentian terms. In the essay "Love," Lawrence distinguishes three types of love. First is the incomplete,

"profane love" which "seeks its own" end. Second, is "sacred love" which is "selfless, seeking not its own" end. Third is "whole" and "dual" love which exists between men and women when their relation "is the melting into pure communion, and it is the friction of sheer sensuality, both."[26] Ferguson and Mabel experience this third type, closest to perfect love, since they feel both strong, frictional sensations and a communion.

Ferguson wishes to make permanent their relation by marrying Mabel. Thomas H. McCabe summarizes decisively the movement of the story in the following:

> The rhythmic movement of this story is double. The long rhythm of the story line is progressive, moving forward into closer and closer relationship. But a dynamic to-and-fro rhythm, defining the struggle between death and life, will and desire, man and woman, pulses within that larger rhythm. The action swings from the world of death to life, from the world of the daily self controlled by desire, and climaxes in an ever-adjusting balance between the worlds of the lovers, each separate and other, who touch and draw apart.[27]

Their relation stresses the importance of individuality even in the communion of love and the permanent union of marriage, which they both want. As Lawrence states in Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious:

> The goal [of love] is the perfecting of each single individuality, unique in itself--which cannot take place without a perfected harmony between the beloved, a harmony which depends on the harmony between the at-last-clarified singleness of each being, a singleness

[26]Phoenix, 153-154.

[27]"Rhythm as Form...," 68.

> equilibrized, polarized in one by the counter-posing singleness of the other.[28]

Another exemplary love story of sorts is "The Thorn in the Flesh" which presents another figure in movement from thanatos to eros. The hero, Bachmann, is a young army recruit who, due to his war experiences, feels close to death. Because of his unique and admirable ability to act on his unconscious, he transcends the cruel, "false authority"[29] of army existence and becomes free to fulfill himself to some degree. He leaves the army to travel into the "unknown" (I, 125) in more than one way. He travels into a new country, a new way of life, and he experiences a new self. In particular, he meets an uncommon girl, Emilie, an ideal Lawrentian woman whose senses are deeply refined. "Her desire was to serve" (127); to serve some gentleman who "had some mystic quality that left her free and proud in service" (127). The strongly egoistic, impure sex of the ordinary soldiers repels her. Theirs is the purely "profane love" as previously defined. With Bachmann she experiences "whole love"--a "pure communion" and "friction of sheer sensuality." Again we have true lovers who move unconsciously towards each other. She is made strong and he is "restored and completed, closer to her" (130). The experience of coitus, as Lawrence exclaims, brings new life to humans and gives them the ability to go on living.[30] Emilie helps Bachmann be himself

[28] Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious, 22.

[29] Kingsley Widmer, The Art of Perversity: D. H. Lawrence's Shorter Fiction (Seattle: University of Washington, 1962), 134.

[30] In Fantasia of the Unconscious, 141, Lawrence discusses the psychological benefits of sexual relations.

and all he desires is to "move and to be, in her, with her" (133). Their story does not end with a promise of marriage due to their unfortunate circumstances. Still, his experience with Emilie has brought him to his true self, and even while surrendering to the cruel army machinery, he remains "true to himself" (134).

One interesting, unsentimental look at what love can be for a man and woman is presented in the clever story "In Love." Hester, a prudish woman of twenty-five, is repulsed by the idea of being "stroked and cuddled" (II, 658) by any man, even her gentle fiancé, Joe. Joe is a charming, simple man who, regretfully enough, tries a "silly love-making game on her" (659), only to be reprimanded by his puritanical fiancée. Hester accuses him of playing a Rudolph Valentino role and he humbly admits his guilt. His repentence of his "betrayal of their simple intimacy" (659) opens up a new relation for Hester and himself. Hester for the first time sees Joe's "honest desire" (659). For the first time she feels "herself responding to him" (659), for she sees him in his true nature. The last line of the story expresses her transformation: "I don't mind what you do, if you love me <u>really</u>" (660).

The necessity for love to be a natural, unforced process is uppermost in Lawrence's love ethic. As soon as Joe drops his "role," he is susceptible to being loved, and Hester is willing to let him love her. The true appreciation of each other's being comes before any sexual desire can be successful.

This simple tale tells a real love story.

"White Stocking" is a completely different tale of marital relations. Leavis terms it "more remarkable than at first sight, perhaps, it is recognized to be,[31] for its interesting and believable portrayal of a somewhat common marriage. It is chosen for this analysis because it is one of the few short stories which reveals an important but often slighted principle of Lawrentian love--that a man and woman, particularly in marriage, must accept change in each other. As Lawrence states in his informal, sincere way,

> The long course of marriage is a long event of perpetual change, in which a man and a woman mutually build up their souls and make themselves whole. It is like rivers flowing on, through new country, always unknown . . . . With every change, a new being emerges, a new rhythm establishes itself; we renew our life as we grow older and there is real peace. Why, oh, why do we want one another to be always the same, fixed, like a menu-card that is never changed? Sex is a changing thing, now alive, now quiescent, now fiery, now apparently quite gone, quite gone. But the ordinary man and woman haven't the gumption to take it in all its changes.[32]

Whiston, the heroic husband-figure of the tale, can "take it in all its changes," and so can his wife.

At the outset of the story, Whiston is presented as a man deeply devoted to his wife for the "light and warmth" (II, 244) she gives him. Mrs. Whiston returns his love--she loves the little, domestic things about him, like the way in which he

[31]Leavis, 258.

[32]"We Need One Another," 193-194.

stands washing himself. Their relation from the start is described as one based on sureness and permanence, something which Lawrence admires in marriage. As he says in "Study of Thomas Hardy," "Every man seeks in woman that which is stable, eternal."[33] He further implies that the woman seeks the same qualities in the man.

Yet theirs is also a tense relation. Whiston, while at work in the day, is "anxious for her, yearning for surety, and kept tense by not getting it" (200). Mrs. Whiston gravely depresses her husband because of her affair with the flamboyant Sam Adams, but she has sense enough to return to her husband and he has sense enough to accept her. He unconsciously strikes her a physical blow, but it is a "humanizing"[34] one, as Leavis describes it. In the end, he accepts her back into his life and exemplifies an admirable humanistic attitude toward marriage. This story reaffirms Lawrence's belief in the value of acceptance of one another in marriage.

One of the most complex Lawrentian man-woman relations is that of March and Henry of The Fox. This story is unique in that the ending does not reveal characters existing in fullness of integration, but they are on the road to fullness of being. It, too, extols the value of marriage. As Leavis comments, "It is a study of human mating; of the attraction

[33] Phoenix, 445.
[34] DHL: Novelist, 258.

between a man and a woman that expresses the profound needs of each and has its meaning in a permanent union."[35] Important related themes to be analyzed are the unconscious nature of love; the love-wrath tension between man and woman; the mysterious nature of love; the growth it can bring an individual.

The nouvelle as a whole is structured around the movement of both March and Henry into deeper self-awareness. March is first portrayed living with her forlorn girlfriend, Banford, an empty existence on a lonely, small, unsuccessful farm. Their failure to make a success of the farm symbolizes their failure to live full existences. Symbolic of their fear of men is their fear for the "demon"[36] fox, and when Henry intrudes upon their isolation, March feels that he is the fox. In one encounter with the real fox, March feels that the fox knows her and she acts "spellbound" (117). The fox possesses her every unconscious thought: "He [the fox] had beome a settled effect in her spirit, a state permanently established, not continuous, but always recurring" (118). This fear of the fox represents her own basic insecurity and weakness of spirit. It is thus understandable how easily Henry can possess her thoughts, too, since to March, he is the fox. Henry both calms and distresses March:

> She became almost peaceful at last. He was identified with the fox--and he was here in full presence. She

[35] Ibid., 272.

[36] Four Short Novels of D.H. Lawrence, 115. All following references to this edition will hereafter be cited parenthetically in the text.

> need not go after him anymore. There in the shadow of her corner she gave herself up to a warm, relaxed peace, almost like sleep, accepting the spell that was on her. But she wished to remain hidden. She was only at full peace whilst he forgot her, talking to Banford (124-125).

She fears the thought that Henry knows her in her weaknesses as the fox does.

Henry's attitude toward March defies any typical love feeling. She both piques and excites him in her strange, almost manly appearance. But the strong mysterious attraction is there, and Henry finally succeeds in capturing her, only after literally killing Banford. March's prophetic dream of Banford's death symbolizes March's unconscious desire to be rid of the detrimental tie Banford has on her. By the end of the story, March and Henry are free to start life anew in Canada.

The essential mystery and darkness surrounding March and Henry's relation, which dominates the tone of the story, strengthens their relation and draws them closer together. One can sense the deep reverence Lawrence holds for sex and the man-woman relationship, particularly in this tale. Lawrence conveys the many conflicting emotions men and woman can experience in the way Henry and March are both repelled and attracted to each other. But Lawrence strongly advocates polarity in marriage to keep it alive and vital:

> The sweet comingling, the sharp clash of opposition. And no possibility of creative development without this polarity, this dual circuit of direct, spontaneous interchange. No hope of life apart from this. The primal unconscious pulsing in its circuit between two beings: love and wrath, cleaving and

repulsion, inglutination and excrementation.[37]

Their final union in marriage and Henry's hope for a new life with March in Canada reflect Lawrence's respect for the institution of marriage. Henry becomes the protector, the leader, in the marriage partnership, something which Lawrence advises men to become.[38] In union with Henry, March is free to become her true self.

Their marriage and the movement west, representing the death of the old self, hold the possibility for a new integration into wholeness. This will replace their previous isolated states. March will hopefully become the woman she is now free to be, and Henry can find his selfhood through his relation with his wife. Each in union with the other can still retain his or her identity: "He would have all his own life as a young man and a male, and she would have all her own life as a woman and a female" (179).

In Lawrence's major novels the relationship between a man and a woman is also developed. He explores the factors that can destroy or nurture a relationship, as seen in the relationships between Rupert Birkin and Ursula Brangwen, between Gerald Crich and Gudrun Brangwen in _Women in Love_. "'I do think,' he said, 'that the world is only held together by the mystic conjunction, the ultimate unison between people--a

[37] _Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious_, 24.

[38] "Education of the People," in _Phoenix_, 665.

bond. And the immediate bond is between man and woman.'"[39] These words, uttered by Rupert Birkin outline one of Lawrence's major philosophies. Man cannot exist alone in the universe; man alone is a cypher. For a man to amount to something in this world, he must establish a lasting and meaningful relationship with a woman. The pressures of modern society take a large toll from mankind; only a strong relationship can help balance the tension.

Rupert Birkin, Lawrence's most articulate spokesman, sets up definite conditions and requirements for the relationship between a man and a woman. To this relationship, love is an important part, though not the most important factor. In trying to sort out his relationship with Ursula Brangwen, he tells her:

> "I don't believe in love at all--that is, any more than I believe in hate, or in grief. Love is one of the emotions like all the others--and so it is all right whilst you feel it. But I can't see how it becomes an absolute. It is just part of human relationships, no more . . . . Love isn't a desideratum--it is an emotion you feel or don't feel, according to circumstance" (121).

Birkin's definition of love reflects his overall concept of relationships, between men and women and between men and men. What Birkin wants from any sort of relationship transcends love. Love alone in a relationship may serve, in time, as a restrictive, not as a liberating force. But in a relationship that is founded on something bigger than love, something more free than love, the individual may find his true being. In such a relation-

[39] D. H. Lawrence, Women in Love (New York: The Viking Press, 1960), 143. All further references will hereafter be cited in the text.

ship, the individual may become a fully integrated soul.

This beyond-love relationship serves as a developing agent for the individual. As Mark Spilka elucidates:

> Birkin calls it "star-equilibrium," and he sets it forth in opposition to Ursula's belief that love surpasses the individual, and to Hermione's belief in spiritual and abstract communion. Such forms of love involve the loss of self-hood; they depend on the ancient theory that men and women are but broken fragments of one whole, while Birkin insists that men and women have been singled out from an original mixture into pure individuality; accordingly, they must polarize rather than merge in love--hence, star-equilibrium.[40]

The individual takes precedence over love; the individual emerges complete only in a relationship based on the star-equilibrium. What Rupert demands from Ursula is a "strange conjunction" that is not a merging of individuals, "but an equilibrium, a pure balance of two single beings:--as the stars balance each other." To Lawrence, the individual is important to the community. In his Fantasia of the Unconscious, he states:

> Life is individual, always was individual and always will be. Life consists of living individuals, and always did so consist, in the beginning of everything. There never was any universe, any cosmos of which the first reality was anything but living, incorporate individuals (181).

Lawrence forever wants each individual to be important in the relationship, for this is the only way that the dreaded, destructive merger can be avoided. If one loses one's individuality in a relationship, one becomes isolated from the community of man. Birkin demands this sort of love from Ursula:

[40] The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence, 125-126.

> And he wanted to be with Ursula as free as with himself single and clear and cool yet balanced, polarised with her. The merging, the clutching, the mingling of love was become [sic] madly abhorrent to him (191).

Not only does Rupert have qualifications and restrictions for love, he also has definite opinions about the sort of relationship that surrounds this love. The sort of relationship that Birkin demands is what Lawrence feels will help man to become integrated with his "living, organic, believing community."[41] Rupert cannot bear hinderances in a relationship; a domineering lover would destroy the beauty of the polarization. Spontaneity, perhaps, is the key to Rupert's relationships, just as it is for the successful love relationships in the rest of Lawrence's fiction. Lawrence realizes that thinking about spontaneity ruins the entire idea, as developed in his essay "On Human Destiny":

> Nowadays we like to talk about spontaneity, spontaneous feeling, spontaneous passion, spontaneous emotion. But our very spontaneity is just an idea. All our modern spontaneity is fathered in the mind, gestated in self-consciousness.[42]

Birkin, unquestionably Lawrence's mouthpiece throughout the novel, attempts to explain to Ursula the importance of spontaneity to a fulfilling relationship:

> "There is," he said in a voice of pure observation, "a final me which is stark and impersonal and beyond responsibility. So there is a final you. And it is there I would want to meet you--not in the emotional, loving plane--but there beyond, where there is no speech and no terms of agreement . . . . And there

[41]"The Spirit of Place," 125-126.

[42]Phoenix II, eds. Warren Roberts and Harry T. Moore (New York: The Viking Press, 1970), 623.

> could be no obligation, because there is no standard for action there, because no understanding has been reaped from that plane. One can only follow the impulse taking that which lies in front and responsible for nothing, asked for nothing, giving nothing, only each taking according to the primal desire" (137-138).

Birkin has a great deal of difficulty in explaining his theory of a man-woman relationship to Ursula. Ursula denouces it as being selfish. It is selfish if one considers a high regard for the individual to be selfish. Birkin's quest for isolation of the individual within the boundaries of a relationship[43] is parallel to Ursula's quest for self in The Rainbow.

Prior to his relationship with Ursula Brangwen, Birkin has been involved with an upper-class intellectual, Hermione Roddice. Hermione constantly demands the mastery of the moment. For example, parties at Breadalby, her home, are full of impromptu dances and plays. After several spontaneous suggestions made by Hermione that everyone go for a walk and appreciate a field of daffodils, Birkin realizes that her pseudo-spontaneity is destroying him. He breaks off with her because of her actual lack of what she claims to possess--spontaneity. It is important to Birkin that Ursula understand the necessity of spontaneity.

The spontaneity must extend beyond one's relationship to one's life-style. In the chapter "A Chair," Ursula and Rupert purchase a rather fine old birch chair. After buying it, both decide that the small chair is actually a part of that which Birkin has always despised; that is, an attachment to material

[43]Mark Schorer, "Women in Love" in The Achievement of D.H. Lawrence, ed. F. Hoffman (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1953), 168.

objects which brings destruction to a relationship. Birkin tells Ursula, "You must leave your surroundings sketchy, unfinished, so that you are never curtailed, never confined, never dominated from the outside" (349). Ursula is gradually learning Birkin's theories, and both decide to give away the chair.

Despite Birkin's rather unconventional views about a spontaneous relationship, a spontaneous lifestyle, he actually has conventional views about marriage. Even though Birkin dislikes most social conventions, he is adamant about marriage for himself and Ursula. Birkin has discovered the secret of finding freedom within the boundaries of social convention.[44] To make the relationship meaningful, Birkin feels the relationship must be finalized:

> "If we are going to make a relationship, even of friendship, there must be something final and irrevocable about it" (136).

In Birkin's eyes, it is all a question of commitment, as he tells Ursula:

> One must commit oneself to a conjunction with the other--for ever. But it is not selfless--it is a maintaining of the self in mystic balance and integrity--like a star balanced with another star (144).

The result of Birkin's definite views is a vacillating relationship with Ursula. In the chapter "Mino" in which Rupert outlines his "freedom together" theory, their relationship reaches a peak of sorts. Even though Birkin has continuously stressed the idea of the man and woman being separate and equal

[44]W.R. Martin, "'Freedom Together' in D.H. Lawrence's Women in Love." English Studies in Africa, VIII (1965), 118.

in a relationship, Ursula's own preconceived notions about the same situation block her understanding:

> "Oh yes, Adam kept Eve in the indestructible paradise, when he kept her single with himself, like a star in its orbit."
>
> "Yes, yes--" cried Ursula, pointing her finger at him.
>
> "There you are--a star in its orbit! A satellite--a satellite of Mars--that's what she is to be! There--there--you've given yourself away! You want to be a satellite, Mars and his satellite. You've said it--you've said it--you've pushed yourself!"
>
> He stood smiling in frustration and amusement--irritation and admiration and love. She was so quick, and so lambent, like discernible fire and so vindicative, and so rich in her dangerous flamy sensitiveness (142).

Ursula refuses to believe that Rupert does not mean a satellite; it is she who insists he means that the woman's to be the dependent one.

Later in the chapter called "Excurse," Ursula eventually succumbs to Rupert's theories. Birkin gives Ursula three rings, an opal, a sapphire, and a topaz. Ursula is deliberately mean to Birkin by bringing Hermione Roddice's name into the conversation. She insists on talking about his past relationship; he would rather forget past encumbrances. A nasty fight ensues and Ursula flares into anger:

> "You!" she cried. "You! You fruit-lover! You purity-monger! It stinks, your truth and your purity. It stinks of the offal you feed on, you scavenger dog, you eater of corpses. You are foul, foul--and you must know it" (299).

She storms off, leaving him alone in the field to hunt for the rings which she has thrown at him. Suddenly, with no explanation from Ursula or from Lawrence, she returns bearing bell-heather for him. Her gift of flowers indicates that she has yielded

her definition of love for his.

Ursula is not the only one who vacillates between love and hate, between acceptance and rejection. Despite his absolutes of opinion, Birkin also feels extremes of emotion. In the chapter called "Moony," Lawrence draws a picture of conflict. Ursula has not yet decided to yield to Birkin's demands and is in a state of conflict over her decision. Birkin is in a similar situation; he is in conflict between desire and destructiveness.[45] Ursula comes upon Birkin one evening in the moonlight; he is standing by Willey Water, throwing "dead husks of flowers" at the water. As she watches, he throws stones at the reflection of the moon on the water.

> But at the centre, the heart of all, was still a vivid, incandescent quivering of a white moon not quite destroyed, a white body of fire writhing and striving and not even now broken open, not yet violeted. It seemed to be drawing itself together with strange, vioent pangs, in itself, the inviolable moon. And the rays were wakening in thin lines of light, to return to the strengthened moon, that shook upon the water in triumphant reassumption (239).

Birkin cannot destroy the moon's reflection, for the moon is inviolable. Birkin cannot destroy the moon which symbolizes woman, any more than he can exist without Ursula. He has been ill and in the south of France; while he was away, he was trying to decide whether or not he could live alone, live without Ursula. Birkin has come to realize that which Lawrence discusses in his essay "We Need One Another." Lawrence says,

> We all want to be absolute, and sufficient unto our-

[45]Mark Spilka, "Women in Love," 171.

> selves. And it is a great blow to our self-esteem that we simply <u>need</u> another human being. We don't mind airily picking and choosing among women--or among men, if we are a woman. But to have to come down to the nasty, sharp-pointed brass tack of admitting: My God, I can't live without that obstreperous woman of mine!--this is terribly humiliating to our isolated conceit.[46]

Birkin realizes that there is nothing he can do alone in the universe; even if he tries to destroy woman as seen in throwing stones at the moon's reflection in the water, he cannot destroy his need for another human being.

<u>Women in Love</u> also contains characters who become isolated within a man-woman relationship. Despite Rupert and Ursula's pyrotechnic fights, they essentially understand and love one another. The key to their outbursts of anger is that the hate is momentary, existing within a strong love relationship. Gerald Crich and Gudrun Brangwen also have a man-woman relationship, but there are no similarities between the two couples, for Gerald and Gudrun have a high destructive, negative relationship.

To begin with, Gerald Crich has a completely different attitude about a relationship. He has no list of rules and restrictions; what he does have is a view toward love that is static. He feels no need for a great union of individuals. Gerald negates Rupert's definition of love from the outset, for he denies any true individuality. As the great colliery owner, he has instituted such reforms that negate the importance or possibility of the individual. His new machines, as

[46]<u>Phoenix</u>, 188.

elucidated in the previous chapter, have taken the place of most of the miners. Gerald's abolishing of the butty system destroyed the intimate contact between the miners that made their work tolerable.

The negation of Rupert's definition of love is seen beyond the disregard of the individual. Gerald also places no importance on spontaneity. Rupert feels that spontaneity replenishes a relationship. Without this impulse, a relationship would possibly become an encumbrance, rather than a meaningful and joyous experience. In the chapter "Shortlands," Rupert is explaining to Gerald the need for spontaneous action:

> "I think it was perfect good form in Laura to bolt from Lupton to the church door. It was almost a masterpiece in good form. It's the hardest thing in the world to act spontaneously on one's impulses--and it's the only really gentlemanly thing to do--provided you're fit to do it."
>
> "You don't expect me to take you seriously, do you?" asked Gerald.
>
> "Yes, Gerald, you're one of the few people I do expect that of."
>
> "And I," said Gerald grimly, "shouldn't like to be in a world of people who acted individually and spontaneously, as you call it. We should have everybody cutting everybody else's throat in five minutes" (27).

Gerald does not understand the concept that Birkin espouses; he cannot, for he cannot understand the basic principle of the concept--the importance of the individual in an equal relationship.

Gerald's attitude toward a love relationship is clearly outlined from the very beginning. It is impossible for Gerald to have any sort of a relationship, because he is isolated from all human beings. He is first presented in the novel through Gudrun's eyes. "But about him also was the strange, guarded look, the unconscious

glisten, as if he did not belong to the same creation as the people about him. Gudrun lighted on him at once" (8). There is no real hope for him because he is utterly isolated; Gudrun recognizes this isolation and is attracted to him, not out of any longing to integrate Gerald with other humans, but because of a perverse fascination. She is immediately attracted to the helpless, hopeless outcasts; this later results in an attraction for Loerke, the homosexual industrial artist. The result of her fascination for Loerke is destruction for Gerald.

The spiritual need for a woman that virtually incapacitates Rupert is not felt by Gerald in the beginning. In the chapter "In the Train," Rupert outlines his need for a relationship, the importance of a relationship. Rupert tells him that he wants "the finality of love." Gerald cannot understand the finality or the love. He, in the beginning, can exist alone in the universe.

> "I don't believe a woman, and nothing but a woman, will ever make my life," said Gerald.
> "Not the centre and core of it--the love between you and a woman?" asked Birkin.
> Gerald's eyes narrowed with a queer dangerous smile as he watched the other man.
> "I never feel that way," he said (50).

A woman has no place in his world at this point. Gerald's attitude toward a relationship with a woman ultimately changes, for in his relationship with Gudrun, he is unable to exist without her. The change occurs slowly. What is important now is the industrial world, for Gerald is busily augmenting his prosperity through reforms in his pits. Even when Birkin insists that one should love a woman, "seeing there's no God," Gerald cannot respond

affirmatively. He believes in nothing, neither love nor God; Birkin, as a result, angrily denounces Gerald as "a born unbeliever."

Gerald's history with women can serve as a guide to his isolation. He disagrees with Birkin's definitions both in theory and practice. Disbelief in the equality of the individual manifests itself in Gerald's attitude and relationship with Minette, one of Lawrence's masterpieces of character. Minette is one of the characters at the bohemian cafe in London who speaks "with a slightly babyish pronunciation which was at once affected and true to her character. Her voice was dull and toneless." Gerald meets Minette and is attracted to her sexually, not intellectually. He is, perhaps, attracted to her because she is not his equal and is unlikely to endanger his superiority. From the beginning, Gerald realizes his potential power of dominion over her:

> He felt an awful, enjoyable power over her, an instinctive cherishing very near to cruelty. For she was a victim. He felt that she was in his power, and he was generous. The electricity was turgid and voluptuously rich, in his limbs. He would be able to destroy her utterly in the strength of his discharge (57-58).

Gerald is attracted to women unlike himself, unequal in character, women with whom there is no danger. He is reluctant to enter into any sort of a relationship wherein his isolating power is imperiled.

One cannot avoid making comparisons between Rupert and Ursula, and Gerald and Gudrun; one cannot avoid discussing Gerald and Gudrun in the terms established by Rupert's

relationship with Ursula. The relationship that exists between Gerald and Gudrun is an unusual one, certainly strange in comparison with Rupert and Ursula. As Eliseo Vivas points out:

> To call the relationship antagonistic is completely inadequate, since until the very end there is a kind of love between the two of them. But it would be no less inadequate to call it ambivalent....Gerald and Gudrun move towards one another in fulfillment, and the union is disastrous for Gerald, although they do not engage in the frightfully intense fights that Birkin and Ursula engage in.[47]

At Hermione Roddice's house, Breadalby, Gerald and Gudrun scrutinize one another for the first time. Despite his absolute statement concerning the lack of a need of a woman in his life, Gerald is captivated by Gudrun. As illustrated in his relationship with Minette in London, Gerald has never actually entered a relationship with a woman who is his equal. His meeting with Gudrun temporarily stuns him, for he has never before met any woman of her magnitude and strength. At one of Hermione's suffocating parties, Gudrun tells Gerald that she refused to swim because she disliked crowds, particularly bathers who resembled "saurians." The reaction by Gerald to this is favorable. For once in Gerald's life, it is conceivable that he could love a woman:

> Whether he would or not, she signified the real world to him. He wanted to come up to her standards, fulfill her expectations. He knew that her criterion was the only one that mattered. And Gerald could not help it, he was bound to strive to come up to her criterion, fulfill her idea of a man and a human being (95).

[47] _The Failure and the Triumph of Art_ (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1960), 246-247.

This is Gerald Crich, the great colliery owner, who recently told Rupert Birkin that no woman was important to him. Crich now places himself in the position of possible destruction by wanting to come up to Gudrun's standards. Later, Gudrun's attraction for Loerke destroys Crich.

The real beginning of Gerald and Gudrun's sexual relationship occurs in the chapter "Death and Love." Gerald's father dies a painful lingering death. His family is forced to wait, knowing that what will come is worse than waiting. During the waiting process, Gerald reaches out to Gudrun. "He seemed to balance her perfectly in opposition to himself, in their dual motion of walking. So, suddenly he was liberated and perfect, strong, heroic (321)." Frantically, Gerald is attempting to establish his own "star-equilibrium." But he cannot, for he does not understand the principles upon which such a relationship is founded. Gerald's life is really a death process which brings him ultimately to his death. Gerald is so isolated from the real meaning of a relationship between a man and a woman that his own relationship destroys rather than integrates him. His soul is isolated by death, instead of integrated and nurtured by love. During this death-in-life process, Gerald attempts the plunge into the salvation of love.[48] The night after the funeral, in an obviously symbolic movement, Gerald walks from Shortlands to the churchyard where his father has just been interred and is revolted by the coldness of the earth, by the rotting

[48] F. R. Leavis, D. H. Lawrence: Novelist, 172.

chrysanthemums and tuberoses on his father's grave. He walks blindly from this scene of death to Gudrun's house, where, after sneaking past the sleeping Brangwen family, he awakens Gudrun and makes love to her. Even in this moment of love, he tells her, "If there weren't you in the world, then I shouldn't be in the world, either" (336). This is hardly the same man who disbelieved in a love relationship.

From the beginning their relationship is built on sand, for Gudrun realizes the great distance between them. She knows that they will never accomplish Rupert's star-equilibrium. "They would never be together. Ah, this awful, inhuman distance which would always be interposed between her and the other being!" (339).

Their relationship is forever an incomplete one. Gerald, despite his mastery over his Arabian mare, over Winifred's rabbit, over the pond in which he swims, cannot master Gudrun. Their relationship can never serve as an integrating factor in their lives, for neither understands the other. Gerald never really communicates with Gudrun; he never talks with her as Rupert does with Ursula. Gerald's life is one that is moving rapidly toward destruction and his love for Gudrun Brangwen only hastens his demise. As Eliseo Vivas points out:

> Gerald is an industrialist moved by a strong will to power, a man whose world does not center. Having succeeded as a mine owner, he gets trapped in a love affair that kills him. And we are made to see, in terms of the relationship between him and Gudrun, why he had to die, and how he was spiritually dead before he died physically.[49]

[49] The Failure and Triumph of Art, 241.

The result of Gerald's relationship with Gudrun is his death. If one considers Rupert's formula for love, the perfect balance of equal individuals, as a formula for life, then Gerald is doomed. In a world torn apart by a corrupt civilization, man must integrate himself with another individual.[50] If one does not, if one cannot, one must die in isolation. Gerald cannot be balanced:

> But he would not make any pure relationship with any other soul. He could not. Marriage was not the commiting of himself into a relationship with Gudrun. It was a commiting of himself in acceptance of the established world, he would accept the established order, in which he did not willingly believe, and then he would retreat to the underworld for his life. This he would do (345).

Gerald's relationship with Gudrun withers his consciousness. The height of his desperation occurs in the Alps, when Gerald is fighting for his soul, which has lain dead too long to be revived. He realizes that his connection with Gudrun is destroying him, but he sees no alternative, for he can no longer stand alone.

> Gerald knows that to exist at all, he must be completely free of Gudrun; he must be self-sufficient as Gudrun is sufficient unto herself; he must leave her if she wants to be left. And yet he cannot leave her for he has nowhere else to go, nothing else to fall back on.[51]

He has become the victim of himself, as well as the victim of Gudrun. He becomes vitalized by his love for Gudrun, and, as

[50] As quoted by Raymond Williams, "The Social Thinking of D. H. Lawrence," in D. H. Lawrence Miscellany, 311.

[51] Yudhishtar, 197.

a result, he becomes dependent upon her as a life-giving force. If she leaves him, he can no longer exist. Instead of staying with Gerald, Gudrun chooses to go to Dresden with the rat-like Loerke, and Gerald is destroyed.[52]

His death is hardly a surprise, for in several episodes, it is foreshadowed. In the chapter "Water-Party," Gudrun and Gerald argue over her ritualistic dancing before the Highland cattle. Gudrun slaps Gerald in the face. His reaction to her blow is a curious one:

> "You have struck the first blow," he said at last, forcing the words from his lungs, in a voice so soft and low, it sounded like a dream within her, not spoken in the outer air.
> "And I shall strike the last," she retorted involuntarily, with confident assurance. He was silent, he did not contradict her (162).

Gerald cannot contradict her for she speaks the truth and Gerald already is aware of the hold she has on him. Gerald is doomed for death, doomed to be isolated in the terrible world that exists outside love, not only because of his connection with industrialism, not only because of his disastrous choice of Gudrun as his partner in their mock star-equilibrium, but also because of his total inability to understand the real need that human beings have for one another.

Pivotal to the relationship between a man and his community is the relationship between men. In Lawrence's brilliant defense, "A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover," he outlines the general

[52]For an excellent antithetical discussion of Gerald and Loerke, see W. R. Martin, "'Freedom Together' in D. H. Lawrence's Women in Love" in English Studies in Africa, VIII (1965), 111-120.

nature of male relationships:

> But relationship is threefold. First, there is the relation to the living universe. Then comes the relation of man to woman. Then comes the relation of man to man. And each is a blood-relationship, not mere spirit or mind.
>
> None, however, is quite so dead as the man-to-man relationship. I think, if we came to analyse to the last what men feel about one another today, we should find that every man feels every other man as a menace. It is a curious thing, but the more mental and ideal men are, the more they seem to feel the bodily presence of any other man a menace, a menace, as it were, to their very being. Every man that comes near me threatens my very existence: nay, more, my very being.
>
> This is the ugly fact which underlies our civilization.[53]

Because of this disastrous gap that has divided men, they are in danger of becoming far more isolated. Lawrence, in his theory of _Blutbruederschaft_ or blood brotherhood, attempts to heal the menacing feeling. A _Blutbruederschaft_ is one of the few ways that men can integrate their beings with the universe.

The _Blutbruederschaft_ proposed by Lawrence is carefully nonsexual. Understandably, Lawrence avoids any hint of a homosexual union, in the vulgar sense, for he was having considerable difficulty publishing his novels dealing with heterosexual love; if his novels were to be misinterpreted as being advocates of homosexual love, publication would be impossible. Publication, however, was not Lawrence's real concern in deliberately avoiding scandal. His theory of a true blood-brotherhood was on a different plane from that of heterosexual love, as seen in his _Fantasia of the Unconscious_:

[53]"A Propos of _Lady Chatterley's Lover_," Phoenix II, 512.

> Is this new polarity, this new circuit of passion between comrades and co-workers, is this also sexual? It is a vivid circuit of polarized passion. Is it hence sex?
>
> It is not. Knowing what sex is, can we call this other also sex? We cannot. . . .
>
> This meeting of many in one great passionate purpose is not sex and should never be confused with sex. It is a great motion in the opposite direction.[54]

For Lawrence, homosexual love and heterosexual love exist on different planes, the former transcending the latter.

The Blutbruederschaft espoused by Rupert Birkin in Women in Love differs from his star-equilibrium, his idea of a perfect relationship between men and women. In the star-equilibrium Birkin is careful to underline the idea of the separateness of the individuals. This separateness does not appear in his formula for male relationships.[55] His ideas tend to stress a mingling, a union between men, "an impersonal union that leaves one free" (199). His ideas concerning the star-equilibrium for heterosexual relationships stress a non-merger, a balance of two souls.

Besides being a union between men, Lawrence's idea for a brotherhood between men is a physical and mental concept. Critic Yudhishtar discusses this dual nature of male love:

> The only way of true relationships between men is for them to meet in some common belief: but Lawrence wished this belief could also be physical and not merely mental. He wanted the expansion of friendship and brotherhood into a full relationship where there could also be physical and passional meeting "on some third holy ground", as there used to be in the old dances and rituals in the old fights between men.[56]

[54] Fantasia of the Unconscious, 143.

[55] H. M. Daleski, The Forked Flame, 183.

[56] Conflict in the Novels of D. H. Lawrence, 39.

Lawrence's Blutbruederschaft theme takes root in Women in Love. A study of the relationship between Rupert Birkin and Gerald Crich can serve not only as a mirror to Lawrence's feelings, but also as an example of men who integrate with the community of man and of men who remain isolated from the community of man in spite of a proffered homosexual relationship.

Rupert Birkin strongly feels the frustration of life. He is initially frustrated because of Ursula's misunderstanding of his definition of love and the subsequent requirements of his love partner. Further frustration results when Ursula does understand his theory of heterosexual love but does not understand his need for a homosexual love. It is difficult to determine whether Rupert's need for a man results from the incompleteness of his relationship with Ursula, but nonetheless, Rupert is dissatisfied.[57]

Even though Rupert genuinely loves Ursula, he often feels confined within the restrictions imposed by her definitions of love. He needs more freedom than she, at first, is willing to give: "He wanted something clearer, more open, cooler, as it were. The hot narrow intimacy between man and wife was abhorrent" (191).

Rupert constantly bombards Gerald with his idea of a blood-brotherhood. When Gerald is despairing over his relationship, or lack of one, with Gudrun, Rupert reintroduces his obsession, as a panacea for Gerald's problems:

> "You've got to take down the love-and-marriage ideal from its pedestal. We want something broader.

[57]Eliseo Vivas, 265.

> I believe in the additional perfect relationship between man and man--additional to marriage."
>
> "I can never see how they can be the same," said Gerald.
>
> "Not the same--but equally important, equally creative, equally sacred, if you like."
>
> "I know," said Gerald, "you believe something like that. Only I can't feel it, you see." He put his hand on Birkin's arm, with a sort of deprecating affection (345).

What Rupert does not fully understand is that Gerald does need the kind of relationship he offers, but Gerald does not realize it. Gerald does not understand or realize many things.

On the whole, Gerald does not take Birkin's offer seriously. He does not realize that Birkin is the prophet, but instead considers Rupert and the majority of his viewpoints amusing:

> Gerald really loved Birkin, though he never quite believed in him. Birkin was too unreal;--clever, whimsical, wonderful, but not practical enough. Gerald felt that his own understanding was much sounder and safer. Birkin was delightful, a wonderful spirit, but after all, not to be counted as a man among men (193).

Gerald, the industrial magnate, could hardly be expected to take Birkin seriously. Gerald's main belief is a work ethic; he generally feels work to be the most important motivating force. Rupert's main belief is a love ethic; he feels human relationships to be more important than work. Later in the novel, he quits his job as a school superintendent in order to live more spontaneously with Ursula.

Gerald's main reaction to the idea of a Blutbruederschaft is one of fear and suspicion. He is afraid because he does not really understand Birkin, much less Birkin's ideas. Birkin beseeches Gerald to join in the union; he is practically frantic in his eagerness. Gerald rebuffs him in fear:

> Birkin sought hard to express himself. But Gerald hardly listened. His face shone with a certain luminous pleasure. He was pleased. But he kept his reserve. He held himself back.
>
> "Shall we swear to each other, one day?" asked Birkin, putting out his hand towards Gerald.
>
> Gerald touched the extended fine, living hand, as if withheld and afraid.
>
> "We'll leave it till I understand it better," he said in a voice of excuse (199).

Gerald is afraid because he is suspicious of the relationship that Birkin offers.[58] His suspicion arises because he cannot imagine that a relationship as close as a blood-brotherhood could possibly be non-personal. Birkin is espousing Lawrence's own desire for a non-personal relationship. He writes:

> I want some new non-personal activity, which is at the same time a genuine vital activity. And I want relations which are not purely personal, based on purely personal qualities; but relations based upon some unanimous accord in truth or belief, and a harmony of purpose, rather than of personality. I am weary of personality.[59]

Gerald's refusal to believe in the non-personal nature of the relationship indicates, perhaps, his real fear of the matter. The relationship comes too near an inner fear. ". . . it is Gerald's refusal rather than Birkin's offer of Blutbruederschaft which seems to betray hidden homosexual feelings; he cannot accept the bond because it comes too close to something he fears in himself."[60]

The result of Birkin's offering and of Gerald's refusal in the union is Gerald's death. This is not to say that solely be-

[58] Yudhishtar, 187.

[59] The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence, I, ed. Harry T. Moore (London: Heinemann, 1962), 395.

[60] G. B. Crump, "Women in Love: Novel and Film," D. H. Lawrence Review, 4, No. 1 (Spring 1971), 40.

cause of his refusal to participate in the <u>Blutbruederschaft</u> does Gerald die. However, his refusal is indicative of his general situation. Gerald is nearly totally isolated in the world; his relationships with women are frustrating and unfulfilling, and his relationships with men are superficial. He can commit himself to nothing but the mines, another source of destruction.

Birkin will always regret his not having achieved an impersonal relationship with Gerald. He will remain forever unfulfilled because of a lack of a genuine homosexual relationship and because of a lack of understanding within Ursula for such a feeling. The final lines of the book reveal this frustration:

> "Did you need Gerald?" she asked.
> "Yes," he said.
> "Aren't I enough for you?" she asked.
> "No," he said. "You are enough for me, as far as a woman is concerned. You are all women to me. But I wanted a man friend, as eternal as you and I are eternal."
> "Why aren't I enough?" she said. "You are enough for me. I don't want anybody else but you. Why isn't it the same with you?"
> "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 said.
> "I don't believe it," she said. "It's an obstinacy, a theory, a perversity."
> "Well--," he said.
> "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.
> "I don't believe that," he answered (472-473).

Rupert's quest for <u>Blutbruederschaft</u> is closely akin to Ursula's quest for self in <u>The Rainbow</u> only his is unsuccessful. The book ends on such a confused, tragic note because one feels there is no

hope for such a relationship.

One of the most ideal of Lawrence's male figures is Captain Hepburn, the hero of A Captain's Doll who makes a very full growth from isolation to integration. Hepburn's thoughts and feelings, like Birkin's, reflect the attitudes in a man which Lawrence admires. Hepburn's concern is not only for establishing organic, living relations with a woman but also with other men, a rarity among the male figures of Lawrence's fiction. Lawrence claims that the second most important relation for a man, next to the central man to woman relationship, is man to man.[61] He advocates a time for there to

> be again the old passion of deathless friendship between man and man. Humanity can never advance into the new regions of unexplored futurity otherwise. Men who can only hark back to woman become automatic, static.[62]

Marriage and "deathless friendship" can be complementary: "the one pivotal, the other adventurous: the one marriage, the center of human life; and the other, the leap ahead."[63] Hepburn is close to both healthy relations by the end of the nouvelle, and thus he transcends the position of most of the major male figures already analyzed. This tale, as Leavis comments, "expresses Lawrence's profoundest insights into relations between men and women, and his accompanying convictions about the nature of a valid marriage."[64]

[61]"We Need One Another," 193.

[62]"Education of the People," Phoenix, 665.

[63]Ibid.

[64]Leavis, 212.

The dramatic action of the story revolves around Hepburn's essential growth in character. At the beginning of the nouvelle, the Captain is a man in true isolation to himself and others. His marriage is a farce and his affair with the beautiful Hannele is a game. The Captain feels no self-knowledge and he does not know what he "is going to do"[65] in life. His wife and he exist in two separate spheres; he treats her as a mere object of adoration, and she manipulates him to her full advantage. Hannele feels "helpless" (191) in her mistress-like role for she feels "in love with the man" (191), but he does not respond to her with the same feeling. Hepburn's attitude toward life is very nihilistic--he goes so far to tell Hannele she means "nothing" (193) to him, and, concerning his own self he says, "I don't consider I count" (203). Hannele's whole concept of love has been destroyed by his peculiar attitude.

In his powerful "darkness" (266), symbolic of the unconscious forces of his psyche, he holds the potential for change and with the physical death of his wife comes his spiritual awakening to life. He retreats to his own personal desert, England, to be alone and establish his thoughts and desires. He comes away from England reborn in his desire to establish human relations. Lawrence generalizes his particular situation to include that of universal man.

> We must all be _able_ to be alone, otherwise we are just

[65] _Four Novels of D. H. Lawrence_, 191. All following references to this edition are cited in parentheses in the text.

> victims. But when we <u>are</u> able to be alone, then we realize that the only thing to do is to start a new relationship with another--or even the same--human being. That people should be stuck apart, like so many telegraph-poles, is nonsense (225).

The Captain still, though, retains "the temptation to be adored," but when he returns to Munich and sees his doeppleganger, the doll which Hannele made in his exact image, he sees what an adoring woman has done to him and could do to him again--make him into a doll. He still feels an unconscious attraction toward Hannele and returns to her, but not as an adoring lover. His proposal of marriage is very unique and one that frightens Hannele, for it challenges her conventional, "simple" (259) concept of love. Hepburn shocks her with this exclamation: "I don't want marriage on a basis of love" (262), the humiliating, submissive love he acted out for his first wife. The words "love" and "adoration" are synonymous for Hepburn: "A woman wants you to adore her, and be in love with her--and I shan't. . . . I feel I've been insulted for forty years: by love, and the women who've loved me. . . . I'll be honoured and I'll be obeyed: or nothing" (264). He proclaims to Hannele that he "shan't adore her or be in love with her"; she will be his wife and he "shall love and cherish her as such" (265), not as an object of adoration. As represented by Hannele's final action in the story, she finally sees the value of his fine interpretation of love. The wish to burn the picture of the "captain's doll" symbolizes her rejection of the adoration-love concept which turns people into dolls.

Hepburn has grown into a very positive notion of life, a

far cry from his early nihilism. Concerning his attitude toward marriage, as Leavis states,

> A man is a man and not a woman, and a woman is a woman and not a man: . . . Hepburn uses 'honour and obey' to point to the positive aspect of profound conviction to which experience has brought him--the conviction that he 'has always made a mistake, undertaking to love.' . . . A man's raison d'etre cannot be to adore a woman, or to make her, or anyone else, happy (an illusory aim); his meaning is not exhausted in the service of wife and children. And unless he is there, vindicated in his full meaning as a man, he is not there to establish with the woman the vital polarity without which there cannot be a lasting relation that doesn't thwart the life in either. It is for the man, Hepburn intimates, to vindicate himself as such by having, in the world, an impersonal, non-domestic purpose and activity. If he does not, whatever the woman may think she desires, she is let down; however adoring, he has failed her.[66]

The desire of Hepburn to go outside of marriage and join with men in some purposeful endeavor, "woman or no woman" (264), is what Lawrence terms man's "creative purpose." Lawrence speaks of it in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*:

> the desire of the human male to build a world: not 'to build a world for you, dear'; but to build up out of his own self and his own belief and his own effort something wonderful . . . This is the prime motivity.[67]

So while marriage may be "central" to man's existence, the "creative passion" offers "the leap ahead," as previously quoted, which Hepburn hopes to make by joining with his man-friend in Africa and building something out of their own intelligence. Hannele will find her fulfillment as wife, an attitude which the modern women's liberation movement would certainly abhor, but it is evi-

[66] Leavis, 231-232.

[67] *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 60.

dent in modern day living that some women do feel fulfilled through their marriage relation. Lawrence does not mean that the man should be superior; the woman is also an "independent force." In his "Study of Thomas Hardy," Lawrence describes what happens to the man who views himself as the "primary male"; he "dulls his senses and his sensibility, and makes him[self] mechanical, automatic."[68]

Lawrence places the ultimate importance on the ability of an individual to be in touch with all humanity. In one particular article, "Nobody Loves Me," he presents a perceptive summary statement on how individuals should relate to each other. For Lawrence, first of all, the words "society" and "mankind" are not synonymous; society is that artificial structure outside of the individual which attempts to tear down man's psyche. Lawrence's fictional heroes and heroines are constantly struggling with society with its industry, wars, class struggles, and other institutions which serve to depress man's spirit. But man need not be at war with his fellow men. As Lawrence so succinctly states,

> One may be at war with society and still keep one's deep peace with mankind. It is not pleasant to beat war with society, but sometimes it is the only way of preserving one's peace of soul, which is peace with the living, struggling, real mankind.[69]

Lawrence scorns the usually false, artificial sense of the conventional "love of humanity." For him it holds special meaning; he defines it as a "feeling of being at one with the struggling soul, or spirit, or whatever it is, of our fellow men."[70] Lawrence

[68]"Study of Thomas Hardy," 491.

[69]"Nobody Loves Me," Phoenix, 204.

[70]Ibid., 205.

strongly criticizes the modern men and women who are killing the sensitive responses in themselves by insisting on feeling: "The way to kill our feeling is to insist on it, harp on it; exaggerate it."[71] Society has helped the brutalizing process; especially in Lawrence's time did the "Great War" make hypocrites of the lovers of humanity.[72] Lawrence sees no real love of humanity in men and women of the modern world, and most of his fiction reflects this loss of feeling that individuals should have for humanity. From the early short story "England, My England" to the monumental Lady Chatterley's Lover, Lawrence portrays modern men and women's pathetic loss of a proper "love of humanity."

Of the short fiction, "Things," "England, My England," "The Princess," and "The Man Who Loved Island" are excellent renditions of man's failure to communicate with individuals and thus the whole of mankind. What Lawrence implies positively about the value of "love of humanity" renders an analysis of these works worthwhile. In the culminating chapter on the importance of religion in the development of proper integration of character, characters who reach the highest summit of fulfillment will be discussed. These same characters are the few who most successfully relate to the whole community of man.

One of Lawrence's most satirical and amusing short stories is "Things." It is both a comical presentation of two young idealists in their search for "freedom" (III, 844), and a biting indict-

[71] Ibid., 206.

[72] Ibid.

ment of their type of people who remain isolated to themselves, each other, and all humanity due to their own egotistical ideals and desires. In this tale, Lawrence presents a sharp critique of twentieth century non-individuals who by their strong idealism only destroy any potential for self-fulfillment. They claim to be living a high culture, detached from material objects, while actually they are living their own type of anti-life, attached to their material treasures. Lawrence comments, "Your idealist alone is a perfect materialist." The reason for this materialistic attachment is that the ideal becomes a "fixed, static entity" in the mind of the idealist, and he "proceeds to work it out in flesh-and-blood, as a fixed, static entity," just as a man would proceed to build an engine with "steel and copper."[73]

"Our idealists" (845), Valerie and Erasmus, proceed to achieve their ideals of the perfect life in the same, materialistic way. Inevitably, they are never quite satisfied, first in their search for "freedom, the priceless treasure" (847), and finally and most significantly, in their search for self-fulfillment. Travelling the European and American Continent time and again, accumulating their many cultural, valuable things, "these two idealists only further their own frustrations with life. Although they claim they "buy the things not for the things sake, but the sake of 'beauty'" (848), after the "glow of beauty...dies down"(848), they cannot bear to part from their treasured "things." This couple is imprisoned by their old dying selves just as they are imprisoned by their

[73]"Democracy," Phoenix, 711.

search for "freedom" and by their "things." In the end, they are portrayed as caged, "evil" (253) looking rats, helplessly lost to any hope for finding their places in the community of man. In its thematic development, this story shows how "It is not exactly the triumph of the middle-class that has made the deadness, but the triumph of the middle-class thing."[74]

Also pathetic in his revelation of character is Egbert of "England, My England," a man who has "no intention of coming to grips with life" (II, 318). He is one who wishes to become completely isolated from others and the world in his wife's family's English cottage and garden. Because of his self-seeking isolation, he fails to live a fulfilling life in any respect. Leavis summarizes his state of non-being quite well:

> The theme of the tale is the impossibility of making a life with no more than this [his retreat]. The impossibility is manifested in Egbert's failure with Winifred [his wife] . . . . He stood, says Lawrence, 'for nothing.' He is irresponsible, ineffective, and in his 'independent' way, parasitic.[75]

He bears close resemblence to the "young idealists" of "Things" in his desire for independence which truly imprisons his psyche. Egbert, as "the living negative of power" and "responsibility" (315), turns not only his wife's soul "to salt" (315) but does the same to his own. He fails to measure up to the "reckless spirit" (325) of Winifred's father which dominates his family's life, and her husband's presence becomes "an anguish to Winifred" (325). She

[74] D. H. Lawrence as quoted in Kingsley Widmer, The Art of Perversity . . ., 88.

[75] D. H. Lawrence: Novelist, 277-278.

admires her father who has the courage to "reckon with" (327) the world; Egbert merely retreats from it. As R. E. Pritchard comments, "Lacking this intensity [of Winifred's father], this creative energy, he is null and purposeless, incapable of ordering his garden, his children, or his work."[76]

Egbert's nihilistic decision to join the army and fight a war he detests reveals his strong desire for annihilation. Death in war is only the physical death for a man who has always been emotionally dead. At the end, Egbert willingly moves forward into the "black sea of death" (333) rather than backward to memories of life. Besides making his usual negative statement on the nature of war, Lawrence quite decisively dramatizes the disastrous effects which befall a person who retreats from living in harmony with others.

The "princess" of the short story of the same title is Egbert's female counterpart, and even Gerald Crich's, in her stagnation of character. Her story tells of a girl raised by her domineering father in a world of their own, cut off from any real human contacts. After her father's death, the daughter continues to exist in her princess-in-her-ivory-tower type fashion. As S. Ronald Weiner comments, "genuine 'fulfillment' is, of course, impossible in such a world."[77] Her father's and her own self-awareness are merely illusory; They have no real identity of

[76] D. H. Lawrence, Body of Darkness (London: Hutchinson and Co., 1971), 106.

[77] "Irony and Symbolism in 'The Princess,'" D. H. Lawrence Miscellany, 223.

self. As the second sentence of the story suggests, "To her father, she was The Princess. To her Boston aunts and uncles she was just Dollie Urquhart, poor little thing" (II, 473). From childhood onward she is taught by her father-teacher to pay no "notice of people" (475) and to treat them as "commoners" (476). Their snobbish attitude of self-importance only leads them to nothingness of being. The inner hardness that Dollie develops as a child remains with her eternally.

Imagery associated with cold and hardness dominates the story:[78] "her 'inner coldness' irritates her American relations" (476); she seems "to understand things in a cold light perfectly, with all the flush of fire absent" (477), she is the "fairy from the North" (478). The voyage with the dark, mysterious Mexican guide, Romero, into the remote, deadly mountains offers her a choice between remaining in the coldness of her too-conscious being, or joining in Romero's warmth and beginning to live by her unconscious. Her physical submission to Romero is a cold and detached one. The "numbed" (503) being of this non-human creature turns Romero's warm passion into a cruel, revengeful one. They finally destroy each other with their fierce, icy passion until they are like two people "who had died" (509). Both suffer from their "distorted sensuality."[79]

The final sentence of the tale is quite suggestive: "Later

[78]Weiner, 230.

[79]David Cavitch, _D. H. Lawrence and the New World_ (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), 171.

she married an elderly man and seemed pleased" (512). She has the superficial marriage that only the princess could deserve and merely "seems" pleased. For a woman who has always been "half in love with death" (485), her future seems quite appropriate. As Leavis states,

> There is no issue for her from the defeat of life, the impasse, that her father's crazy egoism entailed. For what the last brief sentence of the story records is something approaching the order of her father's lapse from a hardly sane self-sufficiency into actual madness.[80]

The princess' life very powerfully demonstrates the nothingness which destroys the person who does not establish some bond with the rest of humanity.

Most effective in its decisive comments on modern day men and women in their states of isolation is the excellent short story, "The Man Who Loved Islands." It develops a number of Lawrence's major themes on the nature of human relations through the story of the island-lover, Cathcart. Frederick R. Karl summarizes Cathcart's character quite well:

> [Cathcart is] a composite of everything Lawrence hated: a twentieth-century Robinson Crusoe who is now, ironically, an Englishman without mettle or resolution, one who, possessing only money, tries to regain a personal paradise that constantly eludes him.[81]

His symbolic tri-part retreat from island to island represents the failure of one individual, controlled by his own weaknesses, to find integration and self-fulfillment.

[80]Leavis, 285.

[81]"Lawrence's 'The Man Who Loved Islands': The Crusoe Who Failed," D. H. Lawrence Miscellany, 265.

Cathcart lacks any proper "love of humanity," and his purchase of the three islands successively represent "his shaky domain," "his place of refuge," and finally "his burial ground."[82]

The dramatic movement of the story conveys the progressive emptiness and final death of Cathcart's life. He goes to his first island "not necessarily to be alone on it, but to make it a world of his own" (III, 722). Cathcart daily concentrates upon his "material island" (725) and thus does not develop his own being. "Spending money" (725) to turn it into a "Paradise" (725) is his dream and personal downfall, quite reminiscent of the all too familiar American Dream. Like the young couple of "Things," Cathcart falls prey to his lust for material possessions. He makes himself "The Master" (726) of all the island's few inhabitants, and as a result becomes a desolate egoist. Cathcart treats his fellow inhabitants, not with love, but "good-will" (727), and "surely general good-will is a form of egoism" (727), comments the narrator. His resulting discontent spreads to his fellow inhabitants until finally his Paradise becomes a commercial hell, and the island-lover retreats to a smaller and more secluded one.

The man of the second island only continues to disintegrate in being, this time into a lover of flowers whose single desire is to study and write a book on them. Here he represents the perverted Nature lover who, instead of communing with Nature for the enrichment of his own being, merely uses it for his own egotistical pleasure. He does instigate a sexual relation with a woman, but

[82]Ibid., 266.

it is purely the "automatism of sex" (737) that overcomes and eventually helps destroy him. Because he feels that it is only with "her will" (727) (and unconsciously enough his own) that she wants him, he develops "self-contempt" (737). From egoism to self-contempt is an easy step for the insecure being that he is. His travel "straight north" comes as no surprise, for it is a movement deeply symbolic of his desire for death.

The third and final stage represents a short, death-like existence of non-living for the islander. He finally cuts off all human ties; he no longer receives letters and has lost all desire for worldly knowledge. His pathetic death represents the culmination of the natural process that he originated. Like Crich, Chatterley, and Skrebensky, by trying to be a "conqueror of life" he becomes a "destroyer of self."[83]

Lawrence employs some of his best nature imagery in this outstandingly wrought tale. First, there exists the symbolic meaning of the physical islands and finally, the symbolic meaning of the death-like snow. The country of snow which exists on the third island is quite reminiscent of the snow country into which Gerald Crich disappears. The final sentence of the tale quite effectively reveals the significance of the snow: "He turned, and felt its breath on him" (746). The snow takes on human characteristics since it represents Cathcart's death wish. The whole of the nature imagery certainly enhances the thematic import of the story. A proper understanding of this important tale renders a clear

[83]Karl, 270.

picture of how Lawrence views modern man and his predicament. Cathcart stands as a modern reflection of what can happen to the individual who succumbs to the forces of materialism around him and, as a result, dies to any real knowledge of himself.

In his novels, Lawrence continues the theme of the failure of mankind to integrate successfully with the community. In *Apocalypse*, he outlines the greatest malady befalling modern man, the obstinence within mankind that prevents one's becoming a truly integrated being:

> The Apocalypse shows us what we are resisting, unnaturally. We are unnaturally resisting our connection with the cosmos, with the world, with mankind, with the nation, with the family. All these connections are in the Apocalypse, anathema, and they are anathema to us. We *cannot bear connection*. That is our malady. We *must* break away, and be isolate. We call that being free, being individual.[84]

Lawrence continues to say that "What man most passionately wants is his living wholeness and his living unison, not his own isolate salvation of his 'soul.'" No matter how isolated man may be, he is still a fragment of the whole; "But I *can* deny my connections, break them, and become a fragment. Then I am wretched." Lawrence's major novels are replete with characters who are wretched, for varying reasons.

Gertrude Morel, in Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers*, is a woman whose life rarely touches the great community. Although she lives in Bestwood, a colliery town on the outskirts of Nottingham, she is amazingly isolated from the community. She is isolated partially because of her background. Gertrude Morel is the daughter of a

[84] *Apocalypse*, 198.

rather solid middle class burgher family. She falls in love with a miner. He fascinates her because he is her opposite, non-intellectual and soft. This fascination eventually dies and she finds herself married to a rather coarse man who comes home every night filthy with coal-dust and drinks heavily in the evenings. Her martiage, once a release, is now a trap:

> She went indoors, wondering if things were never going to alter. She was beginning by now to realise that they would not. She seemed so far away from her girlhood, she wondered if it were the same person walking heavily up the back garden at the Bottoms as had run so lightly up the breakwater at Sheerness ten years before.
>
> "What have I to do with it?" she said to herself. "What have I to do with all this? Even the child I am going to have! It doesn't seem as if I were taken into account" (6).

Gertrude's restlessness grows to such an extent that she becomes an outcast from her husband. Her mental separation becomes reflected in the children, for they join non-verbal conspiracy against the father, whose only real sin is that he is a working man.

She makes various attempts at getting in touch with the community, such as joining the Women's Guild, but these attempts are made for the wrong reason. She reaches out to society not because of any love of mankind, but as an excuse to get away from the oppressiveness of her home. The Women's Guild serves mostly as being another brick in the wall that is being built between herself and her non-intellectual husband.

Eventually, all social contacts are severed, and her only contacts with the community are through her children. She has no real connection with mankind. Her life becomes rooted in her

children and her experiences are vicarious ones. Although she has many children, her main concern is for her son, Paul. After the death of her oldest son, William, Mrs. Morel lives her life through Paul's life:

> Paul was in bed for seven weeks. He got up white and fragile. His father had bought him a pot of scarlet and gold tulips. They used to flame in the window in the March sunshine as he sat on the sofa chattering to his mother. The two knitted together in perfect intimacy. Mrs. Morel's life now rooted itself in Paul (141).

Mrs. Morel constantly participates actively in Paul's life. She is instrumental in Paul's rejection of Miriam Leivers. She fears Miriam because Miriam is much like herself. It is precisely this which attracts her to Paul from the beginning. Gertrude Morel also helps to ruin Paul's affair with Clara Dawes, although their separation is inevitable because their love is merely a physical one. Gertrude's real enemy is Miriam, who has had a spiritual love with Paul. Gertrude eventually recaptures her son, but for a brief period of time. Shortly after his separation from both Clara and Miriam, Mrs. Morel becomes critically ill with a tumor, knowledge of which she has secretly kept hidden. She tells Paul that she is willing herself to die, but cannot. Paul, acting for her as he has always done, gives his mother an overdose of morphine and she dies.

Gertrude Morel establishes a sort of mother pattern in Lawrence's novels. She becomes so engrossed in the wishes and needs of her family that she neglects to live her own life. Her life becomes extraordinarily insular because of her destructive devotion. Mrs. Morel does not follow the advice established by Lawrence in his _Fantasia of the Unconscious_:

> I, the mother, am myself alone: the child is itself alone. But there exists between us a vital dynamic relation, for which I, being the conscious one, am basically responsible. So, as far as possible, there must be in me no departure from myself, lest I injure the preconscious dynamic relation. I must absolutely act according to my own true spontaneous feeling. But, moreover, I must also have wisdom for myself and my child.[85]

Mrs. Morel does not recognize that she is alone and the child, Paul, is alone. What she does in her behavior is to create a smothering relationship that can terminate only in destruction for one or both. Mrs. Morel resists her connection with the cosmos by establishing too deep a connection with her family. Technically she is not isolated from mankind, for she has many children who deeply love her, but she is in actuality isolated because she does not follow what Lawrence suggests in the *Apocalypse*: "Let us find some conception of ourselves that will allow us to be peaceful and happy, instead of tormented and unhappy."[86]

Lady Chatterley's Lover is Lawrence's last novel; in this book, he reiterates the theme that remains prominent throughout his writings--the importance of love in the modern world. *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is the story of two isolated souls who find integration in the world through their relationship. Because of Oliver Mellors, Constance Chatterley becomes at peace with mankind.

Oliver Mellors, gameskeeper to Clifford Chatterley, lives an isolated life. He is physically isolated because he lives in the woods surrounding Wragby Hall and is emotionally isolated because

[85] *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 91.

[86] *Apocalypse*, 198.

he is at war with mankind. Several unsatisfactory relationships with women force Mellors into joining the army. Army life is no hardship, for he has a comfortable position serving a man who respects him. However, Mellors has to leave the army because his colonel dies, destroying the meaning of that kind of life. Upon his release from the army, Mellors tries to become a working man again and finds employment with Chatterley:

> He was temporizing with life. He had thought he would be safe, at least for a time, in this wood. There was no shooting as yet: he had to rear the pheasants. He would be alone, and apart from life, which was all he wanted. . . . And he could go on in life, existing from day to day, without connection and without hope. For he did not know what to do with himself (147).

Mellors is unhappy with his present state of isolation, of total separation from the community of man, for in the community Mellors had previously found contentment. Mellors later tells Connie that, for him, a right relationship with a woman is the "core" (213) of his life. Now that he has no such relationship, he has lost his moorings, as have many modern men. It is through his relationship with Constance Chatterley that he regains his moorings.

Their relationship has inauspicious beginnings. Connie, walking in the woods one day, hears hammering and discovers Mellors repairing huts for the baby pheasants. Connie's very presence annoys him, for she disturbs his isolation: "He felt if he could not be alone, and if he could not be left alone, he would die. His recoil away from the outer world was complete; his last refuge was this wood; to hide himself there!" (91). Because of her intrusion, he treats her coldly, perfunctorily, and with deprecating

politeness. She cannot bear his unstated insolence.

Gradually, their relationship takes roots from this unlikely beginning and eventually blossoms forth into a fulfilling relationship. Fulfillment comes to Connie Chatterley who has been an emotional prisoner of her crippled husband and his circle of emotionally sterile cohorts. This life of hers drives her from the house to the woods. Her life in the house with Clifford, who has increasingly regressed from a temperamental man to a childish cripple, is destroying her life spirit. Each day with Clifford further removes her from any sort of life in the community of man. Soon, she will become as emotionally paralyzed as Clifford is physically paralyzed.

Connie's relationship with Oliver Mellors reaches corners of her being that she previously had not known existed. She had had various sexual experiences as a young girl, with a young German boy in Dresden and young men down from Cambridge, but these experiences were mere encounters, for they had no real meaning. Her relationship with Mellors has meaning. Because of Oliver Mellors, Connie Chatterley is reborn:

> . . . and further and further rolled the waves of herself away from herself, leaving her, till suddenly, in a soft, shuddering convulsion, the quick of all her plasm was touched, the consummation was upon her, and she was gone. She was gone, she was not, and she was born: a woman (181).

Connie's rebirth is in actuality a birth, since previously she had never quite lived. Her experiences had been merely peripheral ones, ones that occasionally touched upon the real meaning of life but had never penetrated it. With Mellors, she comes to understand

the vital necessity of love.

Although Mellors lives an isolated life in the woods, he is still full of venom for society. The picture that Mellors paints of the future, if the world continues along its present path, is one of annihilation: ". . . the serpent swallows itself and leaves a void" (227). Mellors feels that the world will annihilate itself because of improper love. He himself has been a victim of improper love, having been married to Bertha Coutts, to Mellors a vilely selfish woman. Lawrence feels that the only cure for such a society is sex, resulting from a perfect love relationship. Contrary to popular misconception, Lawrence does not advocate promiscuity. In his work, "A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover," Lawrence defends this aspect of the novel:

> And this is the real point of the book. I want men and women to be able to think sex, fully, completely, honestly, cleanly. . . . Years of honest thoughts of sex, and years of struggling action in sex will bring us at last where we want to get, to our real and accomplished chastity, our completeness, when our sexual act and our sexual thought are in harmony, and the one does not quite interfere with the other.[87]

Sex will serve as a regenerative force upon society as it does upon Connie and Mellors.

Mellors' formula for a better, more integrated life results from his relationship with Connie. He decides that mankind is doomed and one can only escape its treacheries by clinging to the last thread of the community--human relationships:

Though it's a shame, what's been done to people these

[87] Phoenix II, 489-490.

> last hundred years: men turned into nothing but labour-insects, and all their manhood taken away, and all their real life. I'd wipe the machines off the face of the earth again, and end the industrial epoch absolutely, like a black mistake. But since I can't, an' nobody can, I'd better hold my peace, an' try an' live my own life: if I've got one to live, which I rather doubt (230).

Obviously, Mellors' formula is a highly personal one, one that can serve as a model for all of humanity. To be at peace with the community, one must be at peace with oneself. For Mellors, the way to peace within himself is through a successful relationship with a woman. Mellors finds this relationship with Connie. They both plan to get divorces and spend the rest of their lives farming, away from Wragby Hall and Wragby woods. Their occupations, their incomes are irrelevant. What is relevant is each other. As long as Mellors has Connie, as long as Connie has Mellors, they are integrated with mankind, for they have restored each other to life. In them has been instilled the desire to shed their isolation and go out into the world. With Mellors and Connie and _Lady Chatterley's Lover_, we have travelled the complete circle of relationships. For many of Lawrence's characters, the relationships, those between men and women, between men and men, and between men and mankind are inseparable.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Religion of Life

"The adventure is gone out of Christianity. We must start on a new venture towards God."[1] These words Lawrence stated in 1924, yet they reflect a very modern view of institutionialized Christianity. Lawrence's thoughts on religion reflect the depth of his intelligence and they form a living, workable theology, as demonstrated by the credible lives of his heroes and heroines of his fiction. His is not the systematic theology of an Aquinas or even a Kierkegaard. His informal religious "dogma" must be coordinated from his fiction and various writings, such as his "Study of Thomas Hardy," "The Crown," and his final, prophetic religious work, *Apocalypse*.

Religion is the climactic subject for analysis of the Lawrentian character in his search for integration. For Lawrence, religion becomes a very necessary facet of living, one which can enrich a person's life beyond the normal, everyday level of relationships. "Men are free when they are obeying some deep inward voice of religious belief. Obeying from within,"[2] states Lawrence in his "Spirit of Place" essay. The important, basic belief for Lawrence is that religion must come "from within," not from some

[1] "Books," *Phoenix*, 734.

[2] *Studies in Classic American Literature*, 6.

outward, formal structure. Religion must be internalized, made personal, or it becomes lifeless. A study of the Lawrentian characters in their religious isolation will elucidate the negative aspect of this basic idea. In particular, Lawrence laments the failure of Christianity through the ages, primarily because it has "denied the body."[3] The full implications of this idea will be analyzed especially in relation to the short story, The Man Who Died, and the nouvelle, The Virgin and the Gipsy.

Although Lawrence's religious ideas are very person-centered, he does believe in the existence of the Trinity, but a Trinity of his unique conception--a very living, working Trinity for the individual. Basically, he views the Father as "the Goal" toward which man strives in his living. He describes God as "Eternal, Infinite, Unchanging"[4] and, as such, that which man lacks but strives for in his living. Man finds these traits in women, says Lawrence, and thus God is closely allied to the fleshly side of man's nature. A close reading of The Man Who Died ultimately clarifies this idea.

Christ, the second person of the Trinity, relates to the spiritual side of man's nature, for He helps man to "overcome the impurity of the flesh,"[5] to make his love a transcendent one. Christ's teachings on love, his supreme command to love, if followed, can enrich the life of the individual. Lawrence's view of love closely parallels that of the cultural analyst, Denis de Rougemont.

[3] Apocalypse, 28.

[4] "On Being Religious," Phoenix, 728.

[5] "Study of Thomas Hardy," 446. All further references to this article will be made in parentheses in the text.

In Love in the Western World, he stresses the value of Christian love, or agape. Rougemont believes that agape "brings forth our neighbors" and that Christ represents "a reassertion of life."[6] Lawrence says that man must submit to the "Christian action of 'loving thy neighbour,' and of dying to be born again" (515) to attain fullness of being.

It is further necessary for man to attain a proper balance between spirit and flesh, two composite parts of his basic nature, to achieve harmony in living. Living a full life, according to Lawrence, requires both a "consummation of body and of spirit" (418). And to attain this man has the third person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, who is both "beyond us and within us" (469) to serve as a reconciler for the principles of the Father (the flesh) and the Son (the spirit). Lawrence implies the Holy Spirit, as man's own inward guide, speaks through man's unconscious.

In "The Crown," Lawrence says, "Without God, without some sort of immortality, . . . without something absolute, we are nothing."[7] And, as Panichas points out, Lawrence believes man must find God "in the flux of physical life and in man's relationship to himself, to other human beings, and to the cosmos."[8] Thus, Lawrence's concept of God is not in the usual tradition of a transcendent God, although he does not deny that God is part of the mystery of life. Indeed, it is hard to define Lawrence's concept

[6]Love in the Western World (New York: Pantheon, 1956), 68.

[7]Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine, 89.

[8]Panichas, 126.

of God, for he refuses "to apply any precise and limitary definitions to his concept of God."[9] It remains for a study of his fiction to probe further the nature of Lawrence's God and his "religion of life."

Of the short fiction, two short stories and two nouvelles best exemplify Lawrence's religious beliefs in practice. "The Border Line," "Daughters of the Vicar," The Virgin and the Gipsy, and The Man Who Died, all contain characters who remain isolated to love and the religious impulse and, as a result, destroy their beings. These stories also contain outstanding characters who, by their religious impulses, redeem themselves through their integration of self with others. "Daughters of the Vicar" and The Virgin and the Gipsy, in addition, present Lawrence's most striking criticisms on the value of institutionalized religions through the figures of the two Vicars of both stories. The Man Who Died, Lawrence's recreation of the Christ-Osiris myth, stands as his culminating statement on religion. A study of the major characters, those both isolated and integrated, will reveal the various complexities of Lawrence's "religion of life."

One of Lawrence's most mysterious and creative "ghost" stories is "The Border Line." In it he presents an interesting study of the lives of one woman, Katherine Farquhar, and her two extremely different husbands, Alan and Philip. This woman, by her growth into fullness of being, discovers the true Lawrentian meaning of love by development of her religious impulse. The story

[9]Panichas, 96.

remains significant for what its characters reveal about the mysteries of life, mysteries connected with Lawrence's view of the cosmos.

Katherine first appears in the story as a "handsome woman of body" (II, 587), who by her "indifference to her surroundings" (587) seems very dissatisfied with her life. It is revealed that she and her first husband, Alan, an extraordinarily masculine individual, were in love with each other, yet there was always an unnatural friction between the two, for each demanded dominance over the other. Because of their pride and haughtiness, they separated after ten years of marriage, and Katherine is now married to a friend of her first husband, a congenial man, Philip, who allows Katherine to be her "queen bee self" (589). Alan has died while fighting bravely during World War I. Katherine and Philip definitely fail to be ideal Laurentian lovers, for they violate the sense of polarity in love Lawrence advocates. Philip does not live up to the forceful personality of Alan, and Katherine only destroys herself by being the dominant member of the marriage. She soon feels the inadequacies of her second husband, and a "curious sense of degradation" (591) starts corrupting her spirit. She lives a "numb" (592) existence, a true anti-life, and her religious impulse is quite repressed. Philip, with all his uxoriousness, is simply using her, manipulating her for his own selfish satisfactions, as she soon realizes.

Yet, one time while she is journeying alone through France to meet Philip in Germany, her suppressed religious impulse comes

alive and eventually brings her a rebirth of spirit. This feeling is primarily associated with the memory and presence of the potent Alan. An overriding irony reveals the psychological movement of Katherine's being. Katherine begins to see the illusory nature of her past "life-day" (594) and her love for Philip, after experiencing the seemingly illusory but very real presence of her dead husband's spirit.

Her journey across the continent symbolizes her own spiritual journey from thanatos to eros. The lifeless Marne country, "the border country, where the Latin races and the Germanic neutralize one another into horrid ash" (593) represents her own feeling of nullity. Yet, it is in this deadly border line country that Katherine finds meaning for her own existence. Strassburg is a city where she feels near the "grey shadows of death" (595), yet it is where she begins her movement toward integration of being by fulfilling her unconscious religious impulse. The climactic occurrence at the cathedral is important for its regenerative, religious effect on Katherine's being. At first, the cathedral takes on monstrous, living qualities in Katherine's imagination, symbolizing her fear of the unknown in her own being:

> There it was, in the upper darkness of the ponderous winter night, like a menace. She remembered her spirit used in the past to soar aloft with it. But now, looming with a faint rush of blood out of the upper black heavens, the Thing stood suspended, looking down with vast demonish menace, calm and implacable.
>
> Mystery and dim, ancient fear came over the woman's soul. The cathedral looked so strange and demonish-heathen. And an ancient, indomitable blood seemed to stir in it. It stood there like some vast silent beast with teeth of stone, waiting and wondering when to stoop against this pallid humanity (595).

The cathedral, a living monster most alive in its blood, frightens this "pallid humanity," the woman dead to her flesh and blood passion. Yet, here, through her reunion with her dead husband in a new passion, she is brought to a new life. Unconsciously, she "moves in the aura of the man to whom she belongs" (596) and allows herself for the first time to accept the "full contentment" (596) which only he can give her. They establish an ideal Lawrentian love relationship:

> Now she knew it [what her husband means for her] and submitted. Now that she was walking with a man who came from the halls of death, to her, for her relief. The strong, silent kindliness of him towards her, even now, was able to wipe out the ashy, nervous horror of the world from her body. She went at his side, still and released, like one newly unbound, walking in the dimness of her own contentment (597).

The redemptive nature of Alan's spirit is closely allied with the presence of the Church, representative of Alan's religiously-revitalizing effect on Katherine. She does not need Christianity, for, as Robert Hadspath comments, "Katherine finds her way to the 'great cathedral, the house of God and Christ' which now assumes not the Christian humility and passivity, but the pagan blood passion."[10] Her reunion with her first husband is so intense that Katherine can feel nothing but repugnance for Philip when she finally sees him in Baden-Baden, her physical journey's destination.

Her second encounter with Alan in a forest near Baden-Baden, where he comes out of the "dulling reddish rocks in the forest" (603) further intensifies her love for Alan and hatred for Philip.

[10]"Duality as Theme and Technique in D. H. Lawrence's 'The Border Line,'" Studies in Short Fiction, IV (Fall 1966), 54.

This second time he consummates his role as her true husband by the physical act of love. At the end of the tale, with the aid of Alan, Katherine severs her ties with the now dead Philip, and crosses the border line of her own existence into a true integration of being. Alan returns to his wife, with the "silent passion of a husband come back from a very long journey" (604).

On a literal level, "The Border Line" may appear rather outlandish in its ghostly portrayal, but on a higher, imaginative level, it excellently portrays the meaning of Lawrence's blood religion. "Blood" refers to the flesh, as signified by Lawrence's description of the living cathedral, and "blood religion" refers to Lawrence's belief that man must be alive in his blood, in his flesh, to find God. As Panichas states, Lawrence believes that "God is not to be set off in particular and absolute areas of faith and life," but "man must seek and believe in God who reveals Himself in darkness, in passion, in silence, in fear."[11] Katherine's feelings of rebirth, attained by her faith in the mysterious presence of her first husband, reaffirm Lawrence's own belief in the strong potential in living a religious life. By her reunion with her husband, she attains the consummation of body and spirit which Lawrence claims as his new law of love, and his religious goal in life. Katherine experiences, by her love, a new reverence for herself, for Alan and for life in general, something Lawrence says all men and women need if "our life would take real form."[12]

[11] Panichas, Adventure in Consciousness, 101.

[12] Phoenix, 469.

Two stories, The Virgin and the Gipsy and "Daughters of the Vicar," are similar to "The Border Line" in their "sleeping-beauty" theme. All contain women figures newly awakened to the value of love. In addition, the first two stories contrast the life of a cold Vicar to that of truly living individuals. Through the various human relations of each work, Lawrence further dramatizes his religious love ideals.

Leavis praises "Daughters of the Vicar" for its revelation of Lawrence's reverence for life. His approach to the work is to analyze it as Lawrence's refutation of the class system, but some of his comments are applicable to the religious theme of the tale. Especially relevant is his statement that the story "is preoccupied (being in this profoundly representative of Lawrence) with defining the nature of a true moral sense--one that shall minister to life."[13] An analysis of the moral courage particularly witnessed by the Vicar's second daughter, Louisa, illustrates Lawrence's moral sense toward living. Morality is certainly an important aspect of religion, and a study of the formation of Louisa's moral conviction, in contrast to the lack of such in her family, further elucidates Lawrence's "religion of life."

The superiority of Louisa's sense of love and life over her family's deadly institutional, religious approach to life, forms one of the unifying themes of the work. At the beginning of the tale, the Vicar and his young, childless wife are introduced as two class-conscious snobs who feel wounded in their pride when they

[13] D. H. Lawrence: Novelist, 84.

must move to a new, small colliery town. Mrs. Lindley hates her husband for having to live in the lowly community and for his poverty; she bears their children "almost mechanically" (I, 137). The stiffling, dead atmosphere in which the children are raised is evident from the start. The failure of the parents to find integration of being is quite evident from the beginning of the story. For the daughters to grow into any form of true integration, they must transcend their dismal background.

After the brief introduction to the nullity of the parent's existence with their false religious devotion, the story proceeds to narrate the events of Mary's, the eldest daughter's, life. She, in her dark, beautiful appearance, holds the potential for finding true love and completeness of being in life, but her choices are disastrous. She chooses to suppress her natural emotion by marrying the "abortion" (145) of a man, the young minister, Mr. Massy. He resembles her father in his daily practice of a deadly, institutionalized religion. Like Mr. Lindley, he performs his town duties of visiting the sick, caring for the aged, with perfunctory grace, not with any feeling of love of humanity. He cannot even love his wife. By marrying him, Mary completely destroys any potential in herself for living: "Mary, in marrying him, tried to become a pure reason such as he was, without feeling or impulse" (153). When she finds herself with child, she feels "for the first time horror, afraid before God and man" (154). She knows she has betrayed her flesh and denied the "God-passion" which Lawrence praises. Mary's type of "love-will" marriage is just what Lawrence criticizes in

the following passage:

> Yet the human heart must have an absolute. It is one of the conditions of being human. The only thing is the God who is the source of all passion. Once go down before the God-passion and human passions take their right rhythm. . . . But human love without God-passion always kills the thing it loves. Man and woman are virtually killing each other with the love-will now. What would it be when mates, or comrades, broke down their absolute love and trust? Because, without the polarized God-passion to hold them stable at the centre, break down they would. With no deep God who is source of all passion and life to hold them separate and yet sustained in accord, the loving comrades would smash one another, and smash all love, all feeling as well. It would be a rare gruesome sight.[14]

Mr. and Mrs. Massy's love is based only on their will to find material security, and thus their mockery of a love only intensifies the disintegration of their beings.

Lawrence laments the fact that so much of the tragedy of modern living is brought on by a person's excessive reliance on reason. Mr. Massy and Mary fail to act on their emotions in their attempt to follow reason, and thus, epitomize a definite form of Lawrentian non-living. Lawrence believes that man's life has become "upset by excessive mental reliance on the externals of the modern machine-civilization, leading to the loss of deep and self-responsible consciousness in man."[15] Mr. Massy and Mary's over reliance on reason truly stifles any creative, religious impulses hidden in their beings.

Louisa feels repugnance toward Mr. Massy and shame over her older sister's behavior. Although she once admired her sister's

[14]As quoted in Panichas, 98.

[15]Ibid., 21.

strength of character, she decides not to follow her lead into a disastrous marriage for herself. Her movement toward the warm, bright cottage of the collier, Alfred Durant, and his mother, away from the dreary Vicarage, represents her rejection of the deadly Greymeed Vicarage life. The true moral, religious sense which the heroine develops further defines Lawrence's beliefs on religion and life.

Similar to the redemptive role of Alan for Katherine in "The Border Line" is both Louisa and Alfred's redemptive effect on each other. Alfred is the "most lovable" (163) of his mother's sons, but, like Paul Morel, his overriding devotion to her has stifled his growth. He feels "not physically, but spiritually impotent" (165) with Louisa. But with the death of his mother and the entrance of Louisa comes the possibility for rebirth in being. The beautifully wrought scene where Louisa cleans the collier's pure, white back after his day in the pit, demonstrates a new, rejuvenating feeling in Louisa too:

> His skin was beautifully white and unblemished, of an opaque, solid whiteness. Gradually Louisa saw it: this also was what he was. It fascinated her. Her feelings of separateness passed away: she ceased to draw back from contact with him and his mother. There was this living centre. Her heart ran hot. She had reached some goal in this beautiful, clear male body. She loved him in a white, personal heat. . . . A tenderness rose in her, she loved even his queer ears. A person--an intimate being he was to her. She put down the towel and went upstairs again, troubled in her heart. She had only seen one human being in her life--and that was Mary. All the rest were strangers. Now her soul was going to open, she was going to see another. She felt strange and pregnant (171).

Lawrence does not speak of Louisa's feelings in purely physical terms; she also appreciates Will for what his pure white body represents, his purity of both body and spirit. Alfred is first

afraid of his feelings toward Louisa, due to his over-attachment to his mother which carries him into an "unformed, unknown chaos" (173). Once his mother dies, though, he is free to join in love with Louisa, and Louisa has the moral courage to make the first move toward him. Alfred feels intimidated by his lowly colliery position in society in comparison to Louisa's higher position as the Vicar's daughter. Her courage, though, transcends the social snobbery of her family. As Leavis states, "It is in the fullest sense moral courage that we witness--moral courage ensuing what is profoundly a moral decision. It is courage to live."[16] Louisa begins a life of fulfillment with her husband-to-be at the end of the story, while Mary wastes away in her husband's vicarage. Louisa's religious reverence for life supersedes anything her family could ever imagine with all their false religious pride.

The Virgin and the Gipsy, one of Lawrence's best parables of regeneration,[17] contains major characters quite similar to those of "Daughters of the Vicar." Vicar Saywell's name reflects his personality, for about all he can do is "say-well," and not live well. Like Vicar Lindley, his Protestant religion has gone bankrupt. Yvette, like Louisa, is a young virgin who finds the true meaning of life and religion by her redemptive experiences of the flesh. The gipsy is a much more forceful, vital man than Alfred Durant, yet they serve similar functions as life-givers for the two virgins. The gipsy is one of Lawrence's most powerful lovers in his almost

[16] D. H. Lawrence: Novelist, 87.

[17] Kingsley Widmer, The Art of Perversity, 187.

Christ-like role. A study of the religious themes in this nouvelle will prove a good introduction to The Man Who Died, for it introduces themes carried to final completion in the second story. The redemptive character of the gipsy prefigures that of the Christ-Osiris "man who died."

The story centers on the movement of yet another female character from thanatos to eros. Yvette, like Louisa, feels suppressed by her family's anti-life feelings and desires some type of release, but unlike Louisa, does not have the moral courage to take positive action. One reason for her hesitancy is that she does not have a new life, like Louisa, to substitute for her deadly existence at the Vicarage. It is not till the end of her story that she finds true rebirth.

The first important event of the story is Yvette's meeting with the gipsy while traveling with her society friends through the countryside. In his symbolic role, he warms their cold beings with his primitive fire. After their first meeting, Yvette remains haunted by his presence and the feeling that he knows her "from the inside, from her secret female self."[18] Most of the time she does not consciously think of him, although his presence is strongly embedded in her unconscious self. Her life at the vicarage numbs her to any real feeling:

> Yet hurt she was: in her limbs, in her body, in her sex, hurt. Hurt, numbed, and half destroyed, with only her nerves vibrating and jangled. And still so young, she could not conceive what was happening (42).

[18] The Virgin and the Gipsy (New York: Alfred P. Knopf, 1970), 58. All future references to this edition are cited parenthetically in the text.

Yvette fluctuates from feelings of pure hatred for the "rectory morality" (43) to feelings of apathy:

> She had a curious reluctance, always, towards taking action, or making any real move of her own. She always wanted someone else to make a move for her, as if she did not want to play her own game of life (103).

Yet her unconscious feelings of repulsion drive her away from the vicarage and for a time she occupies herself by visiting Mrs. Fawcett and Major Eastwood, two people carrying on what society and her father would term an illicit love affair. Yvette, like her passionate mother who had the wisdom to leave her husband, does not care what society in its hypocritical, "Christian" way thinks. She senses that these two people have a right to be together, and her visits to them represent her revolt against conventional morality. To them she confides her feelings of nullity toward life. She says that the gipsy is the only man she truly desires.

The gipsy is the direct antithesis to the vicar, as previously analyzed in the second chapter of this thesis. The former perfectly epitomizes the man in tune with Nature, and the gipsy understands the Lawrentian meaning of God in life. He does not find his God by writing books or preaching sermons, as does the Vicar, but in his relation to people and Nature. Lawrence could easily be describing the gipsy in the following words: "Only in the country, among peasants, where the old ritual of the season lives on its beauty, is there still some living 'faith' in the God of Life."[19] The gipsy recognizes "the Godhead of the flesh"[20] Lawrence believes

[19] As quoted in Panichas, 122.

[20] Ibid., 100.

in, for he finds the reality of God in the life of the flesh. Lawrence exults the gipsy for his higher form of passion. As Leavis comments, Lawrence attempts in this story to vindicate "desire in the sense of compelling a clear and clean and reverent recognition."[21] The following passage further illustrates the type of man the gipsy is and his higher type of passion. Yvette has just confessed to "the Eastwoods" her feelings for the gipsy and the following is the Major's and Mrs. Fawcett's responses:

> "I think," said the Major, taking his pipe from his mouth, "that desire is the most wonderful thing in life. Anybody who can really feel it, is a king, and I envy nobody else!" He put back his pipe.
>
> The Jewess looked at him stupefied.
>
> "But Charles!" she cried. "Every common low man in Halifax feels nothing else!"
>
> He again took his pipe from his mouth.
>
> "That's merely appetite," he said. . . .
>
> "Charles! You're wrong! How <u>could</u> it be a real thing! As if she could possibly marry him and go round in a caravan!"
>
> "I didn't say marry him," said Charles.
>
> "Or a love affair! Why it's monstrous! What would she think of herself!--That's no love! That's--that's prostitution!"
>
> Charles smoked for some moments.
>
> "That gipsy was the best man we had, with horses. Nearly died of pneumonia. I thought he <u>was</u> dead. He's a resurrected man to me. I'm a resurrected man myself, as far as that goes" (87-88).

The Major's words reflect Lawrence's own thoughts on the nature of the gipsy and Yvette's passion. The gipsy's almost pagan relation to the cosmos [the gipsy's wife is even described as a "pagan pariah woman" (29)] is something to be admired by modern men and women who have lost this vital relation. Modern Christianity, through its conventional laws and narrow-minded viewpoint, has lost this

[21] <u>D. H. Lawrence: Novelist</u>, 206.

oneness that even the early Christians felt, says Lawrence.[22] The following description of modern Christians could very easily relate to the Vicar and his followers:

> Society consists of a mass of weak individuals trying to protect themselves, out of fear, from every possible imaginary evil, and, of course, by their very fear, bringing the evil into being. This is the Christian community, today, in its perpetual mean thou-shalt-not. This is how Christian doctrine has worked out in practice.[23]

Yvette sees by her perceptive vision and experience with the gipsy that the Saywells are the "base born" and the gipsy and his kind the "free born" (94). The former are bound by their base sense of morality; the latter are free to develop according to their own God-passion. The former are life-unbelievers; the latter are life-believers, and because of the gipsy, Yvette, too, becomes a believer in life. As Leavis comments, "The freshness, the inexperience, the painfully conscious ignorance, the confident and the need to believe in life are touchingly evoked"[24] in this nouvelle. Yvette moves from a repugnance toward physical contact with men to a deep reverence for the flesh.

At the end of the nouvelle, by Lawrence's powerful use of narrative convention, the gipsy is able to save Yvette from destruction by a catastrophic flood. The flood waters hold significant symbolic importance; it destroys the old religious order and allows for the new to enter into Yvette's life. The death of the strong

[22] Apocalypse, 46.

[23] Apocalypse, 33.

[24] D. H. Lawrence: Novelist, 304.

grandmother and destruction of the vicarage by the torrent frees Yvette to begin life anew, away from the vicarage and all it represents. The gipsy not only saves Yvette from destruction by the flood, but also introduces her to the holy life of the flesh. This redemptive figure warms both her body and soul and brings to her the much needed will to live. Yvette remains grateful to this man, even though she knows she may never see him again: "Her young soul knew the wisdom of it" (120).

Unlike the characters of his short fiction, those of his major novels do not readily achieve religious integration. In Lawrence's novel, The Rainbow, one can readily discern the importance of the religious question not only to the characters concerned, but also to the overall thematic development. F. R. Leavis believes that the basic theme of The Rainbow is a realization of human potential: "The novel has for theme the urgency, and the difficult struggle, of the higher human possibilities to realize themselves."[25] Two of the main characters in the novel, Anna and Will Brangwen, struggle with their religious beliefs and disbeliefs. This struggle is a part of the fulfillment process established by Lawrence in his "Spirit of Place" when he outlines the importance of religion: "Men are free when they are obeying some deep, inward voice of religious belief, obeying from within."[26]

Anna Lensky Brangwen's type of religion is not a conventional one. Instead of humbly accepting the doctrines of Christianity, she

[25] D. H. Lawrence: Novelist, 103.

[26] Studies in Classic American Literature, 6.

constantly criticizes them. Part of her unconventionality is a refusal to accept any notion of mystery, any hint of transubstantiation in the church service:

> It was when she came to pictures of the Pieta that she burst out.
> "I do think they're loathsome," she cried.
> "What?" he said, surprised, abstracted.
> "Those bodies with slits in them, posing to be worshipped."
> "You see, it means the Sacraments, the Bread," he said, slowly.
> "Does it!" she cried, "Then it's worse. I don't want to see your chest slit, nor to eat your dead body, even if you offer it me. Can't you see it's horrible?"
> "It isn't me, it's Christ" (150).

The mystery that accompanies Will Brangwen's sort of religion is completely alien to Anna. Even when the mysteries are carefully, patiently outlined to her, she can see only the concrete matter involved. She not only refuses to accept the doctrines of the church, she also rejects the symbols of these doctrines. She laughs when she tries to consider the Lamb in the church window as being, as Will suggests, "the symbol of Christ, of His innocence and sacrifice" (151). She instead thinks of the lambs gambolling in the pastures, choosing to like them far more than the lambs in the stained glass window.

Anna has no real feel for Christ, nor for the ideas concerning Him that, according to Will Brangwen's Christianity, one must accept. Anna cannot sunder the ties with her earthly, physical self, and soar into the mysteries of the unknown. Instead, she is far more content to deal with non-abstractions, with everyday matters.[27]

[27] H. M. Daleski, The Forked Flame, 100.

Anna's religion, a sort of non-religion, conflicts with Will's religion. She is constantly angered by the fact that he does not share the same response to the conventional religion. Instead of shunning it, he accepts it and she hates him for it:

> He was very strange to her, and, in this church spirit, in conceiving himself as a soul, he seemed to escape and run free of her. In a way, she envied it him, this dark freedom and jubilation of the soul, some strange entity of him. It fascinated her. Again she hated it. And again, she despised him, wanted to destroy it in him (148).

This jeering response, this hatred of an acceptance of the mysteries has not always been Anna's response. Anna's real father, a Polish doctor, is dead, and her mother has married into the Brangwen family. Her step-father has always adored her, even more than he loves his own son, but despite this, Anna's childhood has been a turbulent one. She has always reached out to something in the cosmos that hopefully will satisfy her. Her first exploration is into the world of religion. She has desperately wanted the mysteries to occur, the meaning to come to her, but nothing is achieved but frustration. She has often tried to find this something with her father's mother-of-pearl rosary:

> It was not right, somehow. What these words meant when translated was not the same as the pale rosary meant. There was a discrepancy, a falsehood. It irritated her to say, "_Dominus tecum_," or "_benedicta tu in mulieribus_." She loved the mystic words, "_Ave Maria, Sancta Maria_;" she was moved by "_benedictus fructus ventris tui Jesus_," and by "_nunc et in hora mortis nostrae_." But none of it was quite real. It was _not_ satisfactory, somehow (95).

Anna has always been ill-at-ease with strangers and has always battled with one parent, then the other. Despite her rejection of the Latin words and of her father's rosary, she again turns

to religion for some sort of contentment that she does not find in her family life. When seventeen, Anna becomes an avid church-goer; she is hoping that someday the words will soothe her instead of irritate her:

> Many ways she tried, of escape. She became an assiduous church-goer. But the language meant nothing to her: it seemed false. She hated to hear things expressed, put into words. Whilst the religious feelings were inside her they were passionately moving. In the mouth of the clergyman, they were false, indecent. She tried to read. But, again the tedium and the sense of the spoken word put her off (96-97).

This negative response to the conventional begins before she meets Will Brangwen, a cousin of her step-father. It is significant to realize that her rejection of conventional religion is not a reaction to Will's religion. She has felt nothing for the church for years.

After her marriage to Will Brangwen, her feelings toward religion remain the same. She still attends services, but is often pleased when not many people attend. She attends only out of "habit and custom" (146), not out of any deep belief. Perhaps church will fulfill for her the need for something more, she thinks, although she has long since given up hope for any revelation from religion:

> But quickly this palled. After a short time, she was not very much interested in being good. Her soul was in quest of something, which was not just being good, and doing one's best. No, she wanted something else: something that was not her ready-made duty. Everything seemed to be merely a matter of social duty, and never of her self. They talked about her soul, but somehow never managed to rouse or to implicate her soul. As yet her soul was not brought in at all (147).

This quest for something more serves as a prelude to her daughter

Ursula's quest for self, developed in the last part of the novel. The Brangwen women are forever in search for themselves; some find fulfillment and some do not. Anna seeks fulfillment within the confines of the church and finds only confinement. She rejects these restrictions.

Her response to established religion is indicative of the opposite nature of her relationship with her husband. She is initially attracted to him because he seems to be a mode of escape, one which she has sought in the church and has not found. For a length of time, Anna has thought that she and her husband were a great deal alike, but she eventually realizes that the love they share is their sole common denominator. Will is essentially different from her and will remain so:

> But as time went on, she began to realize 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 realized that he was a dark opposite to her, that they were opposites, not complements.
>
> He did not alter, he remainedseparately himself, and he seemed to expect her to be part of himself, the extension of his will. She felt him trying to gain power over her, without knowing her (158).

Anna's disbelief in conventional religion manifests itself in a constant source of friction between her and her husband. Anna hates him when he submerges into a religious ecstasy, merely by studying books on church paintings. He hates her for forcing him to feel ashamed of his belief in the old religion. Shortly after she realizes the great gap of belief that divides them, Anna realizes that more is at stake than religion. Her individuality is being tried. She is extraordinarily concerned, like Ursula after

her, that her individuality will be damaged or taken away. Will realizes her fear and asserts his will more violently:

> He wanted to impose himself on her. And he began to shudder. She wanted to desert him, to leave him a prey to the open, with the unclean dogs of the darkness setting on to devour him. He must beat her, and make her stay with him. Whereas she fought to keep herself free of him (159).

This fight for independence and dependence constantly rages between them. What originally began as a difference in religious beliefs has begun to culminate in an enormous fight for Anna's individuality. Anna cannot understand his desire for a dependency relationship. She wants both of them to remain free, reminiscent of Rupert Birkin's "star-equilibrium" idea of love. She cannot understand the nature of Will's attempted assertion:

> But she felt his power persisting on her, till she became aware of the strain, she cried out against the exhaustion. He was forcing her, he was forcing her. And she wanted so much joy and the vagueness and the innocence of her pregnancy. She did not want his bitter-corrosive love, she did not want it poured into her, to burn her. Why must she have it? Why, oh, why was he not content, contained (169).

One of the results of this constant battle is her own discontent. She had turned to Will Brangwen to aid her in her quest for something. She has hoped for an enlarging of experience, but instead has received a threat to her individuality.[28]

The result of Anna's entire religious search is a sort of spiritual rebirth. She reasserts her complete individuality by a ritualistic dance when she is large with child, alone in her bedroom:

[28]Daleski, 99.

> And she had to dance in exhultation beyond him. Because he was in the house, she had to dance before her creator in exemption from the man. On a Saturday afternoon, when she had a fire in the bedroom, again she took off her things and danced, lifting her knees and hands in a slow rhythmic exulting. He was in the house, so her pride was fiercer. She would dance his nullification, she would dance to her unseen Lord. She was exalted over him, before the Lord (172).

Anna finds her personal fulfillment in bearing children, and her content is a vague happiness. Her rebirth is completed, for her satisfaction, even though vague, has been born out of total discontent:

> If she were not the wayfarer to the unknown, if she were arrived now, settled in her build, a rich woman, still her doors opened under the arch of the rainbow, her threshold, reflected the passing of the sun and moon, the great travellers, her house was full of the echo of journeying (184).

Her attitude towards religion corresponds to Lawrence's criticism of established religions, as seen in such works of short fiction as _The Virgin and the Gipsy_. Anna becomes a more fully integrated human being because of her refusal to accept institutionalized religion. However, she does not have a perfect relationship with her husband, partially because of their religious differences. G. A. Panichas points out the deficiencies of her religion:

> In striving to integrate the totality of life-experience in both the spiritual and physical areas, Lawrence was seeking for what he referred to as a "communion of common worship," wherein religion becomes an organic tie that brings people together in joy and wonder as the supreme religious manifestations of life.[29]

Her religious beliefs are not perfect because there is no experience of both physical and spiritual consummation. Her religion is

[29] _Adventure in Consciousness_, 20.

a nebulous one, as is Lawrence's, one that has no real definition. Anna's physical consummation is constant; her spiritual consummation occurs only when she has succeeded in dominating her husband. For Lawrence, this would be no real spirituality, for to him there should be no dependency in a relationship.

Another character in The Rainbow undergoes a religious crisis. Will Brangwen's response to religion is by far a more positive reaction than is Anna's. It is, however, the brand of religion he adheres to that Lawrence opposes. He feels the mystery, the spirituality, of Christianity at which Anna sneers; this mystery is an important part of his acceptance of his religion and is one of the main issues between the couple. Will is constantly distressed that Anna cannot accept the symbols and the words, yet his acceptance of the words of the service is a blind one. He never actually listens to the words, nor understands them. He prefers not to understand them, for to understand them would destroy their magic:

> Church had an irresistible attraction for him. And he paid no more attention to that part of the service which was Church to her, than if he had been an angel or a fabulous beast sitting there. He simply paid no heed to the sermon or to the meaning of the service. There was something thick, dark, dense, powerful about him that irritated her too deeply for her to speak of it. The Church teaching in itself meant nothing (147-148).

Will also responds to the conventional symbols of the church that so anger Anna. He does not have the kind of vision Anna has that forces her to shun such symbols as the Lamb of God and hinders for her any sense of mystery. Her non-acceptance of these symbols causes no little shame in Will, and he is considerably angered when

her jeering of his belief ruins its beauty for him:

> He was ashamed of the ecstasy into which he could throw himself with these symbols. And for a few moments he hated the lamb and the mystic pictures of the Eucharist, with a violent ashy hatred. His fire was put out, she had thrown cold water on it. The whole thing was distasteful to him, his mouth was full of ashes. He went out cold with corpse-like anger, leaving her alone. He hated her (151).

Will Brangwen hates Anna because of her imposing her nonbelief upon him. Although she does not force him to accept what she feels, she nonetheless ruins his manner of belief.

One of the conventional symbols that Will Brangwen responds to is the church building itself; Anna and Will's visit to Lincoln Cathedral is outlined in the chapter "The Cathedral." As developed earlier in the novel, Will Brangwen has long been interested in church architecture. Lawrence points out that Will "was interested in churches, in church architecture" (103). What is implied here is that Will's actual interest is not in the church as religion, but in the church as edifice. Later in the novel, Lawrence more clearly spells out Will's true interest: "It was the church <u>building</u> he cared for" (196). Christ rarely enters Will's deliberation about religion; God never does. Eliseo Vivas outlines this point clearly:

> In the case of Anna and Will, insofar as we are told, there seems to be no question of God at all. In church and in the cathedral they undergo experiences that are satisfying to them, but these are aroused, not by the contemplation of God and a feeling of relationship to Him, however conceived, as an object of religious devotion, but the church, the building itself, the environment, the cathedral. To put it baldly, the stimulus does not seem to have mattered at all. What matters is the response itself, its depth and amplitude, its satis-

fying or fulfilling quality.[30]

Religion has peculiar manifestations in the life of Will Brangwen. It has no real connection with day-to-day life, because Will believes in separation of religion and daily life. There is no fusion for Will. If he imposes religion on daily life, the tedium of daily life would tend to degrade the mystery that is of great import to him. If he were to deal mentally with matters of daily existence during the church service, the emotion he feels would be destroyed. The church service should not be defiled; it should be separate from concrete matters:

> And he did not care about his trespasses, neither about the trespasses of his neighbor, when he was in church. Leave that care for weekdays. When he was in church, he took no more notice of his daily life. It was weekday stuff. In church, he wanted a dark, nameless emotion, the emotion of all the great mysteries of passion (148).

This emotion, this mystery, reaches its highest peak in Lincoln Cathedral. Will's experience in the doorway of the cathedral is so intense, so personal, so mysterious, that he can hardly bear it. Lawrence's description of Will's entry into the church is virtually a literal birth:

> Here, in the church, "before" and "after" were folded together, all was contained in oneness. Brangwen came to his consummation. Out of the doors of the womb he had come, putting aside the wings of the womb, and proceeding into the light. Through daylight and day-after-day he had come, knowledge after knowledge, and experience after experience, remembering the darkness of the womb, having prescience of the darkness of death. Then between-while he had pushed open the doors of the cathedral and entered the twilight of both darknesses, the hush of the two-fold silence, where dawn was sunset, and the beginning and the

[30]<u>D. H. Lawrence: The Failure and the Triumph of Art</u>, 214-215.

> end were one. There his soul remained, at the apex of the arch, clinched in the timeless ecstasy, consummated (189-190).

The fact that Will later takes command of his own neighborhood church building comes as no surprise. It is in this activity that he reaches the level of satisfaction that his wife reaches through her children. Neither satisfaction is a directly religious one.

Although Will's manifestation of religion in his life culminates in an odd sort of contentment, his life with Anna has not always been one of contentment. His type of religion causes the majority of strife in their lives. Partially because of his great concern for mystery and emotion, Will has no great regard for the self, for the individual. This disregard for the individual greatly disturbs Anna:

> He did not care about himself as a human being. He did not attach any vital importance to his life in the drafting office, or his life among men. That was just merely the margin to the text. The verity was his connection with Anna and his connection with the Church, his real being lay in his dark emotional experience of the Infinite, of the Absolute.
>
> It exasperated her beyond measure. . . . Indeed her soul and her own self were one and the same in her. Whereas he seemed simply to ignore the fact of his own self, almost to refute it. He had a soul--a dark, inhuman thing caring nothing for humanity (148).

His non-concern for himself as an individual foreshadows Anton Skrebensky's disregard for himself as an individual. Because of his view of the human being, he cannot understand Anna's need for complete independence. He does not realize the extent of Anna's horror of his imposition of himself upon her being. Anna is constantly in fear for her soul.

The result of Will's beliefs and responses is a change of

attitude. He eventually recognizes not only the extent of the battle between them but also the extent of Anna's power over him. In a ritualistic gesture, he ruins a woodcarving he has been working on diligently, a woodcarving that Anna has severely criticized. She feels that his rendition of Eve has made her look like a "marionette" and is considerably smaller than his depiction of Adam. She resents the implication that a woman is not only smaller, lesser in importance than man, but is also subject to dependency. After he ruins the woodcarving, he finalizes the gesture by burning it. This act is a symbolic sacrifice of his beliefs for her beliefs, and its import is not lost to Anna. She realizes that she has won part of the battle.

Will continues to cling to Anna, despite their differences in opinion, clinging to her partially because he finally recognizes the importance of the individual, and also because he recognizes Anna as being the only real individual in his life:

> He wanted to leave her, he wanted to be able to leave her. For his soul's sake, for his manhood's sake, he must be able to leave her.
>
> But for what? She was the ark, and the rest of the world was flood. The only tangible, secure thing was the woman. He could leave her only for another woman. And where was this other woman, and who was the other woman? Besides, he would be just in the same state. Another woman would be woman, the case would be the same (175).

Shortly before his visit to the cathedral, Will Brangwen releases his hold on his wife: "He let go, he did not care what became of him. Strange and dim he became to himself, to her, to everybody. A vagueness had come over everything, like a drowning. He would insist no more, he would force her no more" (177-178). No reason

is given for his releasing of Anna; Will merely has "to give in."

After Will's releasing, he undergoes a curious kind of rebirth. His rebirth causes their relationship momentarily to change. A relaxed atmosphere prevails. Will can exist alone in the universe, free of any clinging onto Anna's independence: "Now at last he had a separate identity, he existed alone, even if he were not quite alone. Before he had only existed in to far as he had relations with another being. Now he had an absolute self--as well as a relative self" (178). Before his rebirth from non-being to being, Will has felt that there is no religion in life outside the church building; he now discovers the religion existing all around him:

> He listened to the thrushes in the gardens and heard a note which the cathedrals did not include: something free and careless and joyous . . . he was glad he was away from his shadowy cathedral. . . . There was life outside the church. There was much that the church did not include. He thought of God and of the whole blue rotunda of the day. That was something great and free (193).

Although Will Brangwen transcends a negative spiritual consummation to a broader physical consummation of religion, he never actually succeeds in becoming a fully integrated soul. Lawrence specifies Will's unfulfillment in the last paragraph of "The Cathedral." Will is making the best of his transcendence, even though the transcendence is not completely successful, for he never fully appreciates its breadth. He will never be completely fulfilled, for "something undeveloped in him limited him, there was a darkness in him which he <u>could</u> not unfold, which would never unfold in him" (197). Will's limitations and conflicts with his wife arise from his own imperfections.

Other characters in Lawrence's fiction also deal with the problem of religion. Such a character is Miriam Leivers (Sons and Lovers) who is Paul Morel's first love. Miriam is an intensely romantic, sensitive young girl who suffers a great deal in trying to maintain any semblance of personal dignity amidst a crew of brothers whose main joy in life is mocking her intensity. Miriam seeks many avenues of escape from her life at Willey Farm; one such avenue is through religion. Her interest in religion emerges naturally in her, for Miriam's mother has instilled in her a deep sense of the constancy of religion.

Miriam's idea of religion is one that allows no separation, no difference between Christ and God:

> Her great companion was her mother. They were both brown-eyed, and inclined to be mystical, such women as treasure religion inside them, breathe it in their nostrils, and see the whole of life in a mist thereof. So to Miriam, Christ and God made one great figure, which she loved tremblingly and passionately when a tremendous sunset burned out the western sky . . . . she went to church reverently, with bowed head, and quivered in anguish from the vulgarity of the other choir-girls and from the common-sounding voice of the curate (142).

Miriam's belief that God and Christ are inseparable is opposite to what Lawrence has outlined in his essay "On Being Religious." In this study of religion, he brings forth the notion that God is not only the "Goal," but is also allied with the Flesh. It is partially because of the connection with the Flesh that man constantly strives towards this Goal. Christ, on the other hand, corresponds with the spiritual aspects of man's nature. This spirituality must also be maintained, for it serves as a balancing agent with the physicality of man.

Because Miriam cannot comprehend the Laurentian separation of God and Christ, the separation of spirit and flesh, she has an unsuccessful relationship with Paul Morel. This is not, however, the sole cause of the difficulties, as discussed in the previous chapter. Miriam recognizes only the spiritual side of Paul and is both ignorant and afraid of the physical side of his nature.

The Leivers women employ religion as a means of escape. Their lives are not glamorous or fulfilling. One episode dealing with burnt potatoes clarifies both Miriam's position in the household and the way in which religion is used by the mother as a lever to elevate herself and Miriam from unsatisfying lives. Miriam has invited Paul to dinner and suffers intensely over every aspect of her being. She imagines herself "a maiden in bondage . . . in a land far away and magical" (145). Her dreams are far more satisfying than her ragged clothes and her worn-down boots. In her desire to have everything run smoothly for Paul and to transcend her lowly position, she nearly ruins the meal. Miriam constantly sneaks into the scullery to pull up a stocking or to fix a button, for she realizes that Paul's eyes miss nothing. Consequently, the potatoes which she is supposed to be tending boil dry and are virtually inedible. Mrs. Leivers serves them anyway and Miriam's brothers are merciless to her:

> "She hasn't got sense even to boil the potatoes," said Edgar. "What is she kept at home for?"
> "On'y for eating everything that's left in th' pantry," said Maurice (146).

Paul cannot understand the antagonism and the feeling of tension that constantly permeate the house; this tension results from

the mother's attitude toward religion:

> The mother exalted everything--even a bit of housework--to the plane of religious trust. The sons resented this; they felt themselves cut away underneath, and they answered with brutality and also with a sneering superciliousness (146-147).

Mrs. Leivers uses religion as a means to elevate herself and Miriam from their lives as pig-tenders. This utilization of religion results in disharmony within the house. Religion is not used as a means through which unity is achieved; the opposite is true.

This disharmony is manifested in the home because Mrs. Leivers has instilled in Miriam the Christian doctrine of "the other cheek" (147). Miriam uses this to her advantage, for she makes her rowdy brothers more furious when they fight with her:

> The boys loathed the other cheek when it was presented to them. Miriam was often sufficiently lofty to turn it. Then they spat on her and hated her. But she walked in her proud humility, living within herself (147).

It is precisely this attitude that Lawrence criticizes in Apocalypse. He loathes false humility:

> There is the Christianity of tenderness. But as far as I can see, it is utterly pushed aside by the Christianity of the self-glorification: the self-glorification of the humble . . . But it is what religion stands for today: down with all strong, free life, let the weak triumph, let the pseudo-humble reign. The religion of the self-glorification of the weak, the reign of the pseudo-humble. This is the spirit of society today, religious and political.[31]

Like Will Brangwen in The Rainbow, Miriam finds real satisfaction in church only. It is here that all her musings about being a beggar-princess, about transcending the pigs on the farm, seem

[31] Apocalypse, 16, 18.

real. Here her elevation is real:

> Miriam did not live till they came to the church. . . . The place was decorated for Easter. In the font hundreds of white narcissi seemed to be growing. The air was dim and coloured from the windows and thrilled with a subtle scent of lilies and narcissi. In that atmosphere Miriam's soul came into a glow . . . Her soul expanded into prayer (167).

Miriam does not utilize religion as a means by which she can integrate her soul into fullness; her limited attitude towards the church and religion isolate her being. Her religious attitude foreshadows unexpected problems with Paul. Her soul grows only in the unnatural atmosphere of the narcissi, the stone walls and the crowds of people. Her soul does not expand in an environment of physical love with Paul. In such an atmosphere, she remains isolated.

She is first fully drawn to Paul Morel in church when she feels he must share her emotions and attitudes about spirituality: "He felt the strange fascination of shadowy religious places. All his latent mysticism quivered into life. She was drawn to him. He was a prayer along with her" (167). Miriam does not realize that Paul responds not only to the spiritual atmosphere of the church, but also to the physical atmosphere of the natural world. His recognition of the importance of this existing duality halts any possibility of a successful relationship with Miriam. The fault is in Miriam's limitations, not his.

Miriam's sense of religion also permeates her attitude toward sex. She has constantly refused to enter a sexual relationship with Paul for several reasons. Her mother's influence on her stops

her from considering a sexual relationship to be a natural relationship, and her deep abiding sense of total spirituality blinds her to the possibility of physicality. On one occasion, shortly before the physical consummation of their relationship, Miriam shows Paul a wild-rose bush she has discovered. The episode outlines the sort of relationship Miriam desires and Paul's reaction to that attitude:

> Her soul quivered. It was the communion she wanted. He turned aside, as if pained. He turned to the bush.
>
> She looked at her roses. They were white, some incurved and holy, others expanded in an ecstasy. The tree was dark as a shadow. She lifted her hand impulsively to the flowers; she went forward and touched them in worship.
>
> "Let us go," he said.
>
> There was a cool scent of ivory roses--a white, virgin scent. Something made him feel anxious and imprisoned (160).

As H. M. Daleski points out, Miriam is trapping Paul. The passage from Sons and Lovers

> shows how Miriam maneuvers Paul into an intimacy which is not only irreproachable and would have her mother's sanction but also feeds and satisfies her own religious longings . . . She turns the wood into a church for herself but a prison for Paul.[32]

When Miriam finally consents to a sexual consummation after countless spiritual consummations, she manages to transform the physical experience into a religious experience; she places herself into the position of a modern-day martyr. The loss of her virginity is her martyrdom:

> Her big, brown eyes were watching him still and resigned and loving; she lay as if she had given herself up to sacrifice: there was her body for him; but the look at

[32] The Forked Flame, 68.

> the back of her eyes, like a creature awaiting immolation, arrested him, and all his blood fell back (289-290).

Miriam is totally unable to admit or understand the existence of a physical being. Anything that is physical, even the burning of potatoes, must be experienced in spiritual terms. Miriam cannot see the duality that Lawrence feels is vital to Christianity, and to a relationship. Lawrence further outlines the nature of this duality in "Study of Thomas Hardy":

> This Christianity would teach them to recognize and to admit the law of the other person, outside and different from the law of one's own being. It is the hardest lesson of love. And the lesson of love learnt, there must be learned the next lesson of reconciliation between different, maybe hostile things. That is the final lesson. Christianity ends in submission, in recognizing and submitting to the law of the other person. "Thou shalt love thy enemy."[33]

Because of her blindness, there is no hope for Miriam in any sort of integrated achievement.

It is through the character of Paul Morel in Sons and Lovers that Lawrence most clearly outlines the importance of the recognition of this duality of the spiritual and the physical. A close survey of Paul's religious background and development will illuminate the necessity of this duality for the fully integrated soul.

Paul's home life atmosphere is as combustible as Miriam's but the atmosphere in each household is different. When he meets Miriam Leivers, he is reaching manhood and is particularly sensitive to tensions that exist in the families. He is familiar with the tension in the Morel house; Gertrude Morel's hatred of her husband

[33] Phoenix, 512.

is no secret. The tension, however, at the Leivers' is different and Paul is attuned to the difference:

> Paul was just opening out from childhood to manhood. This atmosphere, where everything took a religious value, came with a subtle fascination to him. There was something in the air. His own mother was logical. Here there was something different, something he loved, something that at times he hated (147).

The young Paul is not accustomed to the great spirituality of Mrs. Leivers and Miriam. Being an extraordinarily sensitive boy, he immediately feels both sides of this spirituality. He recognizes its possible goodness, which he loves but he also senses its possible restrictions, which he can only hate. From the very outset of his relationship with Miriam, the future difficulties are outlined clearly.

The fascination of the spirituality grows in Paul. It is something still new and he is further captivated. In the scene at church on Easter, quoted extensively above, Miriam's attitude to the spirituality engulfs Paul. He is sensitive to her feelings, particularly about church, for he carefully anticipates her wishes. He is "sensitive to the feel of the place" (167), and carefully avoids going behind the communion rail, for which Miriam is grateful. Paul responds to the mystery of the decorated church. "He felt the strange fascination of shadowy religious places. All his latent mysticism quivered into life" (167). Although he senses and appreciates the spirit of the church, he does not become enmeshed in it, as Miriam is. Paul can appreciate and accept, yet is capable of recognizing the importance of things beyond the walls of the church, or the religious atmosphere of the Leivers' household.

As Paul matures, he increasingly questions the orthodox creed. His questioning arises at a time when there is harmony between his mother, himself, and Miriam; this harmony is ephemeral, for shortly, Paul is forced to make a choice between the two. Religion is a part of his decision. His questioning is violent and is nearly the death of Miriam for his criticism rips her soul to shreds:

> She was dreading the spring: he became so wild, and hurt her so much. All the way he went cruelly smashing her beliefs. . . . But Miriam suffered exquisite pain, as, with an intellect like a knife, the man she loved examined her religion in which she lived and moved and had her being. But he did not spare her. He was cruel. And when they were alone he was even more fierce, as if he would kill her soul (192).

The manner in which Paul questions Miriam's belief is not revealed. What we are given, is the result of the questioning; Miriam's spirituality is too burdensome and Paul eventually rids himself of her.

His criticism continues for much of their relationship. Paul attempts to explain, repeatedly, to Miriam, that one is not religious, or full of belief, on purpose; it is not a conscious act. Miriam, however, scoffs at this, feeling that she is right on this matter.

> "It's not religious to be religious," he said. "I reckon a crow is religious when it sails across the sky. But it only does it because it feels itself carried to where it's going, not because it thinks it is being eternal."
>
> But Miriam knew that one should _be_ religious in everything, have God, whatever God might be, present in everything.
>
> "I don't believe God knows such a lot about Himself," he cried. "God doesn't _know_ things, He _is_ things. And I'm sure He's not soulful" (250-251).

This episode particularly highlights their differences. Paul outlines to her his feelings and she totally ignores them, casting off

any possible synthesis. She cannot reconcile herself to any other possibilities than total spirituality.

Paul, however, feels the first glimmerings of the necessity of both the spiritual and the physical. Lawrence outlines most succinctly these necessities in "Study of Thomas Hardy":

> There is a law beyond the known law, there is a new Commandment. There is love. A man shall find his consummation the crucifixion of the body and the resurrection of the spirit.[34]

Lawrence has also outlined this necessary duality in the Foreward to Sons and Lovers, where he scorns the present supremacy of the Word or spirit and stresses the importance to mankind of the Flesh:

> For it is the Word hath charity, not the Flesh. And it is the Word that answereth the cry of the Word. But if the Word, hearing a cry shall say, "My flesh is destroyed, the bone melteth away," that is to blaspheme the Father. For the Word is but the fabric builded of the Flesh. And when the fabric is finished, then shall the Flesh enjoy it in its hour.
>
> But we have said, "Within this fabric of the Word the Flesh is held" and so, the Son has usurped the Father. And so, the Father, which is the Flesh, withdraws from us, and the Word stands in ruins, as Ninevah and Egypt are dead words on the plains, whence the Flesh has withdrawn itself. For the lesser cannot contain the greater, nor the Son contain the Father, but he is of the Father.[35]

Miriam will someday stand in ruins on the plains, as Ninevah and Egypt, for she has made the Word supreme and has ignored the Flesh. When Paul rejects Miriam the first time, he does so in her terms--religious terms:

[34] Phoenix, 467.

[35] E. W. Tedlock, D. H. Lawrence and Sons and Lovers (New York: New York University Press, 1965), 23.

> See, you are a nun. I have given you what I would give a holy nun--as a mystic monk to a mystic nun. Surely you esteem it best. Yet you regret--no, have regretted--the other. In all our relations no body enters. I do not talk to you through the senses--rather through the spirit (251).

Paul rejects the spirituality of Miriam because it is fatal to him.

At the heart of their difficulties are not only their attitudes towards religion, but also their attitudes toward sex. As discussed previously, Miriam must elevate all physical activities into the realm of the spiritual in order to fully accept them. Paul eventually recognizes the importance of physicality and worships the religion of the Flesh. He realizes the importance of sex to their relationship, for it is an indication of the existence of the dual importance of the Flesh and the Word. Paul endeavors to explain this to Miriam but Miriam only feels that Paul is trying to seduce her: "After all, he was only like other men, seeking his satisfaction" (284). This is Miriam's initial feeling, and her deeper feeling indicates that, potentially she realizes the existence of the physicality: "Oh, but there was something more in him, something deeper! She could trust to it, in spite of all desires" (284). Even though she feels there is something more, she never actually learns what it is. It is her refusal to grow, to become a fully integrated being, that ruins their relationship.

Paul eventually breaks off with her completely. He realizes her narrowness and recognizes the fact that to grow, he must leave Miriam. His leaving Miriam is an indication of his growth, for it represents a partial breaking off from his mother. Miriam is actually little more than a mother-substitute, for she smothers him

with affection as does his mother and is jealous of his feelings. His leaving his mother-figure, even though he returns to his real mother, shows the possibilities for Paul of standing on his own, of becoming a complete being.

On leaving Miriam, Paul enters into a relationship with Clara Dawes, a married woman who is much older than he. As discussed in the earlier chapter, he experiences a complete physical communion, a consummation of the Flesh, with Clara. This relationship is eventually unsatisfactory, for it like his relationship with Miriam is not dual in scope. Being completely physical, it lacks the spirituality needed.

After these unsuccessful relationships, after the death of his mother, Paul undergoes a type of rebirth, for he makes the choice, the decision of returning to life. He will not follow his mother's path to death:

> 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 (420).

According to Harry T. Moore,

> Paul's return to life hinges upon the final word, "quickly," which means livingly rather than rapidly: "The last word in Sons and Lovers is an adverb attesting not only to the hero's desire to live but also to his deep ability to do so." And it is this quickness, this vitality, which has enabled Paul to turn away from Miriam, then Clara, and now, finally from his mother.[36]

Paul's rebirth is not necessarily a strictly religious one,

[36]As quoted by Mark Spilka, The Love Ethic of D. H. Lawrence, 83.

but because of the fact that he can live without his mother it is likely he will eventually become a fully integrated being, for he, perhaps more than other Lawrentian characters, recognizes the importance of the simultaneous existence of the Word and the Flesh.

The Christ-Osiris figure of The Man Who Died surpasses Paul and other characters in his near perfect life of the Word and Flesh. Lawrence's unique interpretation of the Christ myth constitutes a "completion of Christianity rather than a contradiction."[37] In his essay "Resurrection," Lawrence states, "Now man cannot live without some vision of himself. But still less can he live with a vision that is not true to his inner experience and inner feeling."[38] In the figure of the "man who died," he attempts to present a complete living Christ to serve as a real "vision" for man. Lawrence's exquisite nouvelle very lucidly shows that "after we share in the body of Christ, we rise with him in the body."[39]

While much has been written on Lawrence's personal views on the "risen Lord" in an attempt to explicate the story, not as much has been said about how Lawrence combines the best of the pagan religion with Christianity to form his own new myth.[40] His use of the Isis-Osiris myth coupled with the Christ myth accounts for his

[37]Hough, The Dark Sun, 24.

[38]Phoenix II, 573.

[39]Ibid., 574.

[40]David L. Farmer discusses Lawrence's new myth, but not in the same terms, in "Christ and Isis: The Function of the Dying and Reviving God in The Man Who Died," D. H. Lawrence Review, V (Summer 1972), 121-132.

complete, unified interpretation of the ideal religious man. In Apocalypse, Lawrence praises and criticizes certain aspects of both the pagan religious view and Christianity. What he finds praiseworthy in both, he unites into his own religion of life. Lawrence stresses the idea that to live a religious life one must experience both spiritual and physical consummation, thus unifying God, the Father (the flesh principle) with God, the Son (the spirit principle) into the "Godhead of the Flesh."[41] The movement of the Osiris-Christ figure into this ideal consummation of self forms the dramatic and thematic import of the nouvelle. His spiritual fulfillment is due to his Christ-like nature; his physical one comes because of his pagan nature. At the beginning of the story he is barely alive and almost dead to any life of the Flesh. By the end, he has become a full human being who looks forward to "tomorrow."[42] The pagan mythological background enhances the physical passions he feels, while the Christian overtone enriches his being with its spiritual influence. How the two principles become incarnate in one man informs the following analysis.

The story begins where the Christ story of the New Testament ends--with the Resurrection of Christ. The Lawrentian Christ-figure at the beginning is not very heroic; in fact, he is just half a man, a man of the spirit only, and not the flesh. He is a physically weak man, newly escaped from his death tortures. The

[41]"Study of Thomas Hardy," 469.

[42]St. Mawr and The Man Who Died (New York: Random House, 1953), 211. All future references made to this edition will hereafter be cited parenthetically in the text.

epitome of the isolated man, he feels "alone" and "beyond loneliness" (166). He finds his physical surroundings repulsive and, by his lack of feeling, is dead to any life, even in himself. When he is reunited with Madeleine, the Mary Magdalene of the New Testament, he rejects his past role as her teacher: "My mission is over, and my teaching is finished, and death has saved me from my own salvation" (174), he tells her. His wish is now to live his own life, merely to be a man unto himself, and not used by others as he previously was. Truly Lawrentian in his outlook, the new Christ hopes to be both a man of the spirit and the flesh. He tells Madeleine that she can come live with him when he is "healed," or "in touch with the flesh" (175). He leaves Madeleine, representative of his past life, to join the lively peasants, representative of his hopes for the future.

His desires are patient ones since he has suffered so much and he knows he needs time to heal the wounds of his old self. The man who died does not want anyone to touch him, for, as he says, "'I am not yet risen to the Father'" (178), or the Flesh. His is a high passion which requires a special kind of touch to fulfill. He heals his wounds in his much needed solitude, and at the end of Part One, feels ready to grow into his new self. He tells the peasant who gives him lodging, "'The time is come for me to return to men'" (181). He further tells two travellers he meets on the road that "' he is risen, and in a little while will ascend unto the Father'" and that "'He is risen in the flesh'" (182). The new Christ desires to reach God primarily through his experiences with a woman, just as

Lawrence says that the way to God is through the exalted man-woman relation.[43] Yet Part One ends on a note of sadness. The newly resurrected man of the flesh travels "deeper into the phenomenal world, which is a vast complexity of entanglements and allurements" (183). The strong, egotistical madness of men and women disgusts the man who died:

> And the old nausea came back to him. For there was no contact without a subtle attempt to inflict a compulsion. And already he had been compelled even into death. The nausea of the old wound broke out afresh, and he looked again on the world with repulsion, dreading its mean contact (184).

Lawrence quite beautifully expresses the universal feelings of death which all truly living individuals experience time and again with each anti-life assault on their beings. The life-death-rebirth cycle repeats itself daily in men and women's lives, and Lawrence very hopefully believes in the individual's potential for rebirth. A person can achieve rebirth of body and spirit, as the Christ-Osiris man does in Part Two, by establishing "'living organic relations with the cosmos'" through "'the mystery of touch.'"[44]

Just as Part One centers mainly on the Christ-aspect of the man who died, Part Two completes the Christ-Osiris figure with the inclusion of the Isis-Osiris myth. In Apocalypse, Lawrence praises the pagan religions for their development of deep sensual awareness and a feeling of oneness with the cosmos in men and women. He laments that "we have lost almost entirely the great and intricately developed sensual awareness, or sense--awareness, and sense know-

[43]"The Crown," 25.

[44]Lawrence as quoted in Panichas, 20.

ledge of the ancients."[45] The man who died gains what Christians have lost through his sensual relation with the beautiful Isis.

The Isis-Osiris myth is one which deals with the theme of fertility. Isis is the ancient goddess of the "sunrise, the Queen of the South, the Beautiful, and the Beloved Lady of Abundance."[46] She and her mate, Osiris, ruled and civilized Egypt and its surrounding, once-barbaric area. Osiris is killed by a jealous rival, and Isis, after searching far and wide for his body, brings him back to life. In Lawrence's rendition of the myth, the "Isis in Search" (188) is again looking for her Osiris, and when she finds him in the person of the man who died, both are brought to a new life. It is only Osiris she may touch and love, for otherwise her womb is "cool" or almost "cold" (189). When she views the man who died sleeping, Isis, "a true priestess," sees "the other kind of beauty in it [his face], the sheer stillness of deeper life" (173). He is the first man to touch her "with the flame-tip of life" (173). She helps bring the now Christ-Osiris man into "the greater day of the human consciousness" (194).

Just as Lawrence says in Apocalypse that it takes a strong individual to live up to his fuller definition of Christianity,[47] the Christ-Osiris man finds it hard to let himself touch Isis.

[45] Apocalypse, 76.

[46] Norma Lorre Goodrich, The Ancient Myths (New York: New American Library, 1960), 32.

[47] Apocalypse, 28.

He thinks, "I am almost more afraid of this touch than I was of death. For I am more nakedly exposed to it" (202). Yet, once he experiences the life of the flesh, he appreciates the real meaning of life and love, according to Lawrence's "theology." Theirs is no common passion, like that which Isis' slaves experience early in Part Two of the story. Theirs is the mysterious, deeper passion which Lawrence exults time and again in his fiction. It is a feeling based on more than just physical sensation, as the following passage expounds:

> He was absorbed and enmeshed in new sensations. The woman of Isis was lovely to him, not so much in form, as in the wonderful womanly glow of her. Suns beyond suns had dipped her in mysterious fire, the mysterious fire of a potent woman, and to touch her was like touching the sun. Best of all was her tender desire for him,like sunshine, so soft and still (201).

They experience many days of "perfected" and "fulfilled" contact (208), but her Osiris must soon leave because of the feared betrayal of him by her mother and the slaves to the Roman guards. Isis is sad to see him leave her, yet even she wants "the coolness of her own air around her, and the release from anxiety." This is the same type of chasteness in love that Lawrence portrays in many other love relations, particularly in that of Lady Chatterley and Mellors.

Yet, the man who died has put his "touch forever upon the choice woman of this day," and carries "her perfume" in his "flesh like essence of roses" (211). He promises to return to her, "sure as Spring" (210). His final words reflect the ultimately hopeful tone of Lawrence's myth: "'So let the boat carry me. To-morrow is

another day'" (211). The life-death-rebirth cycle is as eternal as Nature itself, according to Lawrence. In his short Nature essay, "The Whistling of Birds," in Phoenix, Lawrence particularly expresses his faith in the eternal potential for rebirth in both Nature and human beings, the same faith that both Christ-Osiris and Isis experience. Thus, both "the man who died" and Isis grow into true integration of being, together, yet separately.

The Man Who Died stands as Lawrence's definitive statement on the ideal relation of Christianity to modern men and women. Some "good Christians" would find great fault with Lawrence's presentation of the Christ myth, for he strongly advocates the necessity for Christ to be especially identified with man in the flesh. But one can easily see why Lawrence chooses to portray his model as a man alive to the life of the flesh, as well as the spirit. As Panichas states, "When this identification becomes concrete and positive, in a creative and purposive sense, life takes on the 'religious form' for which Lawrence yearned."[48] Lawrence is not a Christian in the usual sense of the word, although he appreciates part of Christ's gospel of love. Lawrence says that man must go beyond the spiritual, bodiless, love that Christians now preach, to experience the exulted feelings of the flesh. He summarizes his new law of love as such: "In the act of love, in the act of begetting, Man is with God and of God. Such is the Law."[49]

The Lawrentian individual, as epitomized by the "man who died,"

[48] Adventures in Consciousness, 131.

[49] "Study of Thomas Hardy," 466.

can attain the highest level of integration by a proper religious reverence for life. He can enrich his relations with both his natural environment and others by a proper understanding of the nature of God and Christ, representative of consummation of the flesh and spirit, respectively. Lawrence's religious thought encompasses the whole of the individual's nature, both his body and soul, and thus forms a dynamic, whole "religion of life."

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

D. H. Lawrence is harshly critical of modern life, for he is aware of the dangers that can easily befall one's soul. Lawrence strongly feels the isolation in the universe, against which one must battle, in order to discover and preserve one's being. In his essay "The Spirit of Place," he formulates a theory which, if followed, can lead to an integration of being. One must first respond favorably to the natural environment, transcend the industrial quagmire and be able to maintain one's being through the perilous war times. One must also establish a deep contact not only with the opposite sex, but also with members of one's own sex.[1] And, finally, one must live a life of obeyance to one's private religion which comes from within. This paper has studied the isolation-integration theme in conjunction with various characters from Lawrence's major novels (Sons and Lovers, The Rainbow, Women in Love, and Lady Chatterley's Lover) and from selected works of shorter fiction.

Lawrence constantly stresses the importance of a positive, perpetual relationship with one's natural environment. In his novels, Paul Morel (Sons and Lovers) responds favorably to the

[1]Lawrence discusses only male-male relationships. He does not scorn female-female relationships; he merely does not discuss them.

natural environment, for his response is a sacramental one. His role in nature is a stimulating one, for he instills in others this perceptive awareness. Gerald Crich, on the other hand, responds negatively to his environment. Not only does he operate the mines that continuously fester the green lands, but he also tries to master natural objects. He remains forever isolated in the world, unable to achieve any semblance of integration.

Ursula Brangwen (The Rainbow) manages to achieve integration despite nearly suffocating family connections with the industrial community. Unlike Crich, she can transcend its limitations, for she is aware of its death force. She turns her back on her industrial world and faces the world of the rainbow, the world in which the filth of the world will be cleansed and integrated life can begin anew.

Clifford Chatterley (Lady Chatterley's Lover) cannot transcend his background, for he is crippled in mind as well as in body. Instead of working for integration, he strives forward, deeper into the world of isolation because he is blind to the natural world.

Lawrence views war as a corrupter of men, for men are not only forced to fight over acquisitions, but are also forced to behave like a machine. Anton Skrebensky (The Rainbow) further isolates his being because of his participation in the war machine. On the other hand, Oliver Mellors (Lady Chatterley's Lover) returns from war a more integrated being, for he can transcend the debilitating experiences.

Outstanding illustrations in the short fiction of the person isolated from his environment are Captain Hauptmann in "The Prussian Officer," Elizabeth Bates in "The Odour of Chrysanthemums," and the vicar in The Virgin and the Gipsy. The epitome of integrated beings are the gipsy in The Virgin and the Gipsy, Lou in St. Mawr, and Count Dionys in The Ladybird. In their success at relating properly to various aspects of their environment, they stand as some of Lawrence's most memorable characters. Captain Hauptmann is like Skrebensky in his mechanistic nature; Count Dionys is like Mellors in his successful survival of military life. Lou, although similar to Ursula in her hope for rebirth of being, goes beyond any female characters through her unique, close kinship with her natural environment. Elizabeth Bates epitomizes the "nagging materialism" of the collier's wife, a recurring image of Lawrence's fiction. The vicar and the gipsy exemplify the "life-unbelievers" and "life-believers," respectively, categories in which most of Lawrence's characters can be classified.

Lawrence also feels the importance of maintaining a close relationship with mankind, for alienation is a constant threat to modern man. Man instinctively desires a relationship with another member of the great community: "What man most passionately wants is his living wholeness and his living unison, not his own isolate salvation of his 'soul.' "[2]

[2]D.H. Lawrence, Apocalypse, 199.

Rupert Birkin establishes his contact to the community through his relationship with Ursula Brangwen and through his relationship with Gerald Crich. His contact with Crich is important, for Lawrence firmly believes in a Blutbruederschaft, a blood-brotherhood for men.

Gerald remains in isolation, for he fails where Rupert succeeds. His relationship with Gudrun Brangwen is unsuccessful, largely because of his own misconceptions concerning love. Gerald's isolation is extended with his denial to participate in Rupert's proffered blood-brotherhood. Gerald finds no salvation any where. Mrs. Morel (Sons and Lovers) is similarly isolated, for she has no life beyond her family. No integration occurs for her; she lives a shallow life, devoid of meaning except within her family. Different from Mrs. Morel is Connie Chatterley, who finds wholeness of being through her relationship with Oliver Mellors. Mellors rescues her soul from a stifling existence with her husband, a man who has isolated himself.

Similar to Gerald and Mrs. Morel in their failures to find their place in the community of man are Cathcart in "The Man Who Loved Islands," Egbert in "England, My England, " Dolly Urquhart in "The Princess," and the married couples in "The Overtone" and "The Primrose Path." These characters of short fiction illustrate Lawrence's vision of the failure of modern men and women to establish vital relations with their fellow human beings. Like the successful couples of the novels, Mabel and Dr. Ferguson ("The

Horse Dealer's Daughter") and Geoffrey and Lydia (Love Among the Haystacks) find integration through the central man-woman relation. Captain Hepburn, like Birkin at one time, further hopes for a blood-brotherhood relation. He has never tasted the bitter failure to attain Blutbruederschaft with any one man, unlike Birkin who fails with Gerald Crich.

The culmination of Lawrence's integration theme is contained in his idea of religion. His religion of life, as it were, is a constant assertion of the importance of living, for it stresses the need for a physical consummation as well as a spiritual consummation in life.

In Lawrence's novels, there is a plethora of characters who remain isolated from the religion of life. Anna Brangwen (The Rainbow) is isolated, for she cannot participate in the established religion and cannot communicate with her husband. Her refusal to accept his religion causes a failure in their relationship. Will Brangwen (The Rainbow), Anna's husband, is also isolated but for a different reason. He blindly accepts all church doctrine, yet he feels more for the church building than he does for the church service.

Miriam Leivers (Sons and Lovers) remains isolated because her concept of religion serves as an elevating force, one which sets her apart. Her religious concepts are a hindrance to integration for they prevent her from physically loving Paul Morel. Paul Morel nearly achieves integration through religion, perhaps more closely

SEP 6 / 1 0 2

than any other novel figure, for he not only questions the established religion, but he also postulates his own ideas. These ideas incorporate the importance of both a physical and spiritual consummation, and Paul lives a life carefully following these dual lines.

Of Lawrence's short fiction, "The Border Line," The Virgin and the Gipsy and "Daughter's of the Vicar" portray Lawrence's religious view of life and love. The Vicars of the second and third listed works, like Will and Anna Brangwen and Miriam Leivers, fail to follow any true religious impulses "from within." These ministers of institutionalized religion remain dead to any life-giving impulses. The modern religious myth, The Man Who Died, best dramatizes Lawrence's view of the Christ-man, or more specifically, his exultation of the life of both the Flesh and Spirit. The Christ-Osiris man reaches the highest level of integration of all the Lawrentian characters; he most perfectly experiences both physical and spiritual consummation, central to Lawrence's views.

A Selected Bibliography

Beebe, Maurice. "Lawrence's Sacred Fount: The Artistic Theme of Sons and Lovers." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, IV (1962-3), 539-552.

Bertocci, Angelo P. "Symbolism in Women in Love" in D. H. Lawrence Miscellany, ed. Harry T. Moore. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1959, 83-102.

Brett, Dorothy. Lawrence and Brett. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1933.

Cavitch, David. D. H. Lawrence and the New World. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Clements, A. L. "The Quest for Self: D. H. Lawrence's The Rainbow." Thoth (Spring 1962), 90-100.

Cowan, James C. D. H. Lawrence's American Journey. Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University Press, 1970.

Crump, G. B. "Women in Love: Novel and Film." D. H. Lawrence Review, 4 (Spring 1971), 28-41.

Daleski, H. M. The Forked Flame. London: Faber and Faber, 1965.

deRougemont, Denis. Love in the Western World. New York: Pantheon, 1956.

Englander, Ann. "'The Prussian Officer': The Self Divided." Sewanee Review, LXXI (October-December, 1963), 605-619.

Farmer, David. "Christ and Isis: The Function of the Dying and Reviving God in The Man Who Died." D. H. Lawrence Review V (Summer 1972), 121-137.

Goodrich, Norma Lorre. The Ancient Myths. New York: New American Library, 1960.

Hadspath, Robert. "Duality as Theme and Technique in D. H. Lawrence's 'The Border Line.'" Studies in Short Fiction, IV (Fall 1966) 51-56.

Hough, Graham. The Dark Sun. London: Gerald Duckworth, 1968.

Karl, Frederick R. "Lawrence's 'The Man Who Loved Islands': The Crusoe Who Failed," in D. H. Lawrence Miscellany, ed. Harry T. Moore. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1959, 265-279.

Lawrence, D. H. Apocalypse. New York: Viking Press, 1969.

______________. The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Harry T. Moore. London: Heinemann, 1962.

______________. The Complete Short Stories. New York: Viking Press, 1967.

______________. Four Short Novels of D. H. Lawrence. New York: Viking Press, 1968.

______________. Lady Chatterley's Lover. London: Penguin Books, 1971.

______________. Phoenix, ed. Edward D. McDonald. New York: Viking Press, 1968.

______________. Phoenix II, eds. Warren Roberts and Harry T. Moore. New York: Viking Press, 1970.

______________. Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious. New York: Viking Press, 1967.

______________. The Rainbow. New York: Modern Library, 1915.

______________. Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963.

______________. St. Mawr and The Man Who Died. New York: Alfred P. Knopf, 1953.

______________. Sons and Lovers. New York: Viking Press, 1958.

______________. Studies in Classic American Literature. New York: Viking Press, 1961.

______________. The Virgin and the Gipsy. New York: Alfred P. Knopf, 1970.

______________. Women in Love. New York: Viking Press, 1960.

Leavis, F. R. D. H. Lawrence: Novelist. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968.

Linderberger, Herbert. "Lawrence and the Romantic Tradition" in D. H. Lawrence Miscellany, ed. Harry T. Moore. Carbondale: University of Southern Illinois Press, 1959, 326-341.

Martin, W. R. "'Freedom Together' in D. H. Lawrence's Women in Love." English Studies in Africa, VIII (1965), 112-20.

McCabe, Thomas H. "Rhythm as Form in Lawrence: 'The Horse-Dealer's Daughter.'" PMLA, LXXXVII (January 1972), 64-69.

Moynahan, Julian. "Lady Chatterley's Lover: The Deed of Life." English Literary History, XXVI (March 1959), 66-90.

Panichas, G. A. Adventure in Consciousness. London: Folcroft, 1964.

Pritchard, R. E. D. H. Lawrence, Body of Darkness. London: Hutchinson and Company, 1971.

Schorer, Mark. "D. H. Lawrence and 'The Spirit of Place'" in D. H. Lawrence Miscellany, ed. Harry T. Moore. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1959.

______________. "Women in Love" in The Achievement of D. H. Lawrence, ed. F. Hoffman. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1953, 163-177.

Spilka, Mark. The Love Ethic of D. H. Lawrence. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1955.

Tedlock, E. W. D. H. Lawrence and Sons and Lovers. New York: New York University Press, 1965.

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

Weiner, S. Ronald. "Irony and Symbolism in 'The Princess'" in D. H. Lawrence Miscellany, ed. Harry T. Moore. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1959, 221-238.

Weiss, Daniel. Oedipus in Nottingham. Spokane: University of Washington Press, 1962.

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

Williams, Raymond. "The Social Thinking of D. H. Lawrence" in D. H. Lawrence Miscellany, ed. Harry T. Moore. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1959, 295-311.

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