THE SISTERS

A STUDY OF LAWRENCE'S MODE OF FEMALE CHARACTERIZATION

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA

PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO E LETRAS

THE SISTERS:
A STUDY OF D.H.LAWRENCE'S MODE OF FEMALE CHARACTERIZATION.

Dissertação submetida à Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, para a obtenção do Grau de Mestre em Letras, área de Inglês.

IRENE RIBAROLLI PEREIRA DA SILVA

JUNHO - 1977

Esta dissertação foi julgada adequada para a obtenção de grau de

MESTRE DE LETRAS

e aprovada em sua forma final pelo orientador e pelo Programa de Pós-Graduação.

Prof. John B. Derrick
-Orientador-

Profa. Doloris Ruth Simões de Almeida
-Coordenadora-

Banca Examinadora:

Prof. John B. Derrick, PhD

Prof. Arnold Selig Gordenstein, PhD

Prof. Bonifácio Moreira Pinto, MA.

In Memoriam

Gildo,
Odete,
Gilson,
Gildete,
Gisele
e
Gislaine

OFERECIMENTO

À profa. Ruth Kaphan, grande amiga, que não apenas me estimulou durante a realização deste trabalho mas que participou de todas as fases de sua elaboração, comentando detalhadamente as idéias, livremente dando suas próprias, corrigindo erros e até mesmo coordenando a montagem final deste manuscrito.

À minha família, inteira, que, resignada e pacientemente, acompanhou, suportou e viveu as lutas de uma mulher moderna em sua desesperada busca de um lugar no mundo dos homens. Obrigada, queridos, pela tolerância, compreensão e encorajamento.

AGRADECIMENTOS

- Ao Programa de Pós-graduação em Letras da UFSC, sua coordenadora, meus professores e colegas de curso.

- À Universidade Estadual de Maringá, por ter possibilitado a realização do curso de pós-graduação e a elaboração deste trabalho.

- Ao prof. Alexis Levitin, pelo estímulo durante o curso de pós-graduação.

- Um agradecimento muito especial ao professor Dr. John B. Derrick, pela sábia e paciente orientação deste trabalho. Seu profundo conhecimento de D.H. Lawrence levou-me a fazer de The Sisters "a stepping-stone into his Widdershins."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE SISTERS: A Study of Lawrence's Mode of Female Characterization.

A B S T R A C T

The Rainbow and Women in Love were conceived as part of a larger novel to be entitled The Sisters, in which the lives of the sisters, Ursula and Gudrun, were described.

At a certain point in the writing, Lawrence separated the two novels from their matrix: one portion became The Rainbow, a greater part of which highlighted the life of Ursula, whereas Gudrun's story was most thoroughly described in Women in Love.

A study of the characterization of the sisters in the two books reveals that Lawrence's view of the woman as phallic — independent, active, powerful — remains unaltered from one book to the other. Yet his attitude towards her changed profoundly: from a benevolent, reverent attitude toward her phallic powers in The Rainbow, he begins to attack the same powers in Women in Love.

Both his view of the woman and his attitude towards her have more than a thematic import on his work, particularly on his mode of characterization: whether the view is an inside one, as in The Rainbow, where Lawrence identifies with his heroine, or an objective one, as in Women in Love, where Lawrence judges her, his view of the woman as phallic helps to create round characters. Yet, in his change of attitude towards her will lie the reason for a very drastic change, for when Lawrence portrays the woman who will become man's partner, his wish for a more docile mate brings him to change his portrayal, to show a submissive woman: in forcing her development in this way, the characterization becomes flat.

Lawrence can therefore be considered a good portrayer of female characters when he endows them with phallic attributes and allows them to develop coherently.

AS IRMÃS: Um Estudo da Criação de Personagens Femininas na Obra de Lawrence.

RESUMO

The Rainbow, o Arco-Íris, e Women in Love, Mulheres Apaixonadas, foram concebidos como partes de um romance mais dilatado que, sob o título The Sisters, As Irmãs, descreveria a vida das irmãs Ursula e Gudrun.

Em dado momento, a obra inicial foi dividida em duas: The Rainbow, que, em sua maior parte, focaliza a vida de Ursula, e Women in Love, onde a vida de Gudrun é mais profundamente tratada.

Um estudo da caracterização das irmãs revela que, em Lawrence, a mulher é fálica — independente, ativa, dominadora — e esta visão permanece inalterada nos dois livros. Entretanto, sua atitude para com a mulher muda profundamente de um livro para outro: a reverência que ele demonstra pelos poderes fálicos da mulher em The Rainbow transforma-se em agressão à esses mesmos poderes em Women in Love.

Tanto a sua visão da mulher como a sua atitude para com ela ultrapassam o nível temático já que lhe possibilitam a criação de personagens redondas. Isto se depreende da análise do ponto de vista que desenvolve as personagens, quer quando Lawrence se identifica com a mulher, como em The Rainbow, tratando-a, pois, do ponto de vista interior, quer quando ele a trata objetivamente, julgando-a.

A mudança de atitude não interferiria na criação de personagens complexas, não fosse o fato de que um desejo incontido de Lawrence, o homem, por uma companheira dócil e submissa para o herói, viesse sobrepujar o artista, o que destrói a rotundidade de sua personagem.

Lawrence pode, portanto, ser considerado um bom retratista de personagens femininas, quando ele as dota de atributos fálicos e permite que elas se desenvolvam coerentemente.

CHAPTER I

I N T R O D U C T I O N

A - THE PROBLEM OF LAWRENCE'S AMBIVALENCE TOWARDS WOMAN AND THE CRITICS' RESPONSES TO IT

1 - The paradox of Lawrence's reputation

"... even contradictory truths do not displace one another"

Lawrence

Lawrence's treatment of the female in his works has evoked the most contradictory responses: some critics express their amazement at Lawrence's understanding of woman's nature, others comment more caustically about Lawrence's view of the female. Still others remain indifferent, and their indifference can be viewed as a sign of their acceptance of the author's psychology. Among the first we would cite Martin Green, who claims for Lawrence the title of "Luther of Matriarchy,"[1] grounding his defense on the assumption that Lawrence lived through and for the world of the female. The feminists can be placed among those who abjure the Laurentian view of the female and take his rhetoric of male assertion as the measure of Lawrence's "chauvinism." In the last group we can include F.R. Leavis and Mark Spilka, writers who belong to the Lawrence revival of the fifties. An objective look at these schools of writers will reveal that the three different responses are perfectly viable and at the same time help to detect the line of development in the critics' awareness of Lawrence's ambivalence towards woman.

Discrediting John Middleton Murry, who thirty years before had argued that "in Lawrence the sexual woman is hated,"[2] the generation of critics that belongs to the Lawrence revival takes Lawrence's value judgements on women and on their roles at face value. In their defense we might say that they were, firstly, preoccupied with gaining for Lawrence the reputation of a great writer, and this preoccupation led them to concentrate their attention on Lawrence's profoundly religious attitude towards sex and marriage, his awareness of the process of dissolution in modern life, and his intense belief in the possibility of the individual achieving salvation through a perfectly polarized relationship. F.R. Leavis, the most influential critic of this period, reverently praises Lawrence's efforts at building "a new relation"[3] between man and woman, very often endorsing Lawrence's diagnosis of the causes for the failure of marital relations, a failure that, given the nature of Lawrence's heroines, is generally attributed to the female. Leavis finds fault only with the resolution that Lawrence gives to the conflicts brought about by "the complex and indocile reality"[4] of married life. This drawback is minimized by Leavis' stress on the essential quality of Lawrence's writings: the restorative power of Lawrence's art. With Lawrence, Leavis holds that the novel matters because it "can inform and lead into new places the flow of our sympathetic consciousness, and it can lead our sympathy away in recoil from things gone dead."[5]

Leavis' reflections on the convincingness of Lawrence's diagnosis and prescriptions bring into the open several interesting insights which, however, considering

the nature of his speculations, he lets pass by unchecked. He registers the bid for mastery which recurs so consistently in the man-woman relation, and neither Lovat's request for his wife's submission, in Kangaroo, nor Alexander's avowal that woman must "honour and obey" him, in "The Captain's Doll,"[6] disturb Leavis. Again although he registers the changes woman must undergo when submission is required of her, he finds the heroes' attitudes toward their partners "right,"[7] provided that these changes are artistically rendered. Leavis also notices the natural preponderance that is given to woman "contained and sustainer"[8] of the male, the Magna Mater, "the type-figure adverted to so much in Women in Love of a feminine dominance that must defeat the growth of any prosperous long-term relation between a man and a woman."[9] Yet Leavis never asks why Lawrence gives women such prerogatives that make them so powerful and destructive in the first place. Finally, he subtly observes that "again and again Lawrence's art deals with the woman, nerve-worn and strained or lethally sardonic, in whom life has gone wrong because she is committed to the man's part, or to contempt for it, or to living in a mode that gives it no place."[10] Yet Leavis never questions the reasons for Lawrence's preference for the woman who is a neurotic, nor asks what makes her so, or what are the profound causes for her failure to achieve fulfillment in life.

Mark Spilka, another critic of the Lawrence revival, follows Leavis' method of criticism to some extent: he admires the intense vitality of Lawrence's writings, he praises Lawrence's struggle to build a "Love Ethic" that

could be valuable for his readers and yet, like Leavis, his excessive concern with the "prophetic and didactic"[11] qualities of Lawrence's writings leaves him undisturbed by Lawrence's treatment of the female. Spilka, in fact, seems less disturbed than Leavis because he comes to the point of registering Aldington's subtle apprehension of the existence of a double standard in Lawrence's norms for a successful marriage, then simply discards it. He dismisses Aldington's "what was wrong for (woman) was right for (man) if he (the man) happened to want...it"[12] on the basis that Lawrence's heroes tend to refuse the "counterfeit," "destructive"[13] love that women offer them. Spilka, who wisely detects the presence of "the sensual element"[14] in every Blutbrüderschaft scene, even defends the formula proposed by Birkin to shatter the women's tendency to destroy the male. To him, that formula is Lawrence's most serious effort at establishing a relationship that "preserves the intrinsic 'otherness' of each participant,"[15] whereas, in fact, Birkin's formula is used to preserve his own otherness and it contains the double standard pointed out by Aldington.

Even a woman critic - and a very perceptive one since she captured the futuristic strain of Lawrence's art - responded to Lawrence's treatment of the female in the same way as did Leavis and Spilka. Mary Freeman considered that Lawrence searched "for a more...life-giving understanding"[16] between man and woman, "not just for the solution of Lawrence's own problems, but for the good of mankind."[17]

Freeman analyses the similarities and differences between Lawrence and the futurists, both of whom were "obsessed"[18] with a world full of suffering, destruction and death.

Whereas the futurists accepted and even glorified this corruption, Lawrence attempted, in his characterizations, to integrate dissolution with the possibility of creative relations between man and woman.

Freeman does not separats Lawrence's treatment of the female from his treatment of the male, except to remark that in Women in Love "the women ... are touchstones for testing the soundness of (the males') adjustments."[19]

Graham Hough is the first critic of the Lawrence revival to call the critics' attention to Lawrence's idiosyncratic view of the female and to his ambivalent attitude towards her. He perceives that the recurrent theme of "dominance and submission"[20] and Lawrence's extreme concern with this aspect of man-woman relations reflect Lawrence's personal view of the female as a possessive being: by making woman the allpowerful, Lawrence's males have to struggle against her domination or her "bullying."[21] Hough also registers the changes of attitude towards women that Lawrence's art reflects: from a passive resignation to female power and later a bitter complaint against the female's tendency to dominance,Lawrence's males attempt to make the woman submissive, till, finally,the shift takes the form of a female sacrifice. Hough is perceptive enough to notice that Lawrence's "singular ability to portray the power of a relation between persons, its enduring vitality"[22] is affectad and distorted when an "impurity of motive, perceptible but hard to pin down" intrudes in the narrative. Commenting on "The Princess," Hough says: "... it is hard to get rid of the feeling that the author, not only his character, also wants to revenge himself on all cold white

women, especially if they are rich" and, in his opinion, "it is this suspicion of a suppressed sexual malice in the tale, rather than the subject itself, that makes it offensive."[23]

This suspicion becomes certainty in the hands of Simone de Beauvoir, who labels this impurity of motive open misogyny. She claims that "Lawrence detests modern women" and "forbids his female characters to have an independent sensu - ality"[24] in spite of his male's constant avowals for a mutual meeting and sharing. More vigorously, Kate Millett, another feminist, draws almost the same conclusions about Lawrence's treatment of the female. She contends that Lawrence fears and hates the independent woman that the sexual revolution has helped to create. According to her, Lawrence then creates the myth of the "New Woman"[25] as a devouring vampire[26] and directs the efforts of his artistic career towards her destruction. He assigns his heroes the mission of eradicating the modern woman's "self, ego, will, individuality,"[27] allowing his males to withdraw from women who refuse them thorough submission and also to form, instead, a more satisfactory relationship with a man. Lawrence is spared her caustic accusations only insofar as The Rainbow is concerned, where she acknowledged that the two heroines of the first half of that novel, Lydia and Anna, are given "enormous power," and moreover, that their author even approves of their domineeringness because here Lawrence is not dealing with "the new woman."[28] Both Simone de Beauvoir and Kate Millet brand Lawrence a subtle "chauvinist"[29]: Beauvoir calls his novels "guide-books for women"[30] who otherwise would not understand the importance of their own surrender, while Millett demonstrates further

that Lawrence often uses the woman herself as spokesman for his masculine message that the woman must submit to the male.

In his The Prisoner of Sex Norman Mailer counter-attacks the feminists' attitude. In his defense of Lawrence he condemns Millett's lack of fidelity to Lawrence's writings, showing how Millett very skillfully distorte the real evidences by small moves,brief elisions in the quotations, and the suppression of passing contradictions. The core of his argument lies in his assumption that Millett subtly concealed the emotional conflict that made of Lawrence "a cauldron of boiling opposites - he was on the one hand a Hitler in a teapot, on the other he was the blessed breast of tender love."[31] This emotional conflict, Mailer contends, took Lawrence from adoration of woman to lust for her murder, then took him back to worship her beauty, even her procreative beauty. According to him, "never had a male novelist written more intimately about women - heart, contradiction and soul: never had a novelist loved them more, been so comfortable in the tides of their sentiment, and so ready to see them murdered."[32]

This bird's-eys view of the responses that Lawrence's treatment of the female has evoked shows the critics' growing awareness of the element of misogyny in Lawrence's works, and Mailer's defense of Lawrence helps the reader to see that, in spite of Mailer's anger at that he calls Millett's "narrow argument," there is a point of intersection that puts his thesis and Millett's in similar perspective. While Mailer praises Lawrence's capacity to understand women, he acknowledged Lawrence's desire to have them killed; while

Millett's thesis is directed towards the demonstration of Lawrence's misogyny and chauvinism, she cannot help pointing out Lawrence's fairness to women in The Rainbow, the very novel which is considered one of his greatest achievements. If - as Mailer justly points out - Millett tends to avoid dealing with aspects that might disturb the smooth course of her argument, Mailer is his counter-attack also tends to slide around the kinds of things in her arguments that might reveal her veiled and unemphasized recognition of Lawrence's peculiar understanding of the female nature. Oddly enough, Mailer, who intended to protect Lawrence against "Millett's critical misdemeanor,"[33] practices the same crime against Millett, Yet, instead of invalidating each other's arguments, this dispute makes clear to us that in spite of their intention to tip the balance in the direction of their predilection, their basic honesty refuses to give in to any pattern that would simplify Lawrence: they become, instead, one voice to proclaim Lawrence's ambivalence. Furthermore, since their attitudes point to the existence of a consensus - the acceptance that Lawrence both loved and hated woman, and thus can be viewed both as a "Luther of Matriarchy" and a "chauvinist" - it is possible to acknowledge Lawrence's ambivalence as the element behind the opposing and yet coherent value judgements so far registered.

2. Resolution of the paradox: Lawrence's sexual ambivalence

> You will never go wrong in concluding that a man once loved deeply whatever he hates, and loves it yet...
> George Groddeck

Millett and Mailer's view has more or less coincided with the emergence of the new Freudian achool of critics whose study is not so much concerned with the artistic validity of a work of art as with its psychologic source. These critics tend to see Lawrence's art less as a "concrete vision of experience with normative value for his readers"[34] and more as a record of Lawrence's self-analysis as well as a document of Lawrence's self-induced therapy, his efforts at coming to terms with his inner conflicts. Their approach is supported both by psychoanalysis, which regards every human gesture as profoundly significant and which as a corollary sees every work of art as "a museum piece of the unconscious, an occasion to contemplate the unconscious frozen into one of its possible gestures"[35] as well as by Lawrence's own testimony: "I always say, my motto is Art for my sake"[36]; "One sheds one's sickness in books, repeats and presents again one's emotions, to be master of them."[37]

Weiss, Ford, Daleski, and more recently, Cavitch, Pritchard and Derrick have explored Lawrence's self-analytic use of art, and all agree that Lawrence's view of the woman as assertive, and his changes of attitude towards this for - ever recurrent trait in her, spring from Lawrence's psychic division and his "quest for psychic freedom."[38] According to them, Lawrence's inability to overcome his Oedipal past caused a splitting of consciousness, a disproportion between the male and female elements within himself: as a consequence, Lawrence spent his life striving to effect the balance. The psychogenesis of this split can be traced back to the moment when the son, caught up in the Oedipal dilemna, escapes

his desire to possess the mother by yelding to the fantasy of becoming a woman. Since in Lawrence's home his mother "freed herself at least mentally and spiritually from the husband's domination"[39] and became the ruler "by a sort of divine right of motherhood"[40] Lawrence came to see women as assertive, domineering, masculine beings who castrate their husbands/sons. All these critics agree that the woman projected in his art will always bear traces of his negative identification with this castrating, punitive mother whom Lawrence ambivalently loved and hated. They also agree that her recreation in art may be seen as his attempt to clarify his ambivalent attitute towards her and to gain control over his identification with her. Daleski, Pritchard and Derrick maintain that the sharp swings from adoration of woman to hatred of her, which his art registers, are ultimately Lawrence's attempts at living with the woman within him, a woman who made of him a feminine male and a masculine female.

Lawrence's biographers cite several instances of Lawrence's typical androgyny: his preference for feminine company, his ability to do household jobs, his withdrawal from masculine games; there is also "E.T."'s intimate report that Lawrence once expressed his desire that she were sexless and her testimony of Lawrence's excessive emotional disturbance in contact with the moon, the planet which in his works will represent an almost supernatural female will and power. Yet none of these instances is clearer than Lawrence's own understanding of his problem: "Would God a she-wolf had suckled me, and stood over me with her paps and kicked me back into a rocky corner when she'd had enough of me. It

might have made a man of me."[41]

Lawrence's own admission of his femininity does not imply, however, his acceptance of it. Following the school of criticism mentioned above, one can say of Lawrence what Emil Gutheil said about one of his patients: he strove "in the same degree in which he had yielded to the fantasy of being a woman, to suppress in his person every manifestation of feminine nature. ... He could not destroy the woman within himself; he fantasied on the other hand continually a mass murder of the entire female sex ... " [42] Lawrence fought against his identification with the feminine because to accept it would entail accepting his wish for a male object, accepting his homoerotic desires. This, his "anti-puritanical puritan"[43] mind would not allow. Therefore, to hide covert homosexual desires, Lawrence, like the other "nine-tenths of the men of (his) generation"[44] must espouse the importance of heterosexual love stridently as a sort of blind. As Firenczi says: "in order to free themselves from men, they become the slaves of women."[45] Hence his overestimation of woman, his cry of resentment against her cocksureness, and his view of himself as a "hensure man", a "being crucified into sex."

Psychoanalytical studies suggest to us that Lawrence's unacknowledged femininity is the source of his unrivalled ability to portray the modern, "phallic"[46] woman from within. They also help us to understand that both his love for this woman and his lust for her murder are rooted in the psychosexual conflicts that his identification with her caused him to suffer. Further, in a theory developed out

of the notion of the "S" curve, George Ford explains the forms that love-hate for the female take in Lawrence's art, showing how his attitude toward her undergoes chronological changes. Thus, his early works reveal a strong love for the mother which has its counterpart in a fearful hatred for the father: the novel of this period, Sons and Lovers, is a conscious hymn of love for the mother. Then, later in life, Lawrence comes to understand the crippling influences of the mother on him and tries to form an identification with the father. From love of woman he changes to feelings of hatred for her and a desire for her death: in The Plumed Serpent, from this period, the female protagonist submits to the male, and in his "Sacrifice" Fiction, in stories like "The Woman Who Rode Away", the modern woman is sacrificed altogether, body and soul.

B - DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM UNDER INVESTIGATION

First contacts with Lawrence's works give one the sense that Lawrence's psychic struggle takes a different form in each stage of his artistic career. Since, from the first, my interest in Lawrence was primarily directed towards the forms that Lawrence's ambivalence towards woman takes in his works, I thought it necessary to investigate the presence of each of these ambivalent feelings - hatred and love - in different periods of his career. Previous scholarship made me aware that these feelings are co-present in every period, and more specifically, in every work. Daleski has shown how the

suppressed love for the father in Sons and Lovers becomes apparent whenever Lawrence portrays the father dramatically. Derrick has shown that though Lawrence tries to suppress sympathy for the female in The Plumed Serpent, it creeps back to the surface in the form of Lawrence's own ego-consciousness, the female persona.

I chose, then, to examine the forms that Lawrence's attitude toward the female takes in the so-called "Two in One"[47] period, that is, the period in which Lawrence's artistic career is at its highest. My concern will be with his attitude toward his female protagonists in his two novels of that period, The Rainbow and Women in Love.

I accept as a premise that Lawrence's old anxiety over the mother has made him identify with and introject the phallic mother and equate women with her: thus the modern women that Lawrence re-creates in The Rainbow and Women in Love derive from the maternal prototype. Since the "Two in One" period marks both Lawrence's relationship with woman at its best, and then his changing attitude toward her, it is the general purpose of this dissertation to show that The Rainbow and Women in Love contain all the elements that characterize Lawrence's earlier relation with the archetypal mother: his love and attraction to her as well as the seed of misogyny that marks his attitude towards her later.

What makes the women we are going to deal with - Ursula of The Rainbow, Gudrun and Ursula II of Women in Love - archetypally one, is their abnormal bisexuality.[48] The phallic traits with which Lawrence endows them cause a disproportion between their male and female components, and

their central drama is contained in their struggle to effect the balance: all three try to come to terms with their phallic attributes; all three are active and assertive; all three chastise their men; all three must cope with a more or less suppressed homosexual tendency. Thus we see them, in spite of their uniqueness, as part of "the same single radically unchanged element"[49]: the phallic woman. The recurrence of her pattern is per se a measure of Lawrence's attraction to her, but the degree of his love and repulsion for her will also be measured by his attitude towards the inherent psychosexual imbalance of each of these great heroines.

Within this general purpose we have chosen to analyse in depth the heroines mentioned above. After an introduction to Lawrence's views on characterization in Chapter II, our discussion of Ursula I in chapter III aims to show that Lawrence's love for woman in The Rainbow is greater than his hatred of her. The splitting of her consciousness which causes her to be dual, bisexual, drives her towards self-knowledge, and her struggle reveals her unconscious wish to effect the balance between her male and female components. The author acknowledges her bisexuality and her attempts at effecting the balance, as well as the power which her masculinity confers on her, and he allows her to develop through her vision, neither intruding to give a message nor blaming this modern woman for her inherent capacity to destroy the weaker male. Furthermore, he describes how perturbed the modern heroine herself becomes at being given this almost supernatural power over the male, and how sincere her desire is to find a man to match her stature with whom she can es-

tablish a lasting relationship. With sympathy he reveals the shame which her lesbian attachment has caused and how she suffers from it. Through dramatic action, description, and symbolic imagery, the reader is made aware that the author will try to allow her to achieve her longed-for inner balance. I hope to show that Lawrence's attitude towards Ursula and his understanding of the kind of woman he has created is fair, and I attribute this fairness to his identification with Ursula, an identification that allows him to describe her from within.

Chapter IV intends to show that Women in Love marks the turning point in Lawrence's relation to the phallic woman who is, from here on, going to be seen by Lawrence from a certain distance. She is going to be treated of necessity as an object, especially as a possible partner for the male protagonist, a condition that makes her more needed, therefore more hated and feared. Ursula's phallicism reappears in Ursule II and Gudrun, the heroines of Women in Love, but whereas in The Rainbow Lawrence allowed Ursula to assume, develop and apparently reconcile her bisexuality, in Women in Love the heroines are not given the same chance: Gudrun will be incapable of changing her inherent bisexuality, and Ursula will need a tutor. Furthermore, although Gudrun is shown descriptively, both sisters are assigned a prescriptive role: Gudrun plays the role of the negative influence of woman in man's life, and Ursula II personifies the need for a woman to change and submit. This aplitting of the heroine of The Rainbow into the "positive" Ursula II and the "negative" Gudrun reveals Lawrence's wish to live out

opposite solutions in his relation to the woman. Their prescriptive roles can be seen as the triumphing of Lawrence's misogyny, yet his attraction to the phallic woman is still powerful: in Gudrun's case in spite of seeing her as the male's sexual partner there are many scenes in which he identifies with her; with Ursula II we witness Lawrence's identification with a critical "other" who argues with courage against the hero's bid for mastery.

In a more restricted sense, the aim of chapters III and IV, in which the heroines are analysed in depth, is to provide an answer to the question: how will Lawrence's view of the female and his changing attitude towards woman affect his art?

In conclusion, chapter V will recall the change in Lawrence's attitude toward woman in this period and how this change affected the characterization of the heroines in The Rainbow and Women in Love.

C - PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP

Weiss, in his Oedipus in Nottingham, used Sons and Lovers to show from where Lawrence derived the phallic woman as a type, and he concludes that she is a product of Lawrence's early family relations, a phantasy which Lawrence's mind created to protect him from incest-drive and subsequent fear of castration. Basing his thesis on the Jungian principle of guilt, he states: "In order not to become conscious of his incest wish (this harking back to the animal nature) the

son throws all the burden of guilt on the mother, from which arises the idea of the "terrible mother." The mother becomes for him a spectre of anxiety, a nightmare."[50] Weiss demonstrates, through the analysis of Paul's actions and reactions, that Lawrence yields to the identification with the mother as a safer alternative to facing his father's wrath as rival.To illustrate that this identification has taken place, he points to the "tenderness" that underlies the attitude of the Laurentian male protagonists in their relations to their rivals in love, an attitude alien to normal male rivals. According to Weiss, once the negative counter-Oedipal situation has been established, (that is, once identification with the mother is accomplished,) the Oedipal son longs for the father as his love-object, but since this love also entails castration, love and hate for the father are again repressed and projected in his art in the form of the protagonists' homosexual tendency to treat their rival with "tenderness," "the compassion that tempers hatred."[51]

Weiss examines the anxieties that the Laurentiam male experiences in his relation with woman: either he sees her as virgin or as whore, but since these images are related back to the original mother, intercourse with her always brings incest guilt back. Normal sexuality is thus always tormenting to the bisexual, and in all cases he finds that women are hostile. In Sons and Lovers, Paul insists that Miriam only wants a "soul union" whereas it is her condition of Mother surrogate that makes her forbidden to Paul; Paul possesses Clara but feels guilty afterwards, therefore he renounces her to assuage his guilt. First, however, he blames

this woman for destroying his identity, with her large hands, heavy arms and huge bosom. "There was no himself. ... he felt himself small and helpless, her towering in her force above him."[52] Weiss brings Ursula of The Rainbow and Gudrun as examples of other recurrences of the archetypal "devouring mother" image[53] in Lawrence's work and he again emphasizes "the desire for, and the dread of, coitus"[54] which their male partners experience. They are the kind of women whose "beaked vaginas" absorb man's identity, reducing him to the hateful condition of the dependent son.

Having demonstrated that orgasm will be likened to pain, rather than pleasure, Weiss concludes that Lawrence's wishes to have sex be impersonal, universal, and non-female, his constant cry "to be rid of (his) individuality" ..., to live effortless"[55] are signs of Lawrence's desire to embark on kinds of regressive sexuality that would dissolve his fear of the beaked female.

Pritchard develops this insight of Weiss' at great length. Following a trend opened by Wilson Knight who, in his comment on Women in Love, speaks of the existence of anal components in the kind of sexuality that Birkin offers Ursula, Pritchard holds that it is through the degradation of anality that Lawrence envisages a new healthy relation with woman. He considers that Lawrence managed to overcome his fear of the phallic woman by substituting her deathly womb for the benign ultra-phallic source. The woman's hands become the desired "other" that liberate the man, making him the clear, single, unique, and complete being that a poem like "Manifesto" describes. Like Weiss, Pritchard traces the

genesis of the phallic woman back to Lawrence's incest guilt, likening the loved and hated Magna Mater that peoples Lawrence's works to a remnant of the Oedipal situation.

Pritchard recognizes that Lawrence tried, through his art, to find a resolution for his sexual conflicts in other ways too, in the hope that it would be possible for him to escape the Magna Mater that haunted his life: themes that preach withdrawal from sexuality and which propose the establishment of a more satisfactory relationship with a man are to be counted among his efforts to escape the destiny of Gerald in Women in Love. Lawrence is so obsessed by his need to get rid of the mother's powerful influence on him, according to Pritchard, that at a certain phase of his career "one reaction was to sacrifice (her) and (her) values to brutal male power,"[56] a sacrifice that Lawrence comes to see as the sacrifice of his own anima.

Derrick devotes close attention to just this phase of Lawrence's art in which his obsession drives him to demand the sacrifice of the female. Following Daleski, he sees Lawrence's sadism towards her as a conscious effort to suppress the woman within himself and thus become able to re-identify with the father. Yet, at the unconscious level, this act acquires a deeper meaning; that is, it reveals the deeper desire of the mother-identified son to be violated at the hands of the object in the father. While denying her he is masochistically obtaining pleasure for the woman in himself. This is the motive behind the prescriptive pattern which informs the theme of sacrifice in the Laurentiam fiction: "In his American fiction especially, Lawrence inhabits a li-

berated, assertive and in psychoanalytic parlance, "phallic" heroine who typically submits to the OTHER she encounters in a primitive, patriarchal male."[57] Offering the recurrence of the phallic mother as theme and narrative voice in the American fiction as proof of Lawrence's identification with her, Derrick sees the sacrifice of Lawrence's anima in The Plumed Serpent as loss both insofar as his art and he himself are concerned. For, if the woman represents "the window on the male unknown"[58] her absence implies the supression of ego-consciousness and lack of male object. As a result, together with the author, the reader is plunged into the autistic world of Lawrence's fantasies. Fiction then becomes ritual fantasy in which the female observer is absorbed by the masculine phallus Lawrence would reidentify with.

Though the examination of the phase of Lawrence's artistic career in which he attempts "to annul his own reversed identification"[59] is the core of Derrick's studies, he also traces the line of development that culminates in the sacrifice of Lawrence's own anima: through the narrative persona in relation with the phallic woman Derrick proves that "the sado-masochistic themes" of his American period reflect "psychological conflicts"[60] present at all periods.

Derrick believes that Lawrence's "understanding of woman is both deep and narrow, restricted to those neurotic women in whom he recognized the complementary symptoms of his own negative identification."[61]

D - STATEMENT OF THE THESIS - HOW THIS THESIS DIFFERS FROM AND COMPLEMENTS PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP

Previous Freudian-based scholarship has demonstrated that Lawrence's treatment of the phallic woman and the form in which it occurs throughout his work takes the same "repetition-compulsion pattern" that any obsession takes. All these critics have emphasized that Lawrence's view of the woman and his changing attitudes towards her stem from his necessity to shatter, overcome, or simply survive his psychic conflicts. The present dissertation has a two-fold aim: first, since it takes the conflict as the source for Lawrence's female portraitures, it will corroborate the insights of the critics. Yet, this thesis plans to consider the phallic heroine as an artistic entity. As such we will take the heroine's phallic endowment as the determinant of her psychological and artistic strength. In other words, the very phallicism which Lawrence reveres, fears and attacks here, and for which he will in later works destroy his female characters, in the basic attribute of her artistic validity, the source of the heroine's complexity and aesthetic value. It is also the source of her psychological accuracy, the source of our belief in her as a legitimate character.

For we have chosen complexity and psychological accuracy as our criteria for measuring artistic excellence in this study. Expanding Forster's definition of the round character, whose complexity has "the incalculability of life

about it," we have chosen from Weiss what he sees as the new standard of acceptance for an action, literary or non-literary, in the modern world, where even the layman is concerned with "psychological data as a guide to understanding." Thus, for the modern reader, in a work of art, "the psychological accuracy of an action is the new decorum."

We hold that Lawrence remains an artist in the face of his view of woman as preponderantly phallic: his familial experience, shown in this introduction as the source of this view and his attitude toward woman, will only be invoked to justify the psycho-logic behind an esthetically unsatisfying and incoherent action performed by any female analysed in the present study.

We hope to demonstrate that Lawrence's view of the female helps to create a round heroine[62] at this stage of his career; we also want to show that his change of attitude towards the female shows up in his treatment of character. For the heroines will change in two different ways: woman as the sexual partner destined to play the role of the Magna Mater will change from round to narrow, yet will gain in depth, while the woman as sexual partner destined to solve the male's fear of a heterosexual relation will change from round to flat. Therefore the aim of this dissertation in its more restricted sense is to show that Ursula of The Rainbow, the woman treated subjectively by the author, is a round heroine: she is dual, complex, always in free movement, vital, yet polarized in her "double measures." The reader's reaction is partial to Ursula; that is, there is complete identification - reader and

author are one with her - even when she is being destructive: since the narrator does not judge her, neither does the reader. Above all, she is psychologically valid: her actions can be traced to their sources.

Gudrun, who plays the role of the negative influence on man, loses Ursula's roundness and becomes deeper and narrower. The psychoanalytical pattern of her perversity is developed at full length: she is the heroine who most closely resembles the maternal prototype of the Oedipal son's phantasy of the destructive mother, as Lawrence comes closer to the "radically unchanged element," "the carbon" of character he was trying to render in art. Yet she is not just the destructive "phallic woman" whom Lawrence is sacrificing to an ideology. We hold that, having given a prescriptive role, Lawrence would have felt free to let loose here all his true ambivalence in portraying her: Yet despite her role as dangerous object, her author is strangely, unexpectedly, and deeply concerned with her pathological reactions and her obsession, frequently identifying with her in her suffering. His true ambivalence makes of Gudrun the most expressionistic of the three heroines. The reader's reaction to Gudrun is more complex and more ambivalent than his reaction to Ursula of The Rainbow: we recoil from her sadism, we sympathize with her and feel sorry for her in her crisis of masochism, we identify with her in her apprehension of the sordid ugliness of the industrial world, we feel lost with her in her sense of alienation. Therefore, though she loses the battle of contradicting forces within herself -since she cannot resolve " the deadly anarchy in her own being" - she remains a fine

expression of Lawrence's characterization: with Lawrence we could say that she is "one of the supremest products of our civilization," "a product that well frightens us"[63] adding, as critics have, that she is perhaps the supremest, psychologically most valid production in the Laurentian canon of destructive women.

Ursula II, the Ursula of Women in Love, who plays the role of the positive sexual partner - a condition that she is to acquire only after having undergone a reform — is also a round character in the first half of the novel, but becomes totally flat in the second half.

Having expected her to come from The Rainbow as an integral person ready to confront reality openly, without fearing her own nature, we receive an Ursula II who has acquired a new, defensive mode of being and a new attitude toward life, and as part of the defense, a refusal to confront reality by refusing to accept its negative side.

On the other hand, we see this behavior as coherent in a woman who has adapted her phallicism into a feminine mode of being: Ursula II, no longer envious of male power nor wishing to usurp it, lives the new condition of her femininity, giving more scope to her intuitiveness and to her emotions, yet maintaining underneath the powers that she had already wrested from modern life.

Lawrence's portrayal of Ursula II in the first half of Women in Love is accurate in showing how the modern woman can live with her phallicism. But as Lawrence is siding with a male protagonist who fears the phallic power of

the new woman, the author feels obliged to uncover and to subdue these powers, which the male feels are dangerous to him. When he resorts to this, in the second half of the book, her whole characterization collapses.

CHAPTER II

LAWRENCE'S MODE OF CHARACTERIZATION

> Of all the giants of the age of the novel can we not say that the principal thing which unites them is a special care for characterization which is inextricably bound up with the creation of character from the facets of the artist's own psyche?
>
> Robert Scholes

In a period of time when literary criticism has analysed and rejected Robbe-Grillet's theory posing that "the novel of characters belongs entirely to the past,"[1] and agreed instead to accept "the supremacy of character in the novel,"[2] it is necessary to talk about the theories Lawrence has given to support his mode of characterization.

Though the critics who specifically discuss the psychological novel,[3] the modern novel that describes subjective modes of consciousness, do not include Lawrence in the canon of psychological writers — probably because Lawrence is more conservative in modes of verbalization and in point of view - Lawrence has been amply recognized as "innovator,"[4] as a writer who, together with Proust, Dorothy Richardson, Joyce and Virginia Woolf, abandoned the literary codes supplied by traditional convention and embarked upon the exploration of new modes of artistic expression in the novel.

Ian Watt in The Rise of the Novel and F.R.Leavis in The Great Tradition have described how the novelists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries expressed their

preoccupation with external reality, devoting their efforts to the faithful reproduction of the visible, the "minute presentation of daily life" and, as a corollary, with the depiction of "individual ego."[5] Virginia Woolf echoed this when she said, in "Mr. Benett and Mrs. Brown,"[6] that Benett never got tired of providing the reader with a detailed representation of shops, of houses, of the objective, the knowable. Lawrence went even further, saying that Galsworthy depicted people who were only interested in the cultivation of their social selves. In defense of Victorian and Georgian writers it must be said that this tendency was only the natural response to the philosophical principles that oriented this society: the priority of reason and realism preached by the Enlightenment, the belief in a stable world whose ideology was accepted as valid for the individual in his search for selfhood.

David Daiches and Mark Shorer are the critics who show how 20th Century British fiction "is different from fiction that came earlier"[7] because modern writers no longer conceive either the world as stable or the social codes of the world as valid for the individual; no longer can they look for realism in the external reality because psychology has shown that "a greater part of life is underground"[8]; no longer can they trust the rational, the reasonable, as the structure in their works. ... "Increasing attention to the irrational, new and far-reaching speculations about its nature, texture, and significance," Frederick Hoffman says, "have had a profoundly disturbing effect upon the thinking of man and upon his confidence in his long-established pat-

terns of control."[9] Man begins to see himself "não como o agente independente e desembaraçado que ele pretende ser, mas como realmente ele é, uma criatura só tenuamente conscia das várias influências que moldaram seu pensamento."[10] It is the recognition that "there is something incalculable in each of us, which may at any moment rise to the surface and destroy our normal balance,[11] but may also be necessary and fruitful to discover, that led the modern writers to veer away from the "absolute objectivity"[12] that characterized the novel of the 18th and 19th centuries and to move in the direction of "absolute subjective realism."[12]

That Lawrence departed from the old conception of the world as stable can be seen already in Sons and Lovers:"... there is no secure haven for Paul Morel ...";[13] in The Rainbow the organic world is already impregnated with the anarchy of a fast-spreading industrialism; in Women in Love, an impending ruin threatens to dissolve a fragmented world. Yet it is Lawrence's mode of characterization which more markedly separates him from the traditional writers. The reaction of the contemporary critics to his treatment of character in the novel is the best testimony for the existence of a distinctive feature in Lawrence's portrayals. Edward Garnett, after having read the draft of The Rainbow, said that he was sorry that Lawrence had created characters who were analysed "so far back to common elements that there was some difficulty in sorting out the people and remembering them."[14] It was his reaction that prompted Lawrence to defend his new method:

"I don't think the psychology is wrong, it is

> only that I have a different attitude to my characters, and that necessitates a different attitude in you, which you are not prepared to give"[15]

Worth registering is the strong reaction of J.M.Murry to the new method, a reaction akin to the impact the new method made on him. After having acknowledged Lawrence's attempts at a new rendering of character in the novel, "a new conception of individuality," Murry cries that "it does not admit of individuality as we understand it":

> "We should have thought that we should be able to distinguish between male and female, at least. But no! Remove the names, remove the sedulous cataloques of unnecessary clothing... and man and woman are undistinguishable as octopods in an acquariam tank."[16]

Muir's reaction is also worth recalling, because his assumption that "We should not know any of (Lawrence's people) if we met them in the street,"[17] provoked a bitter complaint from Lawrence. Like Garnett and Murry. Muir perceived that "a new thing"[18] which required a new shape had been rendered into art, but the shock debarred him from understanding, enjoying, and acknowledging the validity of the new method.

Again, the reaction of Lawrence to the works of his contemporaries reveals that Lawrence saw himself as innovator. More, his reaction reveals just where Lawrence's modernity lies. He was scornful towards the works of Galsworthy precisely because, unlike him, this author was deeply

involved in the cultivation of coherent, stable egos who could be easily recognized if "we met them in the street," egos who had their value defined according to the respect they paid to the "certain moral scheme" and to the position they occupied in this scheme. Lawrence defines himself against Galsworthy because he is trying to break "the old stable ego" in his novels, to go beyond the "old fashioned human element" that "causes one to conceive a character in a certain moral scheme and make him consistent."[19] Not even Joyce escaped his criticism. In his "Surgery for the Novel or a Bomb" he criticizes Joyce, (as well as Proust and Virginia Woolf,) accusing them of having treated only the conscious side of the characters' minds. If his criticism was not fair to these writers who, like himself, were also trying to portray the depth of the individual's life, much deeper than "the ego" of character to which Lawrence objected, yet Lawrence's objection points to a difference between his and these authors' attitudes towards the rendering of the layers of the mind below consciousness. This difference must be seen not in terms of the kind of verbalization each uses to express the unconscious but, perhaps, in terms of the degree of depth far within the psyche that each attempts to reach. Perhaps Lawrence was trying to portray the mind at a depth anterior to that which Joyce, Virginia Woolf and Proust were. This is the opinion of Scott Sanders, who acknowledges the efforts of these writers to dismantle the "ego of character" and the moral scheme to which the character belonged. "Yet", he says, "they remained for the most part at the level of consciousness, they explored memory, association, perception, thoughts," whereas Lawrence was trying "to

materialize the instinctual life of the deepest layer of the mind."[20] His assumption is very hard to qualify: who can say if Mrs. Dalloway's insight into the death of Septimus stems from a more or less profound layer of the mind than, say, Ursula's apprehension of the horses in the last pages of The Rainbow?

Yet the investigation of the differences between the Laurentian and these writers' mode of characterization must lie beyond the scope of this dissertation. We have introduced them only to show Lawrence's awareness of several layers of consciousness, an awareness that, since it "is one of the major distinctions between the modern and the ancient conceptions of character,"[21] becomes one of the major proofs of Lawrence's modernity. The opinion of Scott Sanders, quoted above, serves our purpose insofar as it attests to Lawrence's modernity, a modernity that is also acknowledged by Kate Millett, Marvin Mudrick and Mark Shorer. To Kate Millett Lawrence's modernity reposes in the "original species of psychic narrative which is Lawrence's major technical achievement."[22] Shorer and Mudrick defend the originality of Women in Love and The Rainbow, respectively, and much of their argument is grounded on Lawrence's revolutionary treatment of character. They both recognize that Lawrence has changed the notion of character in the novel because he will not create "ego" but "essential beings" who exist at a level anterior to personality and who are animated by "primal forces."[23] They both hold that the analysis of these primal forces in any character is Lawrence's first concern.

We have defended Lawrence as a modern writer: now we must examine what his theory of character is, and, having examined it, show the result of his theories on the creation of his characters.

It is in the letter to Garnett, the letter which tells Garnett not to "look in my novel for the old stable ego of the character" that Lawrence explains what is to replace the old ego.

> "There is another ego, according to whose action the individual is unrecognizable."

He defines this other ego as that which is "non-human in humanity," the "carbon," "the inhuman will," the element that the human being shares with all others and with nature. Whereas the other novelists will portray the ego, "the diamond," Lawrence intends to portray the carbon, by reducing men to their physical minimum, to the point where all men are "part of the some radically unchanged element."[24]

It is in the "Study of Thomas Hardy," which Lawrence has described as a "book on Thomas Hardy, which has turned out as a sort of Story of My Heart"[25] that Lawrence's philosophy is fully given: to him man, the social being, does not coincide with man, the essential being. The former constitutes man's false self, a self tied to the laws supplied by social convention, fed and defined by a "lesser morality." The latter constitutes the true, unconscious self, truer because like a "greater part of every life" it is "underground" and "like roots in the dark maintain a contact with the beyond." Its morality is "the morality of life."[26] The

social self, the self molded by civilization, tends to encompass the true self, but a person can only achieve fulfilment, achieve individuality, if he accept "the tremendous non-human quality of life,"[27] if he respond to "the new unfoldings"[28] that are always pressing him, tormenting him, demanding recognition.

The social self is the conscious ego of character Lawrence was trying to break in his fiction. The self that responds to the unknown, inhuman forces of life is the essential self he uncovers and brings into fiction. The Laurentian characters are always struggling with their conscious and unconscious selves in their attempts to learn to live with this "tremendous non-human quality of life." There are moments when inexplicable, uncontrollable forces, inside them or acting upon them, reveal them as impersonal, potent matter, what Lawrence called his "carbon," and what we have called archetypal, and, in particular, the archetypal,phallic woman. As these forces recede the characters revert into human, personal beings. Yet since they must forever live with these forces, the Laurentian characters never revert to purely social types, unless they be created as a foil, merely conveying the negative aspect of the modern, mechanical ego.

The writers that belong to the New Freudian school of criticism and who justly acknowledge a "psychological motive force"[29] behind Lawrence's struggle into articulation have shown that Lawrence's interest in the forces within character rather than in the "old fashioned human element" represents more than an aesthetic aim: to Daleski it is Lawrence's attempt at arriving at the root of <u>his</u> pro-

blems, at understanding and mastering his duality; to Derrick it is Lawrence's effort to achieve a state of mindlessness which would allow him to experience the regressive modes of sensuality without feeling the guilt of his incest-ridden consciousness. Weiss sees Lawrence's attempt at reducing the "old fashioned human element" to its minimum as an attempt to satisfy his wish to turn the "other" of the sex act into something universal, non-female. Lawrence the essayist and Lawrence the artist are the main corroborators of these critics' theories: in his essay on Hardy he admits that "it is only a disproportion (between the male and female elements of the psyche) or a dissatisfaction which makes the man struggle into articulation"[30] and he makes his struggle and his disproportion known to the reader in his profound identification with the people he is discussing: Raphael and Michaelangelo, as well as Hardy's women, come out of Lawrence's interpretation as facets of Lawrence himself. In his novels, Paul, Gerald and Birkin, in their struggle with the forces within themselves, are often trying to find some kind of unconsciousness: Paul wants love to revert to the impersonal to avoid experiencing the conflicts of his incest-guilt, and for the same reason Gerald throws himself into a state of mindlessness, and Birkin looks for "love that is like sleep."[31] It is therefore Lawrence's use of "art for my sake" that more directly accounts for his intense preoccupation with the "non-human" quality of life.

This intense preoccupation with the "non-human" also confers on the artistic entities which he creates the aesthetic qualification of archetypes. Every character of

Lawrence's shares with every other a common nature that makes him " part of the same radically unchanged element,"[32] "part of some larger scheme."[33] Prey to irrational forces that are at work within him, reduced to the material stratum which defines the inhuman in humanity, attempting to reconcile the male and female elements within his psyche, the Laurentian character gains an archetypal dimension. Lawrence's treatment of character as pure "matter" supports this qualification. The three women we are going to analyse are strongly connected through the "inhuman will" that stirs them and makes them destructive: Ursula I is referred to as "the corrosive salt"[34] when her inhuman will is reduced to its minimum; in Gudrun there is"a body of cold power"[35]; in Ursula II there is an "exquisite force"; "incomprehensible and irrational"[36] that makes her "hard and self-completed like a jewel. "[37] At this material level they are Woman, they are the indistinguishable, generic archetypal, the phallic mother of the Laurentian canon of woman. At this level is to be found the "positivity" of the Laurentian women, "a big sufficiency unto themselves, more than in men."[38] At this level Garnett, Murry and Muir, the first critics of Lawrence's method of characterization, framed their judgement and found Lawrence's new method wanting. It is this level psychoanalytic studies investigate.

The first critics of Lawrence's method of characterization found the method wanting because they abstracted the archetypal side of Lawrence's characters, reducing them only to their simplified, unifying traits. To their eyes Lawrence's characters had lost their individuality,that

which "separates man from man." But the fact that in the Laurentian character "there is another ego," the archetypal dimension, does not imply that the individual, that that which "gives man a distinctive, discrete identify"[39] was abolished by the new method. This other ego, the carbon, renders the individual "unrecognizable" but not non-existent. It was precisely Garnett's inability to grasp anything other than Lawrence's capacity to analyse his people "so far back to common elements" that motivated Lawrence's counter-attack. To Garnett, he patiently explains that his new attitude to his characters demanded "a different attitude" in Garnett but one that Garnett "was not prepared to give" because the development of his characters "takes lines unknown," "as when one draws a fiddle-bow across a fine tray delicately sanded."[40]

Lawrence's patience can become rage, as when Muir fails to perceive a distinctive feature within the generic of the "world of carbon"[41] into which the Laurentian character is plunged: Lawrence angrily refutes Muir's claim that Lawrence's people would not be recognizable if met in the street, saying that since a cat can recognize his master in the dark, it becomes evident that there are criteris for recognizing people "in the street," criteris used to recognize the individual's uniqueness, other than the method that Muir is accustomed to use. Lawrence would demand of the new reader a new perception: no longer is the character to be recognized as an individual by his clothes or his consistent, known actions. We need a new attitude and a new perception, "a deeper sense than any we've been used to exercise" to discover the individual: though unrecognizable

when passing through what Lawrence calls "allotropic states,"[42] he still is a unique being.

These reactions of Lawrence's show that the archetypal dimension does not annul the individual's identity; furthermore, his acknowledgement of the difficulties that his new method entails points to the fact that the archetypal in his characters, instead of being an element of simplification, functions as an element which enriches the character's complexity.

Proof that Lawrence wants the "individual characteristics"[43] of his people recognized can be found not only in Lawrence's reaction to Garnett's failure to "sort out the people" in his novel and in his anger at Muir but also in Lawrence's deep concern with individuality, a concern that lies at the core of his metaphysics. In Sea and Sardinia he complains that "our stage is all wrong" because the theatre lacks "human individuals."[44] In Hardy, Lawrence looks first to the archetypal, observing that "the women (Hardy) approved of are not Female in any sense." Again, when he discusses Tess, he analyses the archetypal side of her nature and places her among all the other women: "Eustacia, ... Tess, ... everybody." Yet the fact that she belongs to the list of Hardy's typical women does not compromise her individuality: he refers to her as a person who "knows she is herself incontrovertibly, and she knows that other people are not herself. This is a very rare quality ..."[45] The same attention to the "human individual"[46] is paid by Lawrence in his analysis of Galsworthy's treatment of character. He is repulsed by the lack of human individuality in Galsworthy's characters -

"in all his books, I have not been able to discover one real individual"[47] - and filled with the sense that because of this lack "they are inferiors" they are only "social beings fallen to a lower level of life."[48] The highest praise Lawrence can give is what he gives to Tess: the bitterest disdain he reserves for people like Galsworthy's.

Lawrence, in the letter to Garnett, was defending his characters also in terms of their individuality, as can be seen in his reference to flux: his characters, in their development, take lines unknown, undergo "allotropic states", that is, undergo changes. In Lawrence it is the conception of identity as flux that builds individuality.

The sense of flux is central to Lawrence's thoughts: "We move, and the rock of ages moves.[49] And since we move and move forever, in no discernible direction, there is no centre to the movement to us." Man not only has to acknowledge this relativism but he will have to stream in his "own odd, intertwining flux."[50] It is the individual's respect for this eternal flow that allows him to "maintain a certain integrity." If man, however, tries to prevent this flow, tries to cut his relatedness to the universe, he becomes"a stupid thing like a lamp-post."[51] Likewise, in the novel, the character is only alive if he makes part of the flux of existence. Galsworthy's characters lack individuality because they have ceased to be "one with the living continuum of the universe."[52]

The idea of motion is basic to Lawrence's conception of being because for Lawrence everything is dual, "everything that exists, even a stone, has two sides to its

nature."[53] These two sides, which Lawrence calls "the two Infinities"[54] are always in tension because they maintain a relation, "a continuum"[55] between their opposite poles. In the human being the movement is thus explained: "... every man comprises male and female in his being, the male always struggling for predominance. A woman likewise consists in male and female, with a female predominant."[56] The polarized flux, the continuous, fluid relation between these "two Infinites" gives rise to the Phoenix, the Holy Ghost,[57] the Individual. If man tries to nail one of the two poles down by imposing his will or his reason on the flux he breaks the balance, he destroys his own integrity. The same respect for the flux will have to be paid by man in his relation with others and in his relation with the "Circumambient Universe," because "everything is true in its own time, place, circumstance ..." The idea of flux is so central to Lawrence's work that he is constantly avowing that a true artist must not only respect this relativism but make it central to his work by registering "the perfected relation between man and his circumambient universe."[58]

Proof that Lawrence's characters have, as we have suggested, their artistic dimension enriched rather than simplified by the addition of the archetypal to their individual characteristics is to be found in the dynamic interaction between the individual and the archetypal sides of the Laurentian character. The interaction has been seen and explained in different ways by modern critics. Though they have not arrived at a consensus about the precise nature of flux, all acknowledge Lawrence's vision of identity as flux. To Langbaum this vision corresponds to the constant inter-

change between the conscious and unconscious selves of the characters, the constant change from matter, archetype, to human, personal. He maintains that selfhood is achieved when this flux takes place naturally, that is, when the evolution "from inanimate to unconscious, animate to thought" is accomplished without the destruction of any of these modes of being. For him, Gudrun's and Gerald's destruction of identity was only the culmination, the realization of the tendency "to destroy one mode of being for the sake of another."[59] That is, Langbaum is attesting to Lawrence's application of his theories to the realization of character in the novel: Lawrence, according to him, has given two sides to his characters; furthermore he has based the characters' identities on the interaction between these sides,and the annihilation of their identities on their halting the flux. Other critics prefer to see Lawrence's vision of identity as flux as the interchange between the characters' inner and social selves: Daleski has shown that identity is established when the two selves are reconciled, and Moynahan agrees with Daleski, both in his recognition that "Lawrence creates two distinct selves" (the self of ordinary social and familial experience and the self of essential being"), and in his acceptance that, in Lawrence, "the most valuable human enterprise is the dual fulfillment of the social and the inhuman selves."[60]

For these critics, then, Lawrence can be judged upon his metaphysics: his characters can be seen both in terms of their belonging to a larger whole, "as part of some larger scheme" and "in terms of their individual characteristics" and it is the interaction between these two levels that

makes the Holy Ghost, the Individual. The testimony of these critics corroborates Harvey's assumption that the individual character, in the very greatest novels, "is immeassurably enriched, that he is not obliterated, or dehumanized into allegory or symbol, but filled with an inexhaustible reservoir of meaning" when he is given not only the "world of diamond" but the "world of carbon"[61] as well.

Of course, the archetypal dimension of Lawrence's characters can be studied in isolation: the nature of psychoanalytic studies demands a deep investigation into the material substratum of Lawrence's people, demands that Lawrence's people be analysed "so far back to common elements" that they become recognizably one with Lawrence. Weiss has analysed Lawrence's males in terms of their abnormal bisexuality: following the development of the first phantasy of the virginal mother, through the phallic woman, to the "beaked" dangerous woman in connection with the forever present fear of coitus in the male bisexual, Weiss traces this recurring pattern back to Lawrence's own old incest fixation. Derrick has analysed the presence of the phallic woman in Lawrence's works and concluded that she is the woman inside Lawrence; Cavitch has analysed the couples in Women in Love and discovered Lawrence's own homosexual fantasies behind the screen of heterosexual love.

The nature of the present dissertation allows us to treat Lawrence's people as Individuals, that is, they will be seen both in terms of their archetypal dimension and in terms of their individual characteristics: Ursula I, Gudrun, and Ursula II considered "as part of some larger scheme"

are phallic women, are archetypes, are, in the psychoanalytic view, the woman inside Lawrence. Yet, since "every single living creature is a single creative unit, a unique, incommutable self,"[62] they will also be seen in terms of their uniqueness, a uniqueness which will be determined by their idiosyncratic response to the relativistic principle that pervades life. Coherently, all three are somehow caught in the process of defining their selfhood, yet each responds differently to the process: Ursula I moves back and forth towards each pole of her dual nature in her attempt at establishing a balance between the poles, and in the end is able to achieve completeness of being; Ursula II is said to be hopeful of achieving her polarized relation whith Birkin; Gudrun has her individuality destroyed when she denies connection with the creative side of the flux of existence.

The co-presence of the individual and the archetypal, as well as the continuous interchange between these levels allows us to adopt an aesthetic principle to judge the artistic value of the characters we are going to analyse in the next three chapters: Forster's theory of character in the novel. Though it is based on the supremacy of the individual over the archetypal in characterization, Froster's idea can be adapted to serve as the ground on which our judgment of the artistic validity of the Laurentian character will be based.

In Forster's system the characters are roughly put into categories. Flat characters, who "are constructed round a single idea or quality" are two dimensional, simplified, easily recognized by the reader because they are "not

changed by circumstances,"[63] therefore remaining "unalterable" in the reader's mind. Were Lawrence's characters only archetypes, they would fall into this category. However, since they transcend this dimension, they become round.

The round character is for Forster the individual who changes. He is deep and broad, that is, multilayered and multifaceted, since he is complexly conceived and realized.The principle of flux is inherent in this character: "the test of a round character is whether it is capable of suprising in a convincing way."[64] It is certainly the flexibility inherent in the nature of this definition that makes it suitable to the test of a Laurentian character: for one thing, though the definition does not acknowledge the interchange between archetypal and individual characteristics, it presupposes no discontinuity between them. Provided that the character changes, and changes in a convincing way, the character's roundness is acknowledged. Second, the same flexibility supports the psychological motivation behind the Laurentian character's actions or thoughts. Since Lawrence's characters do not have a stable ego, the thoughts and actions that reveal character are not to be logically explained:"the psychological accuracy of an action is the new decorum."[65]

According to Forster, there are characters who are intended as round, but whose roundness is shattered when they change in an unconvincing way. This happens when the artist, for some often "unconscious predilection," tries to "nail anything down," forgetting that "nothing is true, or good, or right, except in its own living relatedness to its own circumambient universe."[66] For this reason when the "psy-

chological accuracy of an action"[67] falls short, when the character, in Forster's words, is no longer convincing, we will call the character flat. In Lawrence's own words, "If you try to nail anything down, in the novel, either it kills the novel, or the novel gets up and walks away with the nail."[68]

Forster's classification allows us to define Ursula of The Rainbow as a round heroine: she is both deep and many-faceted. Her roundness is certainly due to the integrity which she maintains within the fluid relation with herself and the universe: she is divided within herself, thus oscillating violently in her choices between the world of dark and light, in her desire for an organic connection with the natural, in the modern world in which she lives, and her equally strong desire to obey the pull towards the man's world. Still, she is able to strike a balance after having exposed herself to every force: she gives full play to her masculine tendencies; she embraces the world of light and later the world of dark; she allows herself to be touched by the machine. Yet, in the end, she acknowledges dark and light, male and female, mechanical and organic. Lawrence confers on her a dual nature and allows her to develop accordingly, respecting the living relation between the character and herself, between the character and the circumambient universe, without putting his predilection, his "thumb" in the balance. She changes, and her changes are convincing,because they are psychologically valid.

In the first half of Women in Love, Lawrence the artist creates in Ursula II a round character: again dual,

emotional, passional, as complex as she was before. Yet the author behind the artist intrudes to make us believe that she is mostly a masculine, destructive being, therefore needing a reform.

But Ursula "walks away with the nail," saving the tale from the (author) who created it."[69] Ursula II, in fact, is the protagonist Birkin's critic throughout, and the reader feels that only a subterfuge could make her submit to a tutor.

This trick Lawrence applies in the second half of Women in Love. In the chapter "Excurse" the author makes Ursula submit to Birkin, and her psychological validity as given by the tale is broken; this time Ursula cannot walk away with the nail. By forcing her to agree without a reason valid to her prior nature to Birkin's argument, he "kills the novel," or in the strict sense, his character. The round turns into flat.

As far as Gudrun's classification is concerned, Forster's criteria will have to be elaborated: they are not comprehensive enough to support the modern, futuristic dimension of Gudrun's characterization. Certainly she is not flat; she is not a mere idea. Symbolically and obscurely Lawrence portrays her morbid sickness with such vividness that she becomes an even more fascinating heroine than Ursula I. She could be called round because she is complex and she changes convincingly: Lawrence penetrates behind the surface of Gudrun's behavior and fully explores the conflicting forces at work within her psyche. Gudrun is revealed as the battleground for the forces of destruction against the last

possibilities of life in her: being too markedly divided within her conflicting male and female components, she edges towards psychosis. In short, she is doomed from the beginning, and the doom reduces her scope of action to a fatalistic fall. Forster defines the round character as "surprising in a convincing way." Doomed, the element of surprise is lacking. She changes but she changes in one direction only: towards the fall. Therefore Gudrun cannot be classified strictly as a round character. We will, thus, call her "deep and narrow." Though she embodies the forces of creation as well as destruction, the nature of her sickness makes her refuse the former. It is her psychic drama that Lawrence discloses: together with the author we plunge into the depths of her psyche and partake of the vivid conflict that is taking place in the submerged caverns of Gudrun's unconscious.

CHAPTER III

LOVE TRIUMPHANT

> Why do we not know that the two in consummation are one; partial and alone for ever; but that the two in consummation are perfect, beyond the range of loneliness and solitude.
>
> Lawrence

A. *The Rainbow* as a whole

The Rainbow is a saga of the loss of man's organic connection with the natural world and the consequent loss of his mode of being. It is the enactment of Lawrence's belief that civilization is a necessary evil: it has provoked man's fall from that state of saving grace which his connection with the natural entailed and so made him lose his selfhood. *The Rainbow* speaks of the necessity for man to become aware of this loss and of the necessity for him to acquire a new identity.

Both the sense of loss and the search for the replacement of being center about three generations of the Brangwen family. Together with the characters, the reader watches the slow disintegration of the mythic world of the Golden Age and the progressive entering of civilization into the lives of the individuals. The receding of the old pastoral life and the movement away from its ordered stability

force them to search for a new identity.

The forebears of the Brangwens that people The Rainbow lived, on the Marsh Farm, a life of profound identification with nature, unconsciously partaking of the rhythm of the seasons, intuitively knowing the mystery and wonder of nature:

> "They knew the intercourse between heaven and earth, sunshine drawn into the breast and bowels, the rain sucked up in the daytime, nakedness that comes under the wind in autumn, showing the birds' nests no longer worth hiding. Their life and interrelations were such; feeling the pulse and body of the soil, that opened to their furrow for the grain, and became smooth and supple after their ploughing, and clung to their feet with a weight that pulled like desire, lying hard and, unresponsive when the crops were to be shorn away"[1]

This interrelation was founded on the principle of "blood-intimacy" which dispenses with mental consciousness: "Their brains wers inert" and so was their blood which "flowed heavy with the accumulation from the living day."[2] At work they had their satisfaction in their blind relation with the earth and at home they lived in harmony with their wives, "knowing nothing of each other, yet living in their separate ways from one root."[3]

But civilization, first two miles away, in Ilkeston, and later just outside the gate of the Marsh Farm, in

Cossethay, made the Brangwen "aware of something standing above him and beyond him." This awareness already disturbs the "heated, blind intercourse of farm-life"[4]: the men hear "with fearsome pleasure" the "shrill whistle of the trains"[5] which announce that "the far-off" is coming near; the women not only wait passively for the coming of civilization, but they crave to run outward to find the beyond. For Lawrence, in an extension of the ideas which he develops in the "Study of Thomas Hardy," it is the woman who grows "towards discovery and light and utterance"[6]; it is the woman who is the carrier of civilization, the source of culture. Looking out of this "teeming life of creation," she wants "another form of life than this, she craves to know the world beyond, where, she imagines, "secrets were made known and desires fullfilled."[7]

When the woman, comparing her husband to the vicar and the Squire at the Hall - who to her are the "vital people in the land - her children to the curate's children and herself to the women of the "far-off world of cities"[8] finds that these outsiders are "finer, bigger," this craving becomes more intense. She, then, wants to achieve "this higher form of being." After analysing the reasons which made these people "more than the beast and the cattle," she concludes that it is education that allows man to raise himself above the common man and the beast. Thus she decides that if she cannot achieve this higher being in herself, "at least the children of her heart... should take place in equality with the living, vital people in the land."[9]

Tom, the representative of the first generation of Brangwens described in the book, is in this sense the first

modern man, for he is divided between the opposing forces inside himself: those that tie him blindly to the land and nature, as they tied his ancestors, and those instilled in him by his mother - the call of the beyond. The suffering caused by this division will be partially mitigated in his relation with Lydia, for he establishes with her a successful relationship centered in tradition and family and in obedience to the rhythms of life in nature. She, as a modern woman, is ahead of Tom in her knowledge of civilized life. Having tested it, she knows that there is nothing fulfilling for men in it, therefore she forces Tom to forgo his search, by seeking, no longer the "beyond" through her, but seeing her as a person and as his fulfillment. As they are the "broken end(s) of(an) arch"[10] only a vital union can give them back their lost harmony. Tom takes her knowledge as true for himself, acknowledging that "there's very little else, on earth, but marriage"[11]; yet, since he has not had the courage to venture beyond, deep down he feels "a prisoner, sitting safe and easy and unadventurous."[12]

The critics are often divided as to what Tom really stands for: to Goldberg his life stands for an "image of a human norm"[13]; to Daleski and Leavis his life is "something to be transcended."[14] However, what is important to The Rainbow's theme is not simply that the life of nature was good whereas modern life is evil. The important thing to consider is the historic dimension, the inevitability of the change, the transitional aspect of this world, the changing conditions in the self and in society. Tom not only experiences these changes but reflects them as well. He is not satisfied

with a life of blood intimacy because he is no longer wholly at one with nature; he cannot leave it altogether because he is not prepared to face the new. Poised between two worlds, torn between the desire of wanting and not wanting to dispense with the old and to venture into the new, Tom lacks the inner peace that his forebears enjoyed. He is therefore to be placed among the moderns, differing from us only in that he is more closely connected to the legendary past, a connection which assures him a greater vitality. His death symbolizes the death of this past and the rupture of man's last link to it.

It is through a coming into consciousness, says Lawrence, that we realize this break, and it is through consciousness that we solder a new line. Tom failed to become totally conscious: his awareness of the beyond, his belief that the only thing left for men on earth was the knowledge of the "satisfaction with his wife"[15] this was for him the farthest man could go towards the discovery of a new mode of being to replace the lost one. The gradual process of change in life, the gradual coming into consciousness is followed next through the lives of Anna and Will. They are only to a degree more conscious of what life asks of them. Within the flood that swept Tom to his death tor lack of firm ground, they will be able to survive only by drowning themselves in sensuality. Like Tom, Anna and Will struggle very hard, attempting the accession into a new mode of being; like Tom, they fall short, not without having stepped into another necessary stage in the process towards self-consciousness. Anna, as a modern, only allows Will to immerse himself into the violent,

regressive sexuality that alleviates their inner dissatisfaction after she has stripped his blind, mystic beliefs from him, trying to convince him that the values by which he lived were not adequate any longer: the present demands a new sort of coherence, a new identity. But, unable to find new values, both admit that they are "unready for fulfillment."[16] Anna subsides into maternity, preferring not to "start on the journey"[17] which would take her to self-knowledge; Will agrees to become "unanimous with the whole of purposive mankind,"[18] a condition that spares him the torments of facing his inner dissatisfaction.

Their daughter, however, will not fear to venture into the unknown, to explore her desires, to face her inner dissatisfaction. Unlike her predecessors, she will not give up the struggle till she achieves what she is in search of: a new identity compatible with the new conditions brought about by modern civilization. She represents the culmination of a process which began with the receding of the pastoral life, the great past, when the importance of the individual was "tiny."[19] Her story is the story of "woman becoming individual, self resposible, taking her own initiative."[20]

Since in Lawrence the sexual relationship "miniatures the cosmos,"[21] it is important to pay special attention to the sexual roles in each of the three generations: as the modern man and woman emerge from out of the changing conditions in society and in personal life, the evolution of their relationship epitomizes the modern pattern of sexuality.

It is in the "Study of Thomas Hardy," composed

while writing his final version of The Rainbow, that Lawrence explains his theory of sex, a theory based on his assumption that every being is both male and female. Sex "is only a definite indication of the great male and female duality"[22]: the conjunction of the two principles makes the unity, the individual. "But always, we are divided within ourselves."[23] In some people the division is not proportional and only those in whom "there is a proper proportion between male and female" are happy, "contented people."[24] The others have to struggle very hard to come into being: their success depends on their ability to reconcile the two elements within themselves. The test for the success is the sexual relationship where man seeks to obtain his consummation:

> "It needs that a man shall know the natural law of his own being, then that he shall seek out the law of the female, with which to join himself as complement. He must know that he is is half, and the woman is the other half: that they are two, but that they are two-in-one"[25]

Lawrence holds that in the Golden Age man was whole; modern civilization has caused the rupture of his unity. In the sex act, in "merging," in "mingling"[26] man can have his wholeness back because

> "In Love, in the act of love, that which is mixed in me becomes pure, that which is female in me is given to the female, that which is male in her draws into me, I am

> complete, I am pure male, she is pure female; we rejoice in contact perfect and naked and clear, singled out unto ourselves, and given the surpassing freedom."[27]

The modern man is, therefore, "crucified into sex": there must be the "melting," "the conjunction of the two"[28] in order that the singling out unto himself may take place.

In the light of these ideas The Rainbow can be understood as the artistic expression of Lawrence's idea of the historical progression of what emerged as the modern sexual pattern. No longer are the people in The Rainbow whole men or whole women: Tom is already dual, as his strong need to find completion in woman attests; furthermore, the elements of his psyche are imperfectly balanced: not only is he strongly attracted to a boy in his early school years but he is no longer "easy to mate, easy to satisfy, and content to exist"[29] as a well-balanced man certainly would be. The other two male protagonists. Will and Skrebensky, also suffer from this inner division.

The women of The Rainbow are also divided in their nature, a division that makes them more masculine than feminine: Lydia is the Call, Tom is the Answer; Lydia initiates Tom in the mysteries of a regressive sexuality which satisfies their sexual ambivalence, forcing him to take conscious realization of the other half that he is seeking in her. Anna is not only as assertive as Lydia but more mental as well, taking profit of her keen mind to jeer(ed) at(his)

soul" because Will is "inarticulate and stupid in thought."[30] Believing in the "omnipotence of the human mind"[31] she destroys Will's mysticism, his respect for his own moral code, forcing him to take conscious "realization of this supreme immoral, Absolute Beauty in the body of woman."[32]

It is, again, in his "Study of Thomas Hardy" that Lawrence classifies qualities such as assertiveness, articulateness, and mental power as essentially masculine traits: for him, theoretically, it is the man who devotes himself to Light, Knowledge, Doing, Public Good, Consciousness, Brain, Movement towards discovery; whereas the woman is more associated with the principle of Love, which stands for immanence, instinct, body.[33] As he says

> "In every creature, the mobility, the law of change, is found exemplified in the male; the stability, the conservatism, is found in the female. In woman man finds his root and establishment. In man woman finds her exfoliation and florescence. The woman grows downwards, like a root, towards the centre and the darkness and the origin.The man grows upwards, like the stalk, towards discovery and light and utterance."[34]

It is this classification which allows us to see the woman of The Rainbow as more masculine than feminine and the male as more predominantly feminine. As one generation succeeds the other, this pattern becomes more and more accentuated: Ursula's assertiveness, her desire to venture into the beyond, her thirst for self-knowledge surpass her grandmother's and her mother's. She goes to the depths of her

search, rejecting the confinment of domesticity, motherhood, and family ties, denying her very femaleness in her search for fullness of being. Her search leads her to recognize herself as a psychological force: she then understands that it is in the complex depths of her being, more than in the external world, that she can find value. She differs from the previous women in her family in another way too: while Lydia respects her husband and Anna only jeers verbally at Will's uncreatedness, Ursula goes further, destroying her partner when he does not live up to her expectations. Her phallic powers, translated as assertiveness and inhumanness are, however, seen as qualities of the soul, necessary for her salvation.

In showing the progress toward the "modern woman" that Ursula thoroughly represents, and the progress towards the modern man, Lawrence is giving artistic expression to his idea that modern life has reversed the roles of man and woman:

> "My mother's generation was the first generation of working class mothers to become self conscious... the woman freed herself at least mentally and spiritually from the husband's domination, and then she became that great institution, that character-forming power, the mother of my generation. I am sure the character of nine-tenths of the men of my generation was formed by the mother: the character of the daughters too.
>
> And what sort of characters ... a "good" husband, gentle and understanding and moral ... daughters morally confident ...

> I think it cannot be denied that ours is the generation of 'free' womanhood, and a helplessly 'pure' world, and of pathetic 'adoring, humble, high minded' men."[35]

In The Rainbow, however, Lawrence translates this idea with admiration for the woman who is only responding to historical forces greater than herself. "Looking out, as she must,"[36] she becomes aware of the historical progress and fights for the "soul's progress."[37]

Other themes, such as the ills of modern life, and the necessity of man to leave society to restore his wholeness, as well as man's fear of the phallic powers of the modern woman and the woman's need for a strong, wise male are themes which Lawrence explores to some extent in The Rainbow but in no way as thoroughly and pessimistically as in Women in Love, its sequel. At the time Lawrence wrote The Rainbow he was too enthused with life and love to be capable of the pessimism which pervades Women in Love. He had just discovered Frieda and realized that "(he) never knew what love was before ... ." He thinks

> "The world is wonderful and beautiful and good beyond one's wildest imagination. Never, never, never could one conceive what love is, beforehand, never. Life can be great - quite godlike. It can be so. God be thanked I have proved it."[38]

Though this love for life does not prevent him

from dealing with the deadening effects of modern civilization on the individual, it prevents him from being overly pessimistic about them: the protagonist of The Rainbow does not need to escape humanity or society at the book's end because it is society that will change. Though his love for Frieda does not prevent him from expressing his view of the greater destructive capacity of modern woman, given the weaker male, it led Lawrence to accomplish one of his desires:

> "I shall do a novel about Love Triumphant one day. I shall do my work for women, better than the Suffrage."[39]

Though the relationships presented to us in The Rainbow are not seen as perfect in any generation, love can be said to have triumphed in The Rainbow: not only has the book affirmed that

> "the one thing to do is for men to have the courage to draw nearer to women, expose themselves to them and be altered by them : and for woman to accept and admit men ... Because the source of all living is in the interchange and the meeting and mingling of these two..."[40]

but is has also struck the note of hope about the possibility of success in the relationship between man and woman.

B. The "New Eve" is born

A thing of kisses and strife
A lit-up shaft of rain
A calling column of blood
A rose-tree bronzey with thorns
A misture of yea and nay
A rainbow of love and hate
A wind that blows back and forth
A creature of beautiful peace, like a river
And a creature of conflict, like a cataract ...[41]

Lawrence

The greater part of The Rainbow is the Bildungsroman of Ursula I, the detailed depiction of her effort towards self-discovery. Though a Bildungsroman gives an author the opportunity to deal with the most turbulent years in a person's life - since the track from birth to maturity encompasses the most radical transitions that one undergoes in life - it cannot be said to be a very original theme: there is often nothing more ordinary than the changes that everygone undergoes within this period; again, this is one of the most common literary forms. However, given that, for Lawrence, "the greater part of every life is underground, like roots in the dark in contact with the beyond,"[42] what is usually commonplace is considered only the surface of an apparently calm lake which conceals an enormous variety of life and mobility in its depth. For one thing, his interest in the inhuman self and the new method of writing which enables him to depict the characters from within allow him to

bring forth the material of which Ursula I is made, and we come to recognize the unique element - the carbon - of the heroine as her story progresses. Also, as he penetrates beneath the surface of the social shell, beneath the ego, he reveals to us the forces that are operating within, and as each person in his elemental state strives to balance his male and female components, we watch Ursula I struggle for this polarity. In this way the apparent simplicity of her early family life and youthful adventures in this literary form serves to heighten the richness of Ursula I's inner life: indeed, this simplicity becomes enriched by the inner reality. Above all, the interchangeability, the tension between these two levels of reality builds the complexity of Ursula I: she will reveal herself both in her relations with the forces operating within herself as well as with the human and non-human world. We will learn that she is neither carbon alone, nor diamond, nor coal; that is, she is neither inhuman will only, nor personality, ego, feelingd. She is all of these. The result is the extraordinary, complex, multilayered Ursula I.

When Ursula I awakens to a sense of her own being, her deepest desire is to "become something," just what, she does not know and she is determined to discover. She is sensitive enough to perceive that "she was a separate entity in the midst of an unseparated obscurity"[43] and to transcend this, to make something of herself, she becomes "a traveller on the face of the earth."[44] It is a long journey till she is able to confront "the want she could put no name to,"[45] but once her decision is made she never retreats to the "unseparated obscurity" that constitutes the inert form

of life surrounding her.

Since she is both young and part of a society unused to female independence, the one adjective that could be applied to sum up her attitude towards life is courageous. Yet, courageous does not encompass the most salient feature of her nature. "She was shy, and she suffered. For one thing, she bit her nails and had a cruel consciousness in her fingertips, a shame, an exposure."[46] Also, "this was torment indeed, to inherit the responsibility of one's own life." "And she was afraid, troubled."[47]

On the other hand, though her attempt to assume the difficult task of becoming responsible for her individuality tells of her mature, rational nature, neither can she be called a rational, practical, mature person. In her drive to forge a life for herself different from that of her parents and their society, she is always led by adolescent, romantic desires: "She thought of wild things, of running away and becoming a domestic servant, of asking some man to take her."[48]

For Ursula I is too complex to be defined briefly. There is no point in arguing that she is romantic if we do not complement this characteristic with its natural counterpart: her extreme sense of down-to-earthness. Her courage is tempered with fear; reason with intuition; delicacy, warmth, grace and femininity with coldness, arrogance, cruelty, and masculinity. Somehow, the imbalance of the male and female elements within her gives her a dual nature. Unless we acknowledge the existence of these opposing attributes and the conflict between them we will not be able to

understand her.

The root of Ursula I's conflicting nature lies in her Oedipal past. We know that "Anna wanted a boy,"[49] and the attitude of disappointment at having a girl was so evident that is caused Will to claim the child for his own. She becomes his favourite and "between him and the little Ursula there came into being a strange alliance." She was always for him" and "his life was based on her."[50] This alliance began too early and lasted too long, leaving behind severe fixations which are reflected in her tortuous path towards normal mature femininity.

Being her father's daughter, she exults in having her soul filled with his love and in loving him. This is a bliss to her. She responds to his call with the passionate blindness of her faithful childish love. She loves the father so deeply and is so indifferent to the mother; she sides with the father against the mother, even "when he was irritable and shouted and made the household unhappy." "She knew her mother was right. But still her heart clamoured after her father ... ."[51] He is her refuge, "her tower of strength,"[52] her source of satisfaction and love. She pays him back with adoration.

Gradually, however, she becomes aware that her Goliath cannot protect her and that she cannot run towards him to satiate her desire to love and be loved. In his frequent attacks of hysteria, Will's pent up rage against the world, against his incompleteness, against his unsuccessful marriage, is driven towards Ursula. He fails to understand her vulnerability, her naivety and her spontaneity, and he punishes her for things she cannot understand she

has done. She seeks refuge and tries to heal the wounds that his cruelty causes her by suffering in isolation and by assuming a thin film of callousness and indifference. Ursula discovers that there is a "cold ... impersonal world,"[53] a world without affection. "And very early she learned that even her adored father was part of this malevolence. And very early she learned to harden her soul in resistance and denial of all that was outside her. ... And when he bullied her, she became hard, cut herself off from all connexion, lived in the little separate world of her own violent will."[54] At first, as a very young child, she pays back his frequent swings from love to bullying with a slave-like adoration and a mask of indifference, always trusting him and forgiving him. She has experienced shock and anguish when her dear father, cruelly, scolds her for what she has done at the church: he had "let her play about in the church" without reprimanding her for riffling "foot-stools and hymnbooks and cushions."[55] Yet when the charwoman angrily gives him the list of things that she has spoiled, he hardens himself against the woman, but pours his anger **on** his little daughter. She has been unjustly ill-treated by him when he discovers that she has, unconsciously, walked upon the seed beds; and she has acquiesced with his sado-masochistic instinct, playing up to to be strong out of her love for him: "She was a fearless little thing, when he dared her. And he had a curious craving to frighten her, to see what she would do with him."[56] She has submitted to his whim, to be his partner in the strangely cruel and dangerous kinds of games that please him:" ... he would leap again with her from the bridge, daringly, almost wickedly. Till at length, as he leapt, once, she dropped forward

on to his head and nearly broke his neck, so that they fell into the water in a heap, and fought for a few moments with death." "When the fair came, she wanted to go in the swing-boats. ... He sent the swingboat sweeping through the air in a great semicircle, till it jerked and swayed at the high horizontal. The child clung on, pale, her eyes fixed on him. People below were calling ... He laughed. The child clung to his hand, pale and mute. In a while she was violently sick."[57] Again and again she has forgiven him. When, however, he comes to the extreme of hitting her on the face because she has left the door of the parish-room open and the children, in her absence, damage his things, she "did not forget, she did not forget, she never forgot" his brutishness and his meanness, his taking delight in hurting her sensitiveness. "Slowly, slowly, the fire of mistrust and defiance burned in her, burned away her connexion with him."[58]

If Anna had not been so immersed in her mother-hood tasks she would have detected Ursula I's needs, she would have understood the unhealthy nature of Ursula I's alliance with the father. Then, perhaps, Ursula I would have sided with her, reviving the pre-Oedipal situation that had so soon been dissolved. Even siding with the father, Ursula I trusted her mother's judgements. But Anna never cut off her "wicked," "callous indifference" to anything but the practical world, and Ursula I never forgives her mother for her indifferent,unresponsive attitude towards the insistent calls of the mysterious, greater life. Not only does Ursula reject the mother, but she also revolts more and more "against babies and muddled domesticity."[59]

The subtle change from forgiveness to non-forgive-

ness in the child Ursula I's reaction to her father's cruelty has many consequences, for her credulity becomes skepticism and inquiry, and her dependence on him changes to a desperate need of independence. She learns that she cannot count on her parents for moral support. She learns, also, to fear and hate authority. More especially, she tries to alleviate her anxieties by immersing herself in the world of nature and in the world of enchantment that her imagination provides her.

But she is already seriously wronged. First, because "she was awakened too soon."[60] Her lower centers, the centers of sex as Lawrence calls them, have already been aroused to activity, and the balance between her male and female elements is disrupted. "Child and parent intensely linked in adult love-sympathy and love-will, on the upper plane, and in the child the deeper sensual centers aroused, but finding no correspondent, no objective, no polarized connection with another person" bring only disastrous consequences to the child.[61] Second, because her adoration for the father was suppressed too sharply. In the normal process of transition from infanthood to adolescence, the love for the father is only gradually driven towards another objective. Therefore Ursula can be considered <u>an adult child.</u> She is an adult in respect to her intense need to use her own initiative, to become independent. She keeps many childish traits such as her tendency to introversion and her enormous capacity to create a rich life of illusion. It is the interchangeability of these processes that accompany her during her drive towards maturity; it is this interchangeability

that makes her duality not only possible but convincing.

As she grows towards adolescence, all her repressed sexual energy, her need for a love-object, is channelled towards religion, which becomes for her a form of life. School is her refuge from home during the week, but it is the mysterious Sunday World that mostly satisfies her need for security and comfort. School is made bearable because she makes an illusion of it. "She seated herself upon the hill of learning, looking down on the smoke and confusion..."[62] of the real world. Little by little the smoke vanishes and she feels herself mingled in the atmosphere of confusion. She asks for the presence of the mystery in her troubled weekday world but she finds no answer. For a certain time she continues playing two different roles to see if it would be possible to find any connexion between the immediacy of the everyday needs and the mysticism of the Sunday World. But she realizes the impracticability of sustaining a double existence, and she either has to adopt the concreteness of the daily world or mysteriousness. She opts for the former, since the latter offers no solution to the several questions that everyday reality forces upon one. Above all she abandons religion because she feels ashamed of the kind of response Christ evokes in her. She wants peace and security, to be embraced by him: "If she could go to him really, and lay her head on his breast, to have comfort, to be made much of, caressed like a child."[63] Instead of this she feels confused and ashamed, because her response is sexual, though she cannot fathom the contradiction. This thought is more painful than blissful, and she rejects religion as she has already rejected the father, placing it among the other magic

components that have constituted the illusion of her life, "the illusion of a father whose life was an Odyssey in an outer world; the illusion of her grandmother, of realities so shadowy and far-off."[64] Religion "now fell away from reality, and became a tale, a myth, an illusion, which however much one might assert it to be true as historical fact, one knew was not true - at least for this present-day life of ours ... ."[65]

Since childhood, one of Ursula's most individualistic traits has been to create her legends and myths; then, when they no longer satisfy her demands, she destroys them, or better, places them in their proper perspective.

It is just in this moment of fierce confusion, sensing the thrust forwards impelling her to take a new step and finding herself directionless - asking herself..."in the obscurity and pathlessness to take a direction! But whither?."[66] - that Skrebensky arrives. Though she has discarded other alternatives, her need for the mystery is as great, and immediately she gives to him all the attributes, worldly and godly, she has as ideals. She wants so much to "walk this earth is gladness, being risen from sorrow"[67] that his sense of completeness and self-assurance—"he was so finely constituted, and so distinct, self-contained, self-supporting," - as well as his "sense of distances" lead her to lay "hold of him at once for her dreams."[68]

From Lawrence's presentation of Skrebensky - "His face was irregular, almost ugly, flattish, with a rather thick nose"[69] - and from Gudrun's criticism - "You look as if

you hadn't a bone in your body"[70] - the reader soon realizes that Skrebensky cannot fulfill Ursula I's expectations. If Lawrence had not posed Ursula I's choice of Skrebensky in a moment of crisis in her life it would have been difficult to reconcile Lawrence's tale with his own doctrine, for according to this, there are certain elements in the individual psyche that account for the choice of a partner. Even more, Ursula's blindness to Skrebensky's defects would be in conflict with one of her most distinctive traits: her sensitivity and her intuitive understanding which, in her case, have their counterpart in her practical mind. We cannot forget that Ursula combines her father's intuitive knowledge and wild passion with her mother's practical reasoning. But after the sudden detachement from the father she has become lost, and Strebensky's false centredness, his false, conventional, assertive masculinity blinds her to his real flabbiness. Then, her romantic imagination is at play again: Skrebensky corresponds to the ideal of man that her introversion has created. Thus, she takes him to be a mythic male, a superman. Seen through her eyes he is all God and deliverer.

Thanks to Ursula I's mistaken apprehension of the real Skrebensky, her extroverted nature is given full play. The earlier part of their romance brings into play a loving, radiant, care-free girl. We see her in all the luminousness that radiates from a person who is enthused with life. Skrebensky effects an outward and heightened inward change in her: "She became elegant, really elegant";[71] she, who had thought she could never love nor trust anyone, "because she could not love herself nor believe in herself"[72] now responds to life spontaneously, intensely.

As Ursula I becomes more intensely alive, Skrebensky seems in equal degree to lose color, to dim. The transformation comes to a climax when Ursula I meets a bargee, sitting in his boat playing with his baby daughter. This common but also intensely alive, sensitive man "watched her as if she were a strange being, as if she lit up his face."[73] Through this recognition of herself, knowing that she is desirable as a woman and able to inspire love in admiration, Ursula forces Skrebensky to admit that he "could not ... himself desire a woman so ..." Ursula is then able to establish a living relation, and to reject a dead one, for, "glad to have ... a moment of communion,"[74] one which is religious in essence, she seals the bond with the bargee in the ritual of giving his baby daughter her own name. As a consequence of this awareness, Ursula I is able to reject the deadness of the relation Skrebensky offers her.

Due to her mistaken apprehension of Skrebensky, we are also confronted with a revengeful, inhuman Ursula I. Before meeting the bargee she has already felt "something finite and sad"[75] in her relation with Skrebensky, a sense of foreboding that she has masked with her passion and with the illusion of him that her phantasy has created. Everything is make-believe, part of the game, and she is content to play the role of "the Sleeping Beauty," always "waiting for something more"[76]: she waits for his kisses, for his male "sunshine," for the violation of the virgin in her. And she loves to be part of this "magic land"[78] where she is enchanted and the people are enchanted, she loves to feel "as if she were supported off her feet, as if her feet were light as

little breezes in motion."[78] After her meeting the bargee, however, she stops playing the role of the Sleeping Beauty to play at being the conqueror. As the Sleeping Beauty she had created a mythic male for herself, putting him on a pedestal; as the conqueror she will undermine the pedestal and annihilate her opponent.

If first, at the height of her passion, she had filled herself with the light "which was of him" and become satisfied to the point of paying "homage"[79] to him; now, after her awakening to the sad reality of his nothingness, she uses her masculine attributes against him. His refusal to let her enjoy her strange connexion with the moon, his attempt to "net" her, make her turn against him. She becomes hard "as a pillar of salt," taking delight in "annihilating him" with her "cold, salt-burning body."[80] She was vindicated: "he was not any more."

This experience marks Ursula I profoundly. She discovers how mysteriously powerful and destructive she can become under the influence of the moon and of forces within herself, dark forces she had never dreamt existed. As she discovers her revengeful impulses, she becomes ashamed of her vain victory over him and afraid of her "other burning corrosive self," and she tries "to deny its existence with all her might,"[81] looking for "goodness and affection," masking her victory subtly by "putting him back together again" and by re-entering the world of illusion again. She plays at being his lover "in a young, romantic, almost fantastic way."[82] If she had erred before in her choice of Skrebensky, in her acceptance of passion only, in her willed assertiveness

against him, she makes another mistake in trying to deny her corrosive self, part of her dualistic nature. How can one come to the knowledge of oneself, unless one acknowledges it? But the forces that come from the unknown and take hold of Ursula cannot be so easily understood, and it will take time till she learns to accept them. Will and Anna never did. Afraid of the forces of darkness, they preferred to submerge themselves in a river of disintegrating sensuality rather than face their true selves. Consequently they remained enclosed in their uncreatedness. Fortunately for Ursula, she is intrinsically dual, encompassing the passions of Will and the rational mind of Anna. Even if she intends to repress part of her nature there will always be a residue to call her back to her right track. Yet a fear of her own nature will haunt her forever.

In refusing to acknowledge her darkness, Ursula directs her already misplaced feelings towards another disastrous experience. She transforms the fear of her revulsion from "the red-eyed old woman,"[83] into an attitude of subjection, responding to a doomed homosexual attraction. With Skrebensky she opted for asserting herself against him: now she does the opposite - she submits to Winifred, her class mistress, out of the feeling that Winnie is "fearless and capable." She gives her the sense of security, of completion, that Ursula I is after. Winifred is for Ursula I the "sun"[84] that can prevent the moon from exerting dominance upon her. Within this symbiotic relationship, she can enjoy the aggressiveness of her own sexuality, projected into the other, rather than exercise it.

In a sense Skrebensky is to be blamed for this

step that Ursula takes, for he first awakens the flood of passion in her and then he is not capable of matching her. When he leaves, the passion that he has awakened has no outlet, and "Her sexual life flamed into a kind of disease within her. She was so overwrought and sensitive, that the mere touch of coarse wool seemed to tear her nerves."[85] This over-sensuality, repressed and tied in with the fear of her destructive nature and an unconscious revolt against her destructive relation with Anton, makes her accept the relation with Winifred. Yet this homosexual connexion is another consequence of her early fixation, another instance of her duality, now strongly disrupted after her failure with Skrebensky. If the feeling of wonder and awe in her early contact with him had caused her to balance the elements within her psyche, had made her more predominantly feminine, now her failure with Skrebensky has made her more masculine: the scene with the bargee has shown that she is "a woman of body and soul."[86] The scene in which she destroys Skrebensky's maleness has brought into being a phallic woman whose "sharp flame" like "cold fires" melts his "soft iron."[87] Her relation with Winifred ultimately represents an unconscious attempt to effect her own balance.

But Winifred's influence does not bring the balance, the equilibrium. It brings instead the cold, destructive self, Ursula I's inhumanness, back. Skrebensky has had to bear her inhumanness for not playing up to her expectations: She "ate" him as she had eaten the sweets he sent her. Winifred does not escape her revenge. Some "inhuman will"[88] turns her into the malignant, punitive Ursula I again, and she perversely marries Winnie to her ignoble

Uncle Tom. The Ursula I who was incapable of forgiving the father has become not only incapable of forgiveness but has also become revengeful. Being woman, she has inherited the cruelty of the mother; the stigma, to Lawrence, of the woman's commitment to light and knowledge. When Anna cruelly destroyed Will's vital passion for "The Cathedral," "she mocked, with a tinkle of profane laughter. And she laughed with malicious triumph."[89] It is this kind of sadistic malignity that neither Tom nor Will nor even Skrebensky would have been capable of.

Ursula has to look for a change inside herself, but she still insists on finding it outside. Her dissatisfaction drives her to dream again. She dreams of "becoming a domestic servant, of asking some man to take her,"[90] anything but staying at home, because she knows that "from her parents she would never get more than a hit in the face."[91] Practically, she applies for a job as teacher in Kent and in Derbyshire. While she waits for the answer she dreams of the lively reality that she expects to have there. Kent would be a paradise "where the sun shone softly" and where "Frederick,"[92] a manly man, would be her partner. Derbyshire is also transformed into a magnificent place where peace is found in the friendly atmosphere of a profound intimacy between her and the other girls who live in the same house. She never has the opportunity of facing the true side of these illusions,or better, her desires, because her father forces her to accept a place that he has arranged for her in Ilkeston. She hates her father and mother even more strongly now that they have forced her to face the ugliness of the school at Ilkeston. But her dreams compensate her again. She is going

to inject her female spirit into the male mode of being that rules the school. "She would make everything personal and vivid, she would give herself, she would give, give, give all her great stores of wealth to her children, she would make them so happy, and they would prefer her to any teacher on the face of the earth ... She would be the gleaming sun of the school."[93] It is interesting to observe that in her dreams she is essentially feminine and the manifest content of the dreams reveals a strong need for love and affection as well as a desire to be loved and protected.

Soon she realizes the impracticableness of her dream. She cannot win over the machine. Yet she does not give up teaching. On the contrary, she proves to be "man" enough to bear the impersonality that the cruel school system imposes on her: she proves to be strong enough to bear the brutality and the hardiness of the man's world. To assure her position in the man's world she must dehumanize herself, adopting the same inhuman measures that Mr. Harby, the school director, does. Overcoming her loathing of pshysical suffering, she inflicts physical punishment on her students.

> "With one hand she managed to hold him, and then the cane came down on him. He writhed, like a mad thing. But the pain of the strokes cut through his writhing, vicious, coward's courage, bit deeper, till at last, with a long whimper that became a yell, he went limp."[94]

After this episode, Mr. Harby, who has done his best to fire her as incompetent, "hated her almost as if she were a man."[95] She, who loves the flowers, the touch of the sun, the song

of the birds, and who wants so much to find "some fantastic fulfillment on earth"[96] sells her joy for living to attain her "place in the working world."[97]

We have seen that, in recording these trials , Lawrence takes great care to emphasize Ursula I's dualistic nature by a continual juxtaposition of the contradictory elements within her. He speaks of her fear and reluctance to enter the man's world - "for she shrank with extreme sensitiveness and shyness from new contact, new situations"[98] and at the same time, of her firm resolution to make part of it; her ideal of creating her students as individuals and her courage to beat them; her love of nature and her conscious effort to suppress its vital contact; the contrast between her practical and her dreamy nature: throughout, she fuses characteristics that seemingly annul each other, yet she continues to be true to her nature, astonishingly alive and coherent.

Again, throughout Ursula's story we are reminded of the fact that in spite of the severe wounds that her experiences in the world cause her to suffer, her core remains intact. She is invulnerable in her very vulnerability. She serves the machine, experiences its degrading effects, but still she remains vital. She accepts the brutalization, accepts being scarred by life: "Something struck her hand that was carrying her bag, bruising her. As it rolled away she saw that it was a potato"[99] (thrown by one of her students.) Still, at the end of her frustrating experience as a teacher, she stands "for joy, happiness, and permanency, in contrast with Maggie, who was for sadness, and the inevita-

ble passing-away of things."[100] Even after her shameful connexion with Winnie we hear that "yet, within all the great attack of disintegration upon her, she remained herself."[101] She keeps her intactness whilst everything and everybody gives in to degradation: Maggie, Uncle Tom, Winnie, Skrebensky, the miners. "It is the same everywhere ... . It is the office, or the shop, or the business that gets the man, the woman gets the bit the shop can't digest. What is he at home, a man? He is a meaningless lump - a standing machine, a machine out of work."[102]

We hear this from Winnie, who understands and recognizes depravity, though she forgets to include herself as part of it. Yet Ursula I, in spite of being a product of and a participant in this dehumanizing society, retains her basic humanity, attesting to Lawrence's belief, at this period, that human strength can overcome the problems which modern mechanical life brings to the individual.

Ursula I's strength - her intactness - paradoxically derives from a residue of infantile fixation: her tendency to make a big illusion of life. Up to this point Ursula I has made an illusion of each of her experiences in life, and has destroyed each illusion as soon as it ceased to have any meaning for her, always creating a new one to correspond to her needs. Also, expecting too much from life, she does not accept the little that the everyday world gives her. The more she experiences life, the less satisfied she becomes, slowly more and more "profoundly aware of the big want."[103] Up to now, her dreams have kept her on the move; till now she is constantly changing her position in life from

one direction to another, changing jobs, loves, ideals. Yet till now she has fixed her dreams on the world of light, running from the fear of her own darkness "under this red sunset,"[104] never stopping to analyse the validity of her thrust, never pausing to consider what she really is and what she has been doing all this for.

Lawrence's belief that "Life is a travelling to the edge of knowledge, then a leap taken - we can not know beforehand. We are driven from behind, always as over the edge of the precipice,"[105] explains how crucial these trials are for Ursula's coming into consciousness.

Ursula I has been accepted at the University. She has dreamed that here, the University and its teachers would be the guardians of the source of the mystery of life, guardians of the sacredness of the temple of wisdom. But her trial continues: she must again break this illusion. Slowly, after some time, she comes to realize that here also the sacredness has been violated and the mystery profaned. Knowledge has been transformed into small tablets of ready-made merchandise that are sold at a high price.

As this truth becomes evident to her, Ursula I suddenly reaches a point where she discovers that she cannot simply go on forever creating and destroying illusions, that she cannot simply move from one "hilltop" to another: she realizes that every illusion leads to disillusion-"Always the shining doorway ahead; and then, upon approach, always the shining doorway was a gate into another ugly yard, dirty and dead."[106] She then wants to know what her thrust has served for, in what world she has been moving, to what direction she

will be led.

From the window of her school her eys meet a woman "in a pink frock, with a scarlet sunshade ... a little white dog running like a fleck of light about her," crossing the road. In seconds she disappears from sight but Ursula I detects the unliving reality that she herself is forced into within the school walls. Life outside is fluid, whereas the learning to which she is applying herself is static. She wonders where the woman is gone - "whither? Whither?"[107] - and the agony in her voice tells of her desire to discover a live reality in freedom. The magic of not knowing what lies ahead also arouses her to question her own way of life.

As she begins to question the nature of her search and the nature of her own being, she begins to question life itself, and she comes to the recognition that there is both light and dark in the world, recognizing also that she has been confining herself within the lighted world "wherein the moths and children played in the security of blinding light, not even knowing there was any darkness, because they stayed in the light;" she also becomes aware that "that which she was, positively, was dark and unrevealed;" furthermore, she understands that "it could not come forth"[108] unless she leaves this "dead unreality,"[109] turns inward and accepts the mystery of her own being. She begins to understand that, till now, she has chosen the light for fear of her darkness, that she has been denying herself.

It is her awareness that the greater part of life cannot be known or analysed that puts her in disagreement with the mechanistic philosophy to which the university

adheres. She cannot accept the professor's irreverent attitude towards life any longer. In a moment of revelation,just after having doubtfully heard from Dr. Frankstone "I don't see why we should attribute some special mystery to life - do you?," Ursula I, seeing a living cell moving under the microscope, understands the why of her disagreement with the professors, understands the purpose and meaning of life: the living cell is for her proof that there is an impenetrable, undecipherable world under the crust of the world of knowledge, light and experience. She also understands that this world cannot be explained, as the professors try to, through complicated chemical and physical formulae; there is more to it than the mechanical laws which the professors apply to it.For Ursula I, the mystery of the moving, living call suggests the purpose and meaning of life: "a oneness with the infinite. To be oneself was a supreme, gleaming triumph of infinity."[110]

Her reaction then is to look for joy and communion in life: she runs back to Anton expecting in him and with him "a new beginning." Yet her instinctive reaction to seeing him is a chill "like a sunshine of frost"; a chill that "she would not admit to herself" warns her that they will not meet as lovers but as the "enemy come together in a truce." We would expect the new Ursula I, who had just discovered that darkness is part of life and that the purpose of life is communion, to respond to her instinctive reaction, and reject him. We are at first put off when she represses it, and shuts her heart and soul in obedience to her powerful will, which tells her to have Skrebensky back. Yet there are other emotions, deeply hidden, motivating her will: her feeling of guilt for what she had done to him, reacting with

her unacknowledged hatred of him: "But she did not forgive him that he had not been strong enough to acknowledge her. He had denied her."[112] We remember that Ursula I suffered bitterly if she were forced to have a low opinion of any person, and she never forgave that person."[113] Unconsciously she is accepting him back with a will to break the illusion she had made of him.

For as the action progresses, we see Ursula I struggling as intensely with her unconscious forces, as before she had struggled with forces outside, in the daylight world. Though Ursula I neither acknowledges nor questions these forces, it is possible to deduce that they operate through her will because till now they have been repressed and directionless; now they have taken over Ursula I, dominated her will , and directed themselves towards Skrebensky, newly arrived from Africa, exhaling the darkness which complements Ursula's newly-found darkness. Though she divines that she is not going to form a fulfilling relationship with him, she will try her darkness out. The reader does not blame Ursula I for so coldly and deliberatly accepting a man whom her heart cannot accept, for he senses the struggle ahead: she will first have to learn to live with this new potential - these forces - now uncontrolled. Later she will learn to gain power over them, when she learns to balance her night goal with her day goal. If first she had hurt herself, accepting only light, repressing darkness, now she will have to go through an apprenticeship in darkness. We see this step as necessary in her way toward self-knowledge: after it she will certainly be ready to face her own self, coming into fullness of being.

When Ursula I accepts Skrebensky she is excited by the thought of sensual contact and aware that he is staking everything on her choice. "He was helpless, at her mercy. She could take or reject."[114] From the beginning she knows she is the call, the stronger one. At first Skrebensky's newly won African darkness excites her, but soon even this is gone. "He aroused no fruitful fecundity in her ... . She knew him all round, not on any side did he lead into the unknown."[115] But, as always, she lives her experience with Skrebensky to the end. For a certain time she accepts his dependence on her, enjoying his body with the "carelessness of a possessor."[116] Then, though she had first asserted herself against him, making him feel "a mere attribute of her," so that his "hope of standing strong and taking her in his own strength was weakened,"[117] she decides that she will break his dependance on her. She tells him she does not want to marry him. When this attempt does not have the desired effect, she finally annihilates him totally, also deliberately, cruelly: "she fastened her arms round him and tightened him in her grip ... pressing in her beaked mouth till she had the heart of him." If, seven years earlier, she had felt guilty trying to restore him by caresses, this time, suffering the torment of her own cruelty again, she accuses him as responsible for their failure: "'It isn't me,' she said: 'You have done with me - we have done with each other.' "[118] If he were stronger, she implies, she would not need to have endured this suffering. In having to witness his pain, in having to endure her own, her victory has become agony.

Yet Ursula I it is not through her trial yet.She discovers that she is pregnant and "the falsity of the dream,

of her connexion with Skrebensky"[119] returns. She makes a move to sell herself in order to assure her baby the right to have a father, humbly asking Skrebensky to accept her back and recognizing the pretentiousness of her desire to find some extraordinary fulfillment on earth. "Was it not enough that she had her man, her children, her place of shelter under the sun?"[120] But she is mature already, and the incapacity of making a dream of this repulsive reality causes her to revive, in her first adult dream, the fierce trial that she has had to endure.

In her nightmare she sees herself emerging from the "marshy meadow" of Willey Water, and this vision must refer to her childhood and to her escape from the marshy life of Cossethay. Then she feels "very wet and a long way from home," lost, looking for "stability and security." Her wetness represents her total immersion in the circles of experience, linking her desire to go back to stability, with a new recognition of the side tracks that led her so far away from her objective. Finally she envisions the dreadful horses.She acknowledges these male forces as beautiful, powerful, yet aggressive and destructive.

> "She was aware of their breasts gripped, clenched narrow in a hold that never relaxed, she was aware of their red nostrils flaming with long endurance, and of their haunches, so rounded, so massive, pressing, pressing, pressing to burst the grip upon their breasts, pressing forever till they went mad, running against the walls of time, and never bursting free. Their great haunches were smoothed and darkened with rain. But the

> darkness and wetness of rain could not put out the hard, urgent, massive fire that was locked within these flanks, never, never."[121]

Though they are stronger than she is and threaten her, she manages to escape them and enter a "cultivated field," leaving them "held up"[122] in their corner. This enigmatic, yet successfully drawn vision must refer to her realization of her powerful, aggressive, destructive nature and of her necessity to come to terms with her hitherto uncontrolled libido.

Having relived her trials, she is so repulsed by the true reality she had lived that she throws up her past. The miscarriage extricates her from the weight of her bygone reality, and she is able to experience a sense of permanency, characteristic of the female nature: a sense that she has been delivered of her old life, "all husk and shell," "her mother and father and Anton..." whereas she, the "kernel," "would have her root fixed in a new Day." Now she recognizes that at the moment her will had fixed on Skrebensky, she had, true to her old mode of being, made an illusion of him: "she had created him," knowing that she would finally destroy him. Now she knows that "it was not for her to create, but to recognize a man created by God."[123] As Lawrence says in Phoenix: "... we seek all the time to come into true relationship with other beings. Yet it has to happen, the relationship, almost unconsciously. We can't deliberately do much with a human connexion, except smash it: and that is usually not difficult. On the positive side we can only most carefully let it take place, without interfering or forcing."[124]

The symbol that gives the book its title is said to be misapplied. In a certain sense this is true, because among all the characters that people the last part of The Rainbow, Ursula I is the only one able to achieve the metamorphosis that is necessary to liberate herself. There is little or no evidence that "the sordid people who crept hard-scaled and separate on the face of the world's corruption ... would cast off their horny covering of disintegration."[125] But for Ursula I, particularly, the symbol fits very well. She achieves the balance within herself, first broken because of her parental attachement. Now she knows that she has to live in harmony with her dualistic nature. It is her intrinsic harmony that gives her "the sense of permanency," that makes her feel herself as part of "Eternity." If she sees this harmony spread throughout the whole earth and synthesized in The Rainbow it is because in finding herself, Ursula I has also found "true relatedness" with the circumambient universe.

> "If we think about it, we find that our life consists in this achieving of a true relationship between ourselves and the living universe about us. This is how I "save my soul" by accomplishing a pure relationship between me and another person, me and other people, me and a nation, me and a race of men, me and the animals ... an infinity of pure relations, big and little, like the stars of the sky ... This, of we knew it, is our life and our eternity: the subtle, perfected relation between me and my whole circumambient universe."[126]

As Ursula I has just achieved the "Eternity in the flux of Time"[127] she is experiencing the peace, equilibrium and perfect harmony between herself, and human and non-human nature. The word "subtle" implies that Lawrence does not claim that this timeless relation is eternal. It is eternal and timeless while it lasts. How can a rainbow remain forever fixed?

CHAPTER IV

TURNING POINT.

> Let there be again the old passion of deathless friendship between man and man ... Marriage and deathless friendship, both should be inviolable and sacred: two great creative passions, separate, apart, but complementary: the one pivotal, the other adventurous: the one, marriage, the centre of human life; and the other, the leap ahead.
>
> Lawrence

A. *Women in Love* as a whole

From the time Lawrence rewrote *The Rainbow* to the time he finished *Women in Love* less than two years elapsed. However, during this period, a single event altered the whole structure of society, desply affecting its people: the war. *Women in Love*, first conceived as part of *The Sisters*, suffered the influence of the war in its finished structure. For this reason, unlike its sister volume, it reflects this crisis of civilization and the intense personal crisis in the individuals, particularly in the life of Lawrence, as he records:

> "This actually does contain the results in one's soul of the war: it is purely destructive, not like *The Rainbow*, destructive - consummating."[1]

Women in Love records the social, cultural, economic and personal chaos of a dying society. An atmosphere of corruption permeates each environment described in the book, and this corruption, like a disease, atrophies a once vital organism. From an early education which teaches the individual to live within a "limited, false set of concepts"[2] in physical surroundings of barren ugliness "like a vision of hell,"[3] society forms men who are no longer "men, personalities ... just accidents,"[4] mechanical units in the mechanical organization of the vast machine which the new leaders, the Industrial Magnates, have built to dominate matter and man. This is the "fine state of chaos" Lawrence speaks of, in which the organic hold of community is broken, as is the organic tie of man to nature and to his work. War is but a consequence of this state, in which the machine principle has taken over all society.

Since Women in Love records the chaos of a dying society at the very time England was passing through one of the worst moments in its story, many critics evaluate the book as a study of social illness, meant to be both a diagnosis of civilization's malady and a prescription for its cure. H.M. Daleski analyses in depth the rottenness of England as described by Lawrence in Women in Love and he gives the social aspect its due weight. The "five social scenes" - Beldover, Shortlands, Breadalby, the Café Pompadour, the Tyrolese hostel - not only give the novel its varied and ample spatial dimension, but they unify the whole "through their common location on volcanic soil," heralding "an inevitable cataclysm." Daleski also assumes

that it is the social mechanism that drives the characters to look for dissolution and to revel in putrescence, holding war responsible for the sickness of man. Since external forces are to be blamed for the characters' corrupt response to life, he considers that there is "no internal division in the book between the social and the personal, for all the social scenes are designed to evoke that background of impending ruin against which the personal drama is enacted, and in relation to which it derives its ultimate menaing."[5]

True, the book in its social dimension supports Daleski; even Lawrence's own testimony emphasizes the importance of the social: he wants "the time to remain unfixed so that the bitterness of the war may be taken for granted in the characters."[6]

However, while emphasizing the importance of the social reality, the book puts a still stronger emphasis on the individual's role, especially on the necessity for him to understand the nature of this process of decay. In his understanding of the war not as the cause but as the symptom of the extreme malady (contained in the society in which he lives and in his soul) lies the individual's only chance of salvation. He will then come to the realization that there is no cure for this malady of civilization, that he will die from it unless he tries to cure his soul and to leave this sick society. That is, Lawrence places the responsibility for the individual's sickness on society which is corrupt, and is corrupting man's soul, and yet he makes the individual the sole agent responsible for his own salvation. Therefore, though there is no barrier between the personal and the so-

cial, each of these two levels of experience must be equally recognized because it is the concurrence and the interaction of these two levels which gives the novel its complexity.

It is in this sense that the letter read aloud by Halliday, in the chapter "Pompadour," is revealed as one of the most important keys to an understanding of the whole book. Here the two levels of experience are acknowledged: external forces, greater than the individual, are seen as the cause for the tendency towards destruction, and the effect of this corrosive society on the individual manifests itself as a break-up in the structure of the psyche. Yet the letter also stresses the inevitability of personal responsibility: no matter how deeply injured by the social mechanism, man has to accept the responsibility for his own salvation. The religious overtones of the letter, which the jeers of Halliday and his crowd help to emphasize, tell of man's responsibility for his own salvation. Finally the letter, revealing Lawrence's understanding and deep concern for man's helplessness, acknowledges man's inadequacy to assume this responsibility after having been so seriously wronged. Halliday reads the letter in the midst of a significantly spasmodic crisis of hiccups. The hiccups are the pathetic response of man to the kind of strength that life demands from him. The importance of the letter justifies its full quotation, though the jeers will be omitted.

> "There is a phase in every race when the desire for destruction overcomes every other desire. In the individual, this desire is ultimately a desire for destruction in the self. It is a desire for

> the reduction-process in oneself, a reducing back to the origin, a return along the Flux of Corruption, to the original rudimentary conditions of being. And in the great retrogressio, the reducing back of the created body of life, we get knowledge, and beyond knowledge, the phosphorescent ecstasy of acute sensation.
>
> And if, Julius, you want this ecstasy of reduction with Minette, you must go on till it is fulfilled. But surely there is in you also, somewhere, the living desire for positive creation, relationships in ultimate faith, when all this process of active corruption, with all its flowers of mud, is transcended, and more or less finished.
>
> Surely there will come an end in us to this desire - for the constant going apart - this passion for putting asunder - everything - ourselves, reducing ourselves part from part - reacting in intimacy only for destruction - using sex as a great reducing agent, reducing the two great elements of male and female from their highly complex unity - reducing the old ideas, going back to the savages for our sensations - always seeking to lose ourselves in some ultimate black sensation, mindless and infinite - burning only with destructive fires, ranging on with the hope of being burnt out utterly."[7]

Above all, the letter is a warning intended to call the attention of the hearers to the fact that they have been travelling towards death and that they must be brought back from this road to a connection with a more whole, vital way of life; the letter is therefore an attempt to bring them

into consciousness.

In pointing to the necessity for consciousness, the letter echoes Birkin's several other reiterations about the importance of awareness: already in "Class-Room" he tells Hermione and Ursula that modern people are going dead "not because they have too much mind, but too little."[8] On another occasion, when Ursula accuses him of wanting them all to be deathly, he replies that all he wants is that they all know that they are deathly, implying that if they realize their illness, there will be some chance of salvation for them.

In the last analysis, it is only Birkin's awareness that saves him and Ursula. Deeply immersed in the death process, fragmented, "in the ultimate stages of living,"[9] but acutely aware of the overwhelming power of destruction in modern society, of the negative effect of the modern will upon consciousness, and of the need to regain a healthy consciousness encompassed by the unconscious, Birkin desperately looks for "the remaining way,"[10] the way of salvation, and he transcends. Halliday(with his crowd) does not take heed of the warning brought by the letter, preferring not "to know and to understand what is happening, even in himself,"[11] preferring to "go on till the process is fulfilled." Gudrun, though shocked into a terrible awareness, takes just the negative content of the warning as the answer to her tormenting enquiry after her own fate. She considers her situation so hopeless that she allows herself "to ebb with the sewer stream"[12] into dissolution, with Loerke. Gerald's blindness prevents him from understanding the content of the letter. Only when he sees a crucifix buried in the snow is he able to

grasp its meaning, for given the letter's religious overtones, his facing the crucifix will have reminded him of its content. Only then will he grasp the extent of his sickness, but, being too weak, he does not try to save himself. Only Ursula who, at the beginning, is not even aware of the fact that she is also caught in the process-for she chose to pretend not to see it - is saved because she is forced by Birkin into awareness.

The interaction between the social and personal realities in the book points to a link between The Rainbow and Women in Love, a link that shows that the two novels, though dissimilar, were developed out of a single conviction that modern civilization is deathly and that our awareness of this is both necessary and important. In The Rainbow man had to evolve from mindlessness to a state of consciousness in which moreover the unconscious must not be denied: Ursula I only acquired her new identity when she recognized herself as a force compounded of two waves, the unconscious and conscious, the dark and the light, the passions and the mind. The other characters, failing to acknowledge the interaction between their conscious and unconscious natures, failed to achieve fullness of being. As with Will, only the social, more repressive self was developed.

Women in Love, "a potential sequel to The Rainbow,"[13] begins with the assumption that civilization is become so harmful to man that it has almost cut him off altogether from the chance of achieving the proper state of awareness which would allow him to achieve an integrated personality. In Women in Love the characters are encased in a

hard ego, in a sick, corrupt, repressive consciousness, dominated by the will. Under the pressure of this consciousness man has repressed his unconscious, had denied his inner need. Women in Love proposes that since man cannot return toward unconsciousness again - for it would mean his death - he must acknowledge his duality, must uncover his consciousness to admit the unconscious. Once the unconscious is acknowledged, man can become whole again. Lawrence speaks of polarity between the centers of the passions, the mind, and the emotions, as opposed to the domination of the emotions or the passions by mind and will, in which the repressed, once returned, will manifest itself warped and twisted.

For this reason, the purpose of the novel is to explore the effects of the domination of a sick consciousness on the psyche of the individual. The novel mirrors, in its description of sexual repression, the repression of the unconscious. The descriptions of sexual perversions are deeply revealing studies of psychopathology, of sadism and masochism, lust to dominate and murder. In each case, repression of some facet of the individual's true nature has sucked up the vital self, and as the novel unfolds it reveals in detail how the illness will progress and how the individual will react in relation to the "intense suffering"[14] which he experiences in his process of dissolution.

Gerald's aggressiveness, uncontrolled in early infancy by a neurotic mother too closely loved, explodes in sadism and in the need to control his miners, his mare, and his sexual partners, after his having "chopp(ed) (him) self down to fit the world."[15] When the counter impulse, the wish

to be passive, returns, it leaves Gerald defenseless, a blind Oedipus in Gudrun's arms. Oscillating from one extreme to the other, Gerald is cut off from the possibilities of normal, mature love. Gudrun's cruelly inhuman remark to him truly describes his illness: "You cannot love."[16]

In Gudrun, the repression of strong masculine traits (evolved in early childhood) and a concomittant fear of their discovery brings her to a withdrawal from "positive creation,"[17] an admission that one has "to die like this," "it (is) the only way." Gudrun comes to seek sensation in self-annihilation, drowning her deepest needs in a destructive urge to smash up, to let go, and in the infliction of self-punishment.

Hermione , the most stereotyped of the characters, the embodiment of the idea of "the triumph of the integral will"[18] over the psyche, has bottled up her spontaneous self and substituted it for a craving for power. Now that she has learned to "use (her) will"[19] she wants to dominate, to manipulate people as well. When she is denied this chance, the unconscious returns so violently as to drive her mad: when Birkin refuses to submit to her will, in Breadalby, she nearly kills him with a heavy paper-weight.

Loerke is the brilliant projection of the Future Man, toward which the other characters are evolving. In him, the process of disease still being fought within the others has triumphed: he has become inhuman, a "creature," after having undergone "the intense suffering" inherent in the nature of the process of disease. He now has completely divorced his mind and will from his emotions and passions. Emotion-

less and willful he is become immensly powerful over those who are still "human being(s)":[20] without feeling the pangs of consciousness he can manipulate people like objects and experience sex as mere sensation.

If man becomes aware of the fact that he is enclosed in a state of self-consciousness which cuts him off from the flux of creation, he will, as a corollary, become aware that a new conjunction is also necessary. As proposed in the "Study of Thomas Hardy" and dramatized in The Rainbow, modern man suffers from his incompletion. Through Birkin's self-questionings we know that

> "In the old age, before sex was, we were mixed, each one a mixture ... The process of singling into individuality resulted into the great polarization of sex. The womanly drew to one side, the manly to the other, But the separation was imperfect even then."

As stressed in The Rainbow, sex is therefore man's lacerating "scar": it has made "men and women" ... broken fragments of one whole," thus forcing man to be "added on to a woman, before he had any real place or wholeness."[21] Since, however, civilization has not helped to develop a fruitful conjunction between man and woman - the sex bond is only "a dreadful bondage, a sort of conscription,"[22] in which each partner uses the other to glorify his own supreme self in the name of love - man has to reject this sick, old kind of sexual union in favour of a new, healthier one. Merging and mingling, the principles on which the old relation is based, have to be replaced by singling out, that is, union based on separateness.

The male rejects mingling because - as Birkin feels - while it prompts the male to lose his identity in the womb, to surrender the self, it provides the woman with the conditions to exert her possessiveness, the sexual assertiveness that allows her to destroy the male. In the domain of a sexual relation based on merging, the woman's "hard kisses"[23] destroy man much as Ursula I destroyed Skrebensky.

In the new conjunction both partners must be equally apart while orbiting together. Yet the male protagonist is clear that the new conjunction must return the sovereignty to the male, "that golden light which is you"[24] - the woman's phallic powers - will be given him: she will revert, as Ursula aptly points out, to sattelite.

The merging will be reserved for a further conjunction of the male to a man. In Women in Love, the male advocates his right to have a conjunction with both a man and a woman: "If he pledged himself with the man he could later be able to pledge himself with the woman."[25]

Because of the fact that Women in Love, in its analysis of the social reality, is too pessimistic - "Withim these pages all is borne away on a river of corruption; mankind is a withered tree, a doomed species - [26] while the treatment of individual reality is too idiosyncratically Laurentian - Birkin protests too much against female assertiveness, demands the woman's submission and advocates a further conjunction only for the male - late critics are very cautious in attributing a universal dimension to the book. While in the fifties F.R. Leavis was ready to assert the normative value of Women in Love without any restriction, Emile Delavenay

thinks that the book should be accepted neither as a norm nor as "a total explanation of human nature" because Lawrence embraced his "own problems into a norm."[27] Scott Sanders believes that even the value of the diagnosis of the crisis of civilization should be doubted because it "is compromised by the distorting effects of the crisis in Lawrence's own life, with its attendant anxieties, hatreds and ambition"; he therefore proposes that the book "should be read, then, not as diagnosis, not as blueprint for renewed human relations, but as the anguished response to a world-wide trauma by an isolated and frustrated man ... ."[28]

That Lawrence at the time was deeply frustrated both in his social and sexual instinct is known; not only does the book attest to this in Birkin's misanthropy and his fear and hatred of sex but Lawrence's pessimistic letters of the period also do:

> "I think there is no future for England, only a decline and a fall. That is the dreadful and unbearable part of it: to have been born into a decadent era, a decline of life, a collapsing civilization!"[29]

As his letters reveal, the same pessimism seems to have undermined even his belief in the value of heterosexual relations and in the regenerative power of sex. Lawrence, who earlier wanted to be called "The Priest of Love,"[30] at this stage abandons his strident call for the necessity for heterosexual unions:

> "the older world is done for ... it's no

> use the man looking to the women for salvation, nor the women looking to sensuous satisfaction for their fulfilment."[31]

That the frustration of his sexual and social instincts compromised the normative value of the book is also admissible: besides the pressure of war, Lawrence felt deeply troubled about his own nature, unsure of his own identity.The preoccupation with the problem of"eternal union with a man"[32] brought out in Women in Love reflects the emergence of Lawrence's femininity which his love for Frieda had put in abeyance.

Yet no matter how disturbed Lawrence was by the World War and by his own problems - perhaps just because of this - he was able to depict the conflict that is unfolded within the mind of a person in whom "the desire for destruction in the self"[33] has taken precedence over any other desire; in presenting the tormented mind of his characters,Lawrence discloses to the reader the intense suffering that afflicts the human soul before it "breaks, breaks away from its organic hold like a leaf that falls."[34] The desire may be Lawrence's perverse desire; this suffering may be Lawrence's own suffering; the roots of sickness of his characters may be Lawrence's own sickness: Lawrence never denied this:

> "this novel only pretends to be a record of the writer's own desires, aspirations, struggles; in a word, a record of the profoundest experiences in the self."[35]

But in pursuing the analysis of his characters' sick conscious-

ness and in unfolding the reactions that each of them adopts in relation to his sickness and to his suffering, the universal scope of the novel is attained: it is with these fragmented people that the modern reader identifies. For one thing, we live "under a volcano which has been either erupting or threatening to erupt every year since 1914[36]; in us, as in Lawrence and in his people, "new unfoldings struggle up in torment[37]; therefore even if the book cannot serve as a formula for the solution to our problems it is more than the record of an isolated man's anxieties and frustrations: his anxieties and frustration do find an objective correlative in modern times. For this reason Women in Love may be the best example of the two-edged value of the autobiographical element in art: as Gillie proposes, this element either "simplifies, sentimentalises, and dissipates ... or ... strengthens and enriches" the work of art. The analysis which follows hopes to demonstrate Gillie's own concluding judgment, that "it is Lawrence's achievement to have accomplished, with some lapses, the second":[38] the enrichment.

B. The Fall of the "New Eve"

> Man must either lead or be destroyed. Woman cannot lead. She can only be at one with man in the creative union, whilst he leads; or failing this, she can destroy.
>
> Lawrence.

As the novel opens, Gudrun, Ursula II's younger sister, now twenty-five, has just returned home, and from her first words it is possible to detect that "the desire for destruction in the self" has already taken precedence over "every other desire" in her, for she expresses her disillusionment in life: she feels that everything fails to blossom and that she herself is caught in the fading process. Yet, although the forces of disintegration, of "putting asunder," are very strong in her, she reveals that "the living desire for positive creation" still exists for her, that she is still linked to humanity,that the "highly complex unity"[39] formed by the male and female elements in herself has not yet been totally destroyed. Her return home points to the existence of a conflict between her desire for destruction and desire for creation: the reader senses that her hold on life has become very loose, and yet she still fights against some of the forces that threaten to make her fall. One senses that Gudrun's personality is dissociated: a psychotic level of her personality is threatening to encompass the neurotic one which, though also unbalanced, still holds the more integrated side of her ego.[40] Her coming back home reveals that she is in a "period en que se veia necesitad de consolidar su yo mas integrado"[41] and feels deeply threatened now by the psychotic side of her personality.

Her "reculer" is explained by Gudrun herself: home for her represents a still point at which she expects to regain her energies in order to be able to "mieux sauter." She arrives at this conclusion after having "asked myself a thousand times"[42] the reason for her coming back home. Indeed

this conscious explanation bears the whole truth. On the one hand it makes it clear for the reader that she is a jumper accustomed to being on the run. On the other hand the connonation that the word "mieux" carries suggests fear: she feels that she is in a dangerous position, otherwise she would not need to prepare herself better for the next jump. It is evident that her role in life as the "Good-Runner"[43] is shaky.

The ensuing conversation with Ursula II brings forth other significant elements that help us understand the reason for her jumps and the nature of her fear. It reveals that Gudrun's carefulness has only to do with the jump itself, because she is not concerned with the achievement of a goal. Apparently she is an adventurous person to whom the jump is an end in itself. Her main concern is to reach the other edge and "land somewhere." In answer to Ursula's question: "But where can one jump to?" she answer "Oh, it doesn't matter." Yet the sudden way in which the sisters break off their conversation and the parallel jump that Ursula II takes "as if to escape something"lead us to the conclusion that Gudrun's leaps <u>do</u> have an objective: she jumps in order to escape something, something that lies at the root of the conflict that she now experiences and that, more than ever, threatens her already shaken integrity. The sisters' conversation is abruptly cut off by Gudrun's sharp and cold answers. It is Gudrun who, pretending to be "casual," suggests that they could go to the wedding, thus escaping from "the tension of the situation This tension was aroused in the first place because the conversation had been forcing them to look "over the edge." Therefore it can be inferred that Gudrun jumps in order to avoid looking into her inner self - here called the

"void"-and also as a defense against inner collpase. It is enough to pay attention to Gudrun's cheek and see that it becomes flushed while the two sisters talk - meaning that she has something to conceal - whereas her voice becomes cold - meaning that she wants it concealed. She fears to have it unwrapped.

The assumption that she has built barriers both to protect the self that she wants to prevail and to conceal the part of her self that is a threat to her can be grounded not only on the fact she is an adventurous person and yet not a seeker, but also on other major symptoms: as we have seen, she represses her emotions and she dislikes seeing others lose control. Ursula II's spontaneuous leap to escape the "tension of the situation" brought about by their conversation causes "a friction of dislike to go over Gudrun's nerves." She had wanted Ursula II to pretend not to have been affected, as she herself pretends. Even "flushed with repressed emotion" and resenting "its having been called into being,"[44] Gudrun is able to simulate calm, but self-consciousness is one indication of her habit of repressing emotions. Birkin attests to this by saying openly that she is "always on the defensive"[45] and his testimony is later corroborated by Ursula II, who worries that she is "never quite sure of how many defences Gudrun was having round herself."[46] These symptons lead us to suspect that she has a secret and that she is constantly on the watch, afraid lest anyone might penetrate it, afraid that she herself might see it. Whenever anything threatens to reveal her, she immediately flushes and calls on mockery to protect herself.

But there are still other symptons revealing the existence of barriers. One of them is her habit of distancing herself from and belittling things. She is always looking at the world "through the wrong end of the opera-glasses,"[47] a habit that Ursula II, with her capacity for divination, points to as perverse. Distancing gives Gudrun the possibility of gaining power over the object that is being focalized, as well as control over her own affective reactions. In this way she can look objectively at the world, and by distorting the objects, especially people, avoid any possibility of connection or communion with them. While the two sisters wait for the wedding, Gudrun's "objective curiosity" is sharply contrasted with Ursula II's communion with the crowd, anxious and apprehensive because of the groom's delay. Through her glass, Gudrun only sees each person as "a marionette in a theatre, a finished creation ... She knew them, they were finished, sealed and stamped and finished with, for her."[48] Her eyeing is an armour; it gives her the possibility to create an obstacle to repress her highly intuitive and sensitive nature. She, then, "mocking and objective,"[49] has the chance of veering away from seeing "the world ... horrific."[50] Even Ursula II, who does know the reason for Gudrun's jumps, as the "look of knowledge"[51] shows, is slow to understand that Gudrun "finished life off so thoroughly, she made things so ugly and so final."[52] Once she understands this trait of her sister's, she associates Gudrun with Hermione. In both women the grasping of reality is never spontaneous. It has to pass through a mental process first.

Finally, a consequence of the role she has created

ed as "voyeuse" is her skeptical outlook on life, her cry that "Nothing materializes"; marriage is merely the "inevitable next step," a means of finding financial support: man makes it "impossible"; she gets "no feeling whatever from the thought of bearing children"; home has no significance for her "I find myself completely out of it" - and her father does not occupy her thoughts: "I've refrained" (from thinking about him at all.)[53]

These facts, as Lawrence says, "hung together,in the deepest sense."[54] They make it clear for us that because she is repressing something, Gudrun has had to deny life. They also explain why she has chosen to be a "bird of paradise,"[55] as Birkin describes her. She does not want to find a place, since she is not in search of a meaningful life; she is not looking for her original identity, as Ursula I of The Rainbow was, since she is afraid of revealing her secret. She only wants to go on bearing the burden of her dissociated personality by herself. On the conscious level, her coming back home represents the one hope left to her: her belief that a marriage based on means will help her next jump: it would allow her to maintain the position of "onlooker,"[56] a "watcher" of life, and it would provide her with means to continue the life of change indispensible for keeping the lid pressed tightly on her repression. Yet on the unconscious level it represents her loss of control over the repression. She has come back home unwillingly. A strange force, whose origin she could not explain, even after having asked herself "a thousand times" why she is returning, brings her back to the ugly town of her past, a town that she hates and does not

want to remember, to know "that this exists."[57] This compulsion certainly points to the return of the repressed: the side of her personality that she wants concealed is forcing itself into consciousness. The more integrated side of her personality, "su yo mas integrado,"[58] is being absorbed within the chaos of the psychotic side of her personality.

For Gudrun is a man-like woman[59] and the imbalance between her male and female components lies at the root of her conflicts. What makes these conflicts the more intense and the less easily resolved is that Gudrun does not want to bring her desire to be a man to the conscious level. In contradiction to the message which the novel gives, that the individual must know himself in order to become able to transcend, Gudrun deeply represses her homoerotic tendencies.

On the one hand, she wants Ursula II as her love-object and yet she envies her as woman. Her desire is dramatized in the Breadalby chapter where Lawrence, making use of a Biblical passage, artistically conveys the strange nature of Gudrun's clinging to Ursula II. Gudrun plays the role of Ruth, who loves the helpless widow Naomi with "desperate passion."[60] Her envy of Ursula II comes about whenever she compares herself to Ursula II and she realizes the womanliness in her sister: she envies Ursula's spontaneity, she envies Ursula's self-centeredness, her self-sufficiency and peacefulness. She would like to be like Ursula II.

On the other hand Gudrun wants to exert the phallicism that her preponderantly masculine components con-

fer upon her while at the same time desiring castration in order to place her homoerotic feelings in abeyance. Her fetishistic reverence of her stockings reveals her sense of herself as a phallic being; her "I get no feeling whatever from the thought of bearing children" conveys a definite rejection of a woman's role; the chapter "Diver" also corroborates her dissatisfaction at being a woman. She sees Gerald swimming and she envies his mobility and freedom in the water. Being a man in a woman's body represents for her such a limitation as to "prevent (her) living;" a man hasn't "the thousand obstacles a woman has in front of her." Yet, she identifies herself with the subjugated mare, in the chapter "Coal Dust," an act that shows her sadomasochism toward her masculine components. Kate, in The Plumed Serpent, at seeing the disembowelment of the horse, leaves because she fears to be sacrificed. Gudrun, however, wants to undergo sacrifice, wants to be castrated,wants to kill the man in herself. Again, her rejection of the "cuttle-fish,"[61] symbolic of a woman's phallic powers, is indicative of her refusal to acknowledge the masculine components in herself. In short, Gudrun is in rebellion against the woman in herself because as a woman she cannot be fulfilled; yet she is struggling against her masculine components because as a man she is incomplete.

The survival of such opposing impulses within Gudrun explains the nature of her "contrariness":[62] she can be both a "smart woman" that "intimidated"[63] the provincial people and yet have a soft, passive look: she can have a "strong, slow, almost man-like" voice[64] and a "gentle, solicitous, "[65] "caressive,"[66] "quiet"[67] voice; her "silky and rich

and soft" body encompasses both a calm face and a passive nature as well as a queer readiness to flush and a "sullen passion of cruelty."[68] These opposing qualities find expression in her colourful, gaudy, defiant stockings and her feminine attire. To make her contrariness more evident still, Lawrence synthesizes the opposing qualities of Gudrun in the symbol of the clock: it is a "long-case clock, and inserted into its dial was a ruddy, round, slant-eyed, joyous-painted face" which "gave her an obtrusive 'glad-eye.'"[69] Significantly the "long case" supports a sexless face, symbolic of the sexual indefinition Gudrun wants to maintain.

There are several instances in the book that exemplify her unattained genital fulfillment. Voyeurism, or "her strange religion, that put (Gerald) to nought"[70] is one of her substitutes for mature sexual satisfaction. "She experienced a keen paroxysm, a transport"[71] the first time she sees Gerald. As a voyeuse she identifies herself with the mare which Gerald spurs, and vicariously she experiences a masochistic sexual experience. ..."looking at him with black-dilated, spellbound eyes ..." "Gudrun looked and saw the trickles of blood on the sides of the mare, and she turned white ... The world reeled and passed into nothingness for Gudrun ..."[72] At the water party, Gerald and Gudrun are in the same canoe; Gudrun is in charge of the rowing, and she even stops paddling in order to fully enjoy Gerald's beauty while he is fixing the lanterns in the boat: "She loved to look at him. For the present she did not want to touch him, to know the further satisfying substance of his living body... she only wanted to see him ..."[73] After Diana's drowning, Gerald, tired of help-

less combat with the "cold ... endless" watery world, clambers into another boat. Gudrun sees him from the distance and "the beauty of the subjection of his loins, ... made her want to die."[74] Two out of the three times in which she achieves ecstasy in communion with the snow, voyeurism is, again, the vehicle for her rapport: "She crouched down in front of the window." "Gerald bent above her ... Already he felt he was alone. She was gone. She was completely gone ...."[75] "'It is beautiful, beautiful!' she sang in strange, rhapsodic tones. 'It is the most beautiful thing I have ever seen in my life!'"[76]

Only twice does she achieve full satisfaction with Gerald: the first time, under the bridge, and even here their intercourse does not reveal traces of mature sexuality. To achieve orgasm she has to bring to mind the sweetheart of a miner. Probably she is identifying with the miner and with Gerald and can thus exert her phallicism, for here she is the contained whereas Gerald is the container: "He lifted her, and seemed to pour her into himself, like wine into a cup." Like Skrebensky under the moon, it is Gerald who is seen as the "soft iron becoming surcharged with her electric life."[77] The second time "she had extreme pleasure of him" was when "he did not come to, he remained remote and candid, unconscious."[78] In their other sexual encounters, described once in terms of their "supreme pangs of nervous gratification,"[79] once in her reaction of feeling "nausea of him,"[80] she feels that "his passion was awful to her, tense and ghastly, and impersonal ... it would kill her."[81]

There is also evidence of masturbation on her part. "He was looking unconsciously, glisteningly, down at her

head, from which the hair fell loose, as she brushed it with wild, nervous hand. She held her head aside and brushed and brushed her hair madly." As she sees the reflection of the "wolf" looking at her and threatening to disturb her auto-erotic gratification she distracts his attention till she has obtained self-pleasure. "She turned, now her face white, her dark eyes blazing with uncanny, overwrought excitement."[82] In Gudrun's sexuality "there is no reciprocity." All the sexual excitements that give her pleasure reduce sex, degrade it. In Lawrence's terms they kill the religious mystery, fruit of the "give and take"[83] inherent in the nature of mature sex.

In spite of these signs of thwarted sexuality, both Mark Spilka and Eliseo Vivas are, so to speak, deceived by Gudrun's extraordinary beauty. Mark Spilka, after referring to her cynicism, adds that she is a "lovely woman, dressed always in bright colours, in handsome gowns, and her sheer sensual appeal is delivered to us at every turn.[84] Eliseo Vivas is also caught in the spell of her sensual appeal. For him "Gudrun is presented in the book as a sexually normal woman. We shall see that she craves for refinements of perversion, but she does not repudiate the male qua male, as a homosexual woman would."[85] Vivas fails to grasp her thwarted womanhood, but his statement has double weight for this analysis, since it reinforces the presence of self-contradictory qualities in Gudrun and it corroborates our assumption that she cannot simply be called "homosexual" since she wants to deny the man inside her, a man who, despite her denial, becomes visible. Both Hermione (who is also sexually abnormal) and the colliers detected Gudrun's flawed nature. "Gudrun was the more

beautiful and attractive (Hermione) had decided again. Ursula (II) was more physical, more womanly."[86] When on their way to church Ursula II and Gudrun meet an old and a young collier, it is the promiscuous old one who wants Gudrun. "I'd give my week's wage for five minutes," says the elder, whereas the younger one adds, "It's not worth that to me."[87] True, the social aspect cannot be underestimated, and this passage does bear reference to the ignominous attitude of both men towards women and sex, but the implicit reference to Gudrun's strange appeal is undeniable. Further, the "cormorant" fixed upon a "little enamel box" which "she always kept so very private to herself"[88] confirms that she is not a sexually normal woman and that it is her sexual inversion that she wants to keep private. Significantly a cormorant is a snake-like bird that catches fish which it is not allowed to swallow.

This discussion of Gudrun's problems illustrates her volcanic inner state, and it helps to suggest the inevitability of an eruption, heralded by her necessity to come back home. Up to the "reculer," Gudrun had surely been able to reconcile within herself both her repulsion toward her female nature and her rejection of the preponderantly masculine elements of her psyche. Protected behind her denial of life and vital sex, safe as a mere onlooker and as a jumper, she has been able to bear the burden that her divided psyche has imposed onto her. Her flights to London, her plunging into the loathsome Bohemian life, her subjection to the atmosphere of corruption and degradation that pervades the streets of Beldover are the means she uses to dissipate, for a time, the poisonous depression that threatens to suffocate her. They are pain-

killers that serve merely as palliatives against the repressed that is threatening to return. But the effort has undermined her strength, and the "reculer" (consciously meant to gather back her forces but forebodingly pointing to her fall) turns out to be the catalystic element of the fall.

Adopting José Bleger's concept of symbiosis ("La symbiosis es una interdependencia entre dos o más personas que se complementan para mantener controladas, inmovilisadas y en cierta medida satisfechas, las necessidades de las partes más inmaduras de la personalidad") we hold that Gudrun, unable to exert control over the repression any longer, makes of Gerald the "depositario"[89] of the part of her personality that she is repressing, and that has become dangerous to her. Her objective eyeing had not failed to work when she first saw Gerald: "Here was something not quite so preconcluded," she thought as she saw Gerald and his mother among the crowd outside the church, waiting for the groom's arrival. She sees in Gerald both the "sinister stillness in his bearing," the danger of "his bearing," the danger of "his unsubdued temper" and the "gleaming beauty, maleness, like a young, good-humoured smiling wolf."[90] These are certainly traits of her make-up that she prefers to see in Gerald. He, therefore, represents some complement to herself, a person on whom she can place her sadism, thus remaining basically masochistic, womanly. Her objective eyeing, the voyeurismof the masochist, did not fail to recognize a true sadist instantaneously, dramatically conveying the psychologist's claim that "sadists and mashochists have a secret language ... a secret alliance with secret customs and secret agreement."[91] Gerald's childhood history, his

handling of the mare, his thwarting the rabbit's desire to escape, and his attempts at killing Gudrun and Loerke do place him in the category of sadist. Gudrun's identification with the subdued mare and rabbit, her giving herself into Gerald's hands, and later Loerke's, are signs of her masochism, exemplified again when the counter-impulse, for mastery, appears revealed[92] in the pleasure she feels when she intercepts the mare and later in the ritual of her dancing before the cattle. The thrill of violation and death gratifies her thwarted sexuality and satisfies her psychosexual distortion.

Several critics, including Daleski, believe that Gudrun is first drawn to Gerald because of their mutual instinct towards destruction. But if the symbiotic nature of their relation is accepted, the impulse that drives them together is, in the last analysis, the impulse to keep alive.[93] Since she can neither assimilate the masculine, sadistic side of her nature to assume a feminine self, as Ursula II does, nor live out her sexual ambiguity, it rests with Gudrun to dissociate the male components in herself by placing them in Gerald. Of course, this is not a satisfactory solution, and Gudrun senses this herself. In placing the less integrated side of her personality on Gerald "el centro de la personalidad ya no será más la parte mas madura del yo; lo reprimido retorna desplazando y ocupando su lugar."[94] She will then be able to confront reality, although she will not be centered anymore. She unconsciously knows that she had better avoid any kind of contact with him, although she knows that "he was the final approximation of life to her."[95] She also knows that in accepting the job in Beldover she is signing a pledge

with him, she is accepting the symbiotic chain. "All the time, there was something in her urging her to avoid the final establishing of a relationship with Gerald,"[96] because she senses that once she establishes it, she will lose control over her own destiny. And she only goes to Beldover after she has found in rationalization the means to placate her mind: she would go there and stay there for a short period "if only to see what it is like."[97] This excuse is a measure of her desire to conceal from herself the fact that she cannot contain her psychotic and neurotic personality any longer. It also makes clear that she is giving in to Gerald, knowing that "it was fatal," because she is in extremity. Had she been in a less traumatic situation, she would have escaped "the terrible hopelessness of fate," she would have been able to resist the impact that he caused on her already the first time she saw him: ... "She was tortured with desire to see him again, a nostalgia, a necessity to see him again ... ."[98] Therefore, her bond to Gerald cannot simply be explained in terms of her desire "to annihilate Gerald"[99] as Vivas proposes; it cannot be the testing ground for "her desire for violence against him" only.[100] It is, above all, Gudrun's projection of her masculine, sadist impulses onto Gerald, her making of Gerald an extension of her own self.

She will play the masochist to him and he will have to answer to her desire. Since, however, "toda perversão ativa se acompanha de seu equivalente passivo ...,"[101] her sadism will be called on when her masochistic instincts are not allowed full play. She becomes mad with rage when Gerald interrupts the ritual of her dancing before the cattle. Here

she had been playing with death, and Gerald broke the enchantment that her lust for self-destruction had created. She then "struck the first blow," as she will "strike the last," because he interrupts her intercourse with death. She herself cannot understand the irrational impulse that has led her to hit Gerald; she asks herself "Why are you behaving in this impossible and ridiculous fashion." The answer that she gives to satisfy her consciousness is in part very satisfactory: "It is you who make me behave like this."[102] Gerald had just interrupted her flirtation with death, and thwarted her masochism. Furthermore, the blow is an invitation for him to reply in kind, and Gerald refuses. Consequently, if Gerald fails to play the sadist to her, he will certainly make her desire to break the symbiotic chain. Her dancing before the cattle and the blow she deals Gerald preclude the outcome, foreshadow their relationship. First she will try to "lose (herself) in some ultimate black sensation"[103] by means of her degenerative relation with Gerald; later she will destroy him when he does not respond sadistically, as he should.

It is in the chapter "Rabbit" that symbiosis is dramatically confirmed. Gudrun and Gerald "pass(es) through as it were allotropic states"[104] which reveal to each other the distorted character of the other's sensuality. The scream of the rabbit tears "the veil of her consciousness" and the repressed unconscious comes out visibly inflamed. It is the brutal, warped, savage side of their natures that bursts out. "Some greater, inhuman will"[106] drives them to sign a hellish pact, symbolically sealed by the bleeding scratches that the rabbit inflicts. It is a pact that contains all the tones of

a religious rite. The demonical, insane, cruel, "great black-and-white rabbit," binds them by blood[107] then confirms their union by racing "round and round the court" involving them in a circle that "binds their brains." The ceremony is witnessed by another "rabbit" - Winifred - significantly dressed in her "dress of black and white stripes."[108] The ritual in which the rabbit binds their brains is the rite of passage into the world of "acute sensation" mentioned in the letter; it is to be the breaking of "the relation between the senses and the outspoken mind" announced by the African statuette; it is their mutual recognition of themselves as partakers of the mystery of "frost knowledge."[109] It confirms Gudrun's intuitive apprehension of Gerald when she first sees him: "is there really some pale gold, arctic light that envelopes us two?"[110] Their pact is the acknowledgement of a violent sensuality that gratifies their lustful, forbidden desires, and it is the breaking open of a stream of ungovernable emotions till now carefully damped by them both. She will arouse Gerald - she will play the rabbit, the victim to Gerald - and finally, like the rabbit, she will be the "ultimate victor."

Their attitudes after regaining consciousness show that neither of them desired this outcome. "There was a league between them abhorrent to them both." "He would have to make himself touch her, deliberately." "She knew that he was initiate as she was initiate. This thwarted her, contravened her, for the moment." At first, it is her intention to deny her role as a rabbit. But she realizes that it is impossible for her to continue attempting to suppress her sick, uncon - scious impulses, despite her conscious desire to hide them.

Therefore she accepts that they are both rabbits, "and more."[111]

It is the chapter entitled "Threshold" that contains the promise of fulfillment. As initiates they will experience a "brutal and licentious" sensuality that satisfies the repressed. Gudrun is looking forward to plunging into this unrestrained orgy. "She knew she wanted this ... Ah, if that which was unknown and suppressed in her were once let loose, what an orgiastic and satisfying event it would be."[112]

Their sexual relations have the characteristics of the symbiotic bond as described by Jose Bleger: sometimes Gudrun plays the role that is Gerald's, at other times she is the mother to him, because, "si bien los roles son fijos, pueden rotar o alternar los depositarios que los asumen."[113] But their sexual relations always have a compulsory character.

When Gerald plays the feminine role in their relations, he agrees to being docked, or to put it his way, to sell his soul: "I'd sell my soul a hundred times - but I couldn't bear not to have you here." In their intercourse under the bridge "he threw his cigarette away" and "then he was quite free to balance her." She feels gratified playing the masculine role in this intercourse. He is the cup. "It was what she wanted." Her hands are the instruments with which she obtains the "precious knowledge of him" and they are compared to rapacious, greedy birds, that "could feed upon the fields of his mystical plastic form." Gerald feels that he is being castrated, sucked out, but "he could not help himself. Her fingers had him under their power."[114] Gerald cannot extricate himself from them, from Gudrun. The bond of their sym-

biotic relation is too strong, and can only be ruptured if the risk of total disintegration is run. For this, Gerald lacks the will and the strength.

At other times Gudrun plays the role of mother to him, and at these times it is she who becomes the recipient of the poison that his sick soul liberates. "And she, subject, received him as a vessel filled with his bitter potion of death." "Mother and substance of all life she was. And he, child and man, received of her and was made whole." This part of the pact does not satisfy Gudrun in the least. "She was sick with terror, sick ... her heart sank ... an ache like nausea was upon her: a nausea of him... She felt old, old."[115] She has even to dispense with her own sleep to afford him his. To understand the burden that she has to bear, it is enough to compare the avidity with which she absorbed him after their intercourse under the bridge ("She kissed him, putting her fingers over his face, his eyes, his nostrils")[116] to the repulsion that oppresses her after having nursed him. Here she kisses him in order not to look in "his dreadful opened eyes."[117] Yet she does not deny herself to him. Furthermore, she does not call on the cruelty that critics view as the basic trait of her make-up. Were Gudrun simply after Gerald's destruction, were she simply the "belle dame sans merci" she would have denied him this "sleep of fecundity within the womb."[118] But Gudrun respects the pact even when it demands that she play the mother to Gerald. She has had a strange intuition of this when she saw the arched, marble fireplace in Gerald's house: "She felt as if she were caught at last by fate, imprisoned in some horrible and fatal trap." But she has accepted it,

and as if offering herself to fate, echoes Mrs. Crich's voice: "Don't come any further with me."[119] This Mrs. Crich said to Gerald when he was leading her to her bedroom, and Gudrun repeats the very same words as Gerald leads her to the gate, hinting at the limit he must respect in their relationship. She wants their roles to be defined for the maintenance of their pact, and ultimately for her survival.

It is not difficult to understand why she abhors the mother's role that she has to play as part of her pact: it is the counterpart of "black licentiousness." The latter can dissolve her brain, prevent suffering; the former brings her into a state of overconsciousness, forcing her to investigate the very nature of her damage. "It was as if she drew a glittering rope of knowledge out of the sea of darkness, drew ... and drew it out of the fathomless depths of the past, and still it did not come to an end, there was no end to it, she must haul and haul at the rope of glittering consciousness ... till she was weary, aching... and yet she had not done."[120] Her ties to him are so strong that even at the price of this new suffering, she will not untie them. Yet she does not try to understand her predicament. She forces herself to believe that the stability of marriage will bring her the peace that she misses and she submits to Gerald's strong and violent love, fooling herself that she is "living fully and finally,"[121] accepting Gerald's "monstrous... juxtaposition against her"[122] "because of what <u>had</u> been, because of his coming to her that first night, into her own house, in his extremity, because - "[123] She cannot finish her thought because the root of her malady remains buried in the unconscious, and defies her attempts at self-analysis, but she con-

tinues her relation with Gerald because the chains of a symbiotic connection cannot be easily broken. "El secreto de la symbiosis as de un cadaver con vida que debe ser mantenido, controlado e inmovilizado entre sus integrantes: si se descontrola se produce la destruccion o, por lo menos, el riesgo,"[124]

This relation, up to the point it is maintained, keeps both Gerald and Gudrun alive: it does not allow Gudrun and Gerald to disintegrate because it preserves their basic humanity. Gudrun remains human up to the point when she gives in to Loerke, the conscious bisexual "who has found his mate in a human being";[125] Gerald, who to the end never ceased to play the role of the frost spirit, always "shining like the sun on frost,"[126] keeps, till his death, a certain humanity, a humanity that is his "limitation." Whereas Loerke, no more a man, just a creature, "was detached from everything," "in Gerald's soul there still lingered some attachment to the rest, to the whole. ... He was limited, borné, subject to his necessity, in the last issue, for goodness, for righteousness, for oneness with hte ultimate purpose."[127] This relation never allowed "the snow (to melt)"[128] for Gerald, but it did not destroy his humanity. In the last analysis, Gerald dies of this limitation: "why should he close up and become impervious, immune, ..."[129]

Yet, such a relation by its very nature - that of keeping two sick people immobile - cannot cure, cannot bring them to an awareness of the nature of their sickness, for it keeps the participants unknowing. For this reason, such a relation inevitably leads to the destruction of what it is intended to preserve. Locked in this self-consuming relation-

ship, Gudrun's torment becomes unbearable. The moments of over-consciousness that her relation with Gerald entail, though not sufficient to reveal the nature of her sickness, reveal to her the hollowness of her life, a hollowness that becomes more intensified when she compares her life to that of Ursula II. Ever since she formed her connection with Gerald she has seen Ursula II and Birkin as her parental substitutes. The appeal that Ursula II and Birkin have for is so strong that she wishes she could stay with them in their happiness. "How pleased Gudrun was to come out of the shop, and enter the car ... with Ursula and Birkin! What an adventure life seemed at this moment! ... Ah, if she could be <u>just like that</u>, it would be perfect!" "That seemed like life indeed to her." [130] But she cannot escape her deathly connection to Gerald; free, she would again desire Ursula II and see Birkin with contempt: "Living with him (she) should think would be more than impossible."[131]

Since the rabbit ritual has tied Gerald and Gudrun, she has to go on bearing "the intense suffering" before the soul breaks and falls "into the long, long (Arctic) process of purely sensual understanding,"[132] before the human soul is metamorphosed into a soulless "creature" like Loerke. To convey the intensity of Gudrun's suffering, Lawrence, in a fantastic visual image, establishes the contrast between the grandfather clock, which underlies Ursula II's being, and Gudrun's apprehension of another clock: the former "has two pink roses in a basket painted above the figures on the face;"[133] but the clock that symbolizes Gudrun, as we noted, is a "long-case clock, and inserted into its dial was a ruddy, round, slant-eyed, joyous-painted face" which "gave her an obtrusive

"glad-eye."

Like this face "she has never really lived, she only watched." And the double meaning contained in the word "watch" fully expresses her role in life: to watch the unremitting watch. At the height of her psychotic despair she even sees her face reflected on a mirror as "a twelve-hour clock dial." It fills her with a mad desire for relief, a need for human comfort, peace, rest. For once, she con - sciously calls for "otherness": "Oh, why wasn't there somebody to take her in their arms and fold her safe and perfect, for sleep. She wanted so much this perfect enfolded sleep." This, Gerald could not give her. They are the two sides of one coin: "Ha! He needed putting to sleep himself - poor Gerald."[134]

In developing the conflicts in the depth of Gudrun's mind, Lawrence shows an incomparable understanding of human nature. He perceives the multiplicity of motives that lie behind human behaviour, the complexity of the inner structure of the psyche, the impenetrable mystery of the forces that work upon the individual and the lack of control of the individual over them. More, in portraying the suffering inherent in the nature of this inner conflict, Lawrence shows an enormous sympathy with Gudrun and the characters that struggle with corruption. Therefore the reader cannot help sympathizing with Gudrun, in spite of her thwarted apprehension of life; he cannot help feeling sorry for her when her suffering becomes so intense as to blind her to the possibility of salvation.

It is in one of these crises that she hears Bir-

kin's letter read aloud at the Café Pompadour. The shock that the letter causes her proves that, in spite of her cynicism, in spite of the attempts at dissolving herself in "black licentiousness," there has always been a flicker of hope burning in her for life and that it is this hope for life that causes her to suffer. The letter, however, brings her face to face with the fact that she suffers "horribly from a complication of diseases for which there is no hope."[135] She then embraces her fate, embraces dissolution consciously. She then understands that there is no hope for her. Significantly, when Gudrun and Ursula II next meet at a hotel, Gudrun "began to move downstairs as Ursula ran up." More significant still is that she wears a "strange black-and-white band round her hair"[136] - on that same night. These are the rabbit's colours, and since, till now, she has been "at (Gerald's) mercy" her gesture is the premonition of a turning point in her relation with Gerald. She will cut her hold on life by cutting the symbiotic vinculum. This is the way to become "ultimate victor"[137] over Gerald.

The ensuing conversation with Birkin (at dinner) that same night strengthens her decision to lapse from "the desire for ... goodness."[138] "It might have been her own fate she was inquiring after," when she asks Birkin if the English would have to disappear. Though Birkin refuses to admit that "there is no hope" for the "complication of diseases" we suffer from, Gudrun accepts hopelessness as true for herself and accepts the fact that it is her fate "to disappear as Gudrun, the human being, whereas "a new creature (will step) into life."[139]

Even after her conscious decision to "disappear," there is still a long way of suffering for her to travel. Her connection with Gerald, though deathly, is the last connection she can have with life. Though she wants to "break away from its organic hold,"[140]

> "the source of creation is central with the human soul, and the issue from that source proceeds without any choice or knowledge on our part."[141]

It has taken a long time and has caused Gudrun great suffering to accept the dissociation of her male and female components; it will cause her still greater suffering to accept her total dehumanization.

I think that when she first intended to "disappear," she intended to use her sexual ambivalence consciously for this purpose, burning herself out through regression with Gerald, whom she now sees as doomed, to consume herself by his radio-active, "living metal." In the snowy Alps both had felt like "opposite poles of one fierce energy ... powerful enough to leap over the confines of life into the forbidden places and back again."[142] The hostel, half-buried in the expanse of snow, would be their coffin. But Gerald refuses to become aware of his unconscious perversity and somehow refuses to follow Gudrun in the exploration of her fantasies. "Because, however much he might mentally will to be immune and self-complete, the desire for this state was lacking."[143] In her first communion with the snow, she is rapt at the window, fully embarked on her "great retrogression," feeling the ecstasy of acute sensation in the

barren land of autistic phantasies, when Gerald breaks her isolation and forces her back to the human world. The three scenes in which she has ecstatic communion with the snow show that the more immersed she becomes, the more insistent is Gerald's call. As before when he had failed to play up to her expectations, she becomes sadistic towards him: now because of his refusal to leave his human world and to enter her less human, more disintegrated world of sensation. Gudrun's reactions against Gerald's interference become more and more violent; there is an increasing "diabolic coldness in her."[144] She did not react violently against Gerald the first time he debarred her communion with the snow, by pressing his violent passion on her. She had felt "some terror and a little horror" of him, but she had lain passive, "silent and ... remote."[145] But during her second "intercourse" with snow she reacts more strongly, to make him understand his exclusion. The look of "terrible merriment" that is reflected on her face and the admission that "it was the most complete moment of my life" penetrates Gerald's heart like "a fine blade."[146] The time that precedes "the last blow," Gudrun becomes cruel and brutal. She tells him openly not to try to prevent her from getting her consummation. "If you can't see it yourself, why try to debar me?" His passion does not satisfy her any longer; she no longer desires the "sheer blind force of passion" but "the subtle thrills of extreme sensation in reduction" that lie "far out of Gerald's knowledge":[147] a greatly refined sadism.

Determined to have her consummation yet firmly tied to the symbiotic chain, Gudrun is left with the only

alternative of open combat. She has learned through Loerke the kind of detachment that will save her from his constant torture and allow her a different kind of disintegration. Either she will make Gerald give up the connection with her and accept the more destructive sensuality which Loerke opens before them, or they will have to separate. But Gerald neither leaves her nor becomes immune. Their relation continues on the same basis: "Sometimes it was he who seemed strongest ... sometimes it was the reverse. But always it was this eternal see-saw, one destroyed that the other might exist, one ratified because the other was annulled."[148] In searching for reasons to break this deadlock, Gudrun suddenly grasps that Gerald's attraction to other women means that he is no man of hers at all: "He should have all the women he can — he is naturally promiscuous." This accusation seems to appear like the Biblical "Mene! Mene!"[149] justifying her irrevocable decision to combat him.

Eliseo Vivas says that "Gudrun murders Gerald without premeditated guile or plan, in a more or less unconscious manner..."[150] Yet, she has now made it clear that she must rid herself of the suffering that her relation with Gerald is causing her. She consciously goads him to fury in order to provoke a reaction from him: she knows that "he might kill her."[151] But she does not want to die: she wants only to break her hold on life because it is causing her too great a suffering; she wants to break "the relation between the senses and the outspoken mind";[152] she wants to ebb with the sewer stream" through Loerke. If one of the two had to die, "it should not be her death." Since none of formulae she tried worked out - neither "the going apart of the two

protagonists, (nor) the subjugating of the one will to the other,"[153] she would try the last alternative: his death.

With Loerke's help she begins to attack Gerald where he is most vulnerable: first she makes him drink the biliousness of her pity: "I had to take pity on you. But it was never love."[154] Then she denies herself to him and asks him not to desire her anymore. The shock makes him rigid, unconscious. Again, to prove the triumph of her pity, she brings him back to life. Finally she makes him bleed by publicly cutting the "umbilical cord" in front of his rival. She cries aloud in the hotel that she is not to be called Mrs. Crich since she is not married to him, or better,since from now on she is not going to play the mother's role to him.

Yet in spite of the ever-harsher conflict, despite her ever-increasing cruelty to him, she cannot break free yet of their symbiotic band. At the height of her repulsion for him, aversion becomes attraction and she falls prey to "his domination."[155] Unable to bear these turnabouts, she makes use of her last weapon. She goads him to fury by affirming that their relationship had been a total failure because of Gerald's inability to love. Gerald becomes so blind that his only desire is to kill her, and only her adroitness saves her from his wrath. The next day she takes part in the ceremony that unties them. Loerke officiates.

The religious ritual of their break-up, while containing the sexual overtones of the regressive mode of sexuality upon which she is going to embark, parodies the sacrifice of the Lamb. It weirdly mixes that part of the mass

which offers God the immolation of the Lamb with the crucifixion of Christ. The voices of Gudrun and Loerke are like bells; Loerke, the priest, produces and dispenses the wafers and wine. Water and wine are symbolized and parodied by hot coffee and Heidelbeer, made of the fruit which grows under the deathly snow. The sacrifice is rendered to Christ instead of being rendered to the Father. Gerald, the son of man, is going to be immolated for the sake of the creature, Gudrun. Without Gerald, she will become like Loerke: detached, absolute in herself, divorced from the subjection to goodness.

When Gerald meets them, the strange ritual has already been initiated. There is no more coffee and Heidelbeer is offered instead. "Then suddenly. (Loerke) elevated the bottle gallantly in the air." Unlike Jesus, Gerald refuses the chalice. Still he does not admit that disintegration is the only way left. He does not want to become, like Lorke, aware of his sickness: he does not want to become, like Loerke, a creature. Therefore he tries to do away with him, striking him twice on the head.

But now Gudrun's "last blow" is struck: "She raised her clenched hand high, and brought it down ... on to the face and ... breast of Gerald." At this "stroke," Gerald feels "his soul opened."[156] The tie is cut. He will be free now to act out his lusts openly: first his overpowering desire to strangle Gudrun. In this, in a frenzy of sadism, he almost succeeds; then, in disgust, he lets her fall, and drifts away. But his "profound if hidden lust ... to be murdered"[157] that Birkin long ago warned him of, has also been released by Gudrun's blow: and now this desire to be violated, murdered, takes over Gerald. It is this he recognizes when he sees

the half-buried crucifix, and he "feel(s) the blow descending" as he stumbles toward death.

The moon, woman's ally, watches "unremitting"[158] in the same way it had watched Diana[159] choking her young rescuer. Now Gudrun, "whether she wanted it or not"[160] knows she has become the dangerous "cuttlefish"[161] that coldly de - stroys her man, and finally she is "cold, a cold woman" who cannot even cry, "and the sight of her cold, pale, impassive face soon stopped the fountain of Ursula (II)'s tears." Finally, finally, she is detached from the necessity of human contact, divorced from the subjection to goodness and from the pangs of consciousness. "The long case" that bore the sexless clock face dial is sealed forever, and her immunity prevents her from hearing the terrible "tic-tac," from answering the tormenting human question "whither." Gerald is "mute Matter."[162] Gudrun is the "living matter" who has buried her own spirit "in pang after pang of vital, explosive self-reduction."[163] She will experience the long process of disintegration which succeeds the breaking point, "the point when the soul in intense suffering breaks, breaks away from its organic hold like a leaf that falls." Gudrun has finally escaped suffering and fallen "from the connexion with life and hope" "into the long (Arctic) process of purely sensual understanding, knowledge in the mystery of dissolution."[164] In this, she has discarded the neurotic side of her personality and assumed the psychotic level. The repressed has taken over and she has regressed "a la época en que el yo aún no se habia delimitado netamente frente al mundo exterior y frente al prõjimo."[165] Detached from the external world and prey to her introversion, Gudrun seeks refuge in the kind of world

a Loerke has offered, in "the inner mysteries of sensation,"[166] in a final "reducing back."[167]

David Cavitch is one of the first critics to inquire into the genesis of Gudrun's "distorted feelings of love" and he explains them "as Birkin's persona." According to him "Lawrence transferred to her the feelings that would have been Birkin's if his homosexuality had become explicitly the central issue in the fiction."[168] Thus he explains the character's illness by the author's.

Cavitch's view is important as a testimony of Gudrun's nature as extremely perverse, regressive, distorted. Yet, since we have proposed to show that the phallicism which causes Lawrence's women to become psychically distorted is the source of the heroine's strength and artistic appeal, rather than the projection of the author's sickness, we will try to discover the genesis of Gudrun's psychosexual distortion in her own life, as described both in Women in Love and in The Rainbow. If, as hoped, we have shown her as a complex, psychologically valid character - a person in her own right - the reason for her psychic split should be given in the earlier novel or hinted at in the later one.

In Women in Love we are given a clue in the chapter "Death and Love"; here we are invited to pick up the thread which Gudrun, in a crisis of "active superconsciousness," brings into the open, but drops, after a desperate, tormenting attempt at penetrating into the caverns of her unconscious: while lying wide awake beside Gerald, whom she has just nurtured with motherly love, it is the remembrance of "her childhood ... her family ... her past"[169] which torments her.

Therefore we strongly suspect that it is in her past, impenetrable to her, that the answer for her problems must lie.

Going back to her childhood, to The Rainbow, we are told that she "was the mother's favourite" for only the first year of her life, for the mother "always lived in her latest baby." We also learn that Gudrun could not, anytime in her early infancy, claim much love from the father, because Ursula I was "the child of her father's heart."[170] She may not have found the father when she was in need of him to place on him the intense feelings she had devoted to the mother in their short yet excessively binding attachment. This lack of object love may have caused the split of Gudrun's personality: it certainly would explain why the infant Gudrun, in attempting a "redirection" of her "psychic energies,"[171] places them into the world of "her own fancies"[172] and in an attachment to Ursula I.

We know from The Rainbow that in her early years she is already absorbed in her autistic world: she "would have nothing to do with realities." This trait is carried throughout infancy, and in early adolescence Gudrun has become even more immersed in her fancies: "She seemed to avoid all contact, instinctively ... pursuing half-formed fancies that had no relation to anyone else."[173]

Her attachment to Ursula I is also formed in her early infancy. When the third daughter, Theresa, is born, they "were much together, Gudrun and Ursula ... From the first she (Gudrun) followed Ursula's lead."[174] While Ursula I at this time feels that her father is "her strength and

greater self," Gudrun has already had to share the motherly love with the newly born baby. She then follows "Ursula's lead" almost as if her elder sister were her father. We know that this attachment continues throughout her childhood, for when she is ten, Lawrence tells us that Gudrun "left all (reality) to her elder sister: only she believed in Ursula, and trusted to Ursula." Her sister, in turn, "had a great tenderness for her co-mate sister." As the girls grow into adolescence, this binding love is tied closer: "The younger girl lived her religious, responsible life in her sister, by proxy,"[175] avoiding contact with the rest of the world.

Knowing this about her past, we recognize that the traits Gudrun exhibits in Women in Love - mistrust of people, distancing herself to keep from contact, her outward placidness, her inward aggressiveness, her attachment to Ursula II - are really a continuation of early traits: we feel that the later Gudrun acts in accordance with attitudes brought from childhood. In short, we feel that Lawrence developed his characterization of Gudrun coherently through both novels. Lawrence's use of the same adjectives in both novels strongly reinforces our feeling: her outward passivity and placidness which conceal her inward aggressiveness is thoroughly described by the narrator of Women in Love in the following terms: "her nature, in spite of her apparent placidity and calm, was profoundly restless."[176] This description is echoed through Hermione's apprehension of her as "the more beautiful and attractive" in contrast to Ursula II whom she sees as "more womanly."[177] Gerald also detects "a body of cold power in (Gudrun)."[178] The narrator of The Rainbow, while describing Gudrun as "strangely placid, almost

passive,"[179] and speaking of her "long sleepy body",[180] takes care to show how powerful and untamed Gudrun's forces are: when she is only two, and such "a quiet child ... absorbed in her fancies," we hear that "yet her will was indomitable, once set."[181] Several times she is described as a wild animal, a "lithe, farouche animal"[182] and we are made to feel in the Gudrun of The Rainbow the same hidden and potentially dangerous power which Gerald detected in her in Women in Love: there is a force "unalterable" in her.

Our belief in Lawrence(s development of Gudrun's characterization from one book to the other allows us to infer that Gudrun's return home, in the beginning of Women in Love, was forced by her repressed love for Ursula: she would want the old connexion eith Ursula again. This would explain why she came back, despite her lack of identifica - tion with her father and mother and her complete rejection of the ugly reality of Beldover. While she walks along the streets of Beldover we are made to feel the compulsive nature of her return:

> "But all the time her heart was crying, as if in the midst of some ordeal: "I want to go back, I want to go away, I want not to know it, not to know that this exists."
> "Yet she must go forward."[183]

This would explain why Gudrun, in her opening conversation with Ursula II, is so irritated when Ursula II refuses to assume a definitely hostile attitude against marriage. Ursula II, in response to her sister's "don't you really want to get married?" admits instead that she would "marry like a

shot" if she found the right man. Gudrun is left with the alternative of finding for herself the "highly attractive individual of sufficient means" who could afford her the possibility of continuing her role of "Good-Runner." These clues, which have allowed us to trace Gudrun's psychosexual distortion in Women in Love back to her childhood as described in The Rainbow, are hovever not enough to reveal Lawrence's attitude toward her in The Rainbow, since Gudrun is not fully developed there. Yet, considering that in The Rainbow he gives the phallic Ursula I the possibility of achieving fullness of being, by allowing her to accomplish the balance between her male and female elements through self-knowledge, we see Lawrence's refusal to allow Gudrun the inner balance which would redeem her, in Women in Love, as a symptom of the accentuation of his antagonism towards woman, the tipping of his ambivalence toward her on to the side of sometimes open, often disguised misogyny. This same antagonism will bring him to use a male hero in Women in Love, a hero necessary for the redemption of Ursula II.

C. The New Eve Regains Paradise

I do think that a woman must yield
some sort of precedence to a man.

Lawrence

When we first meet Ursula II in Women in Love we have the impression that she is a woman who has already been enriched by the experiences of an enlightening past. For the reader who meets her again, fresh from The Rainbow, knows that in that novel Ursula I was given the possibility to opt either for life or for death and that, as her trials proceeded, she slowly came to realize that death and life are but two sides of the mystery of being: that she could not choose "life" without being confronted with "death." Her opening conversation with Gudrun reveals a mature Ursula II who knows that life can be cruel and ugly and yet offer some fruitition. While Gudrun is in open rebellion against the environment-against family, institutions - Ursula II faces this stage of her life as transient and awaits the coming of a better one. Despite her skeptical outlook on marriage she is not wholly without faith in it, for she admits she "(would) marry like a shot" if she found the right man. Her accomodation to the ugliness of the town does not imply her submission to it, since she is still capable of feeling acutely the violation that it causes on the newly arrived Gudrun. She herself must be struggling to get out of it, as the narrative voice informs us through the comparison with "an infant in the womb." The following pages continue to contrast Ursula II

and Gudrun's attitude towards life, and Ursula II's is shown as the wiser, since Ursula II's impassioned involvement with the others, her identification with the apprehensive bride are seen as healthier than Gudrun's thorough rejection. Ursula II's patient acceptance of this world of ugliness has somehow preserved her faith in life, whereas Gudrun's rejection has made her ironical and hostile. The first pages show two sensitive beings united in a fear of the future, disbelief in conventional married life, refusal to accept the old feminine ideal of immanence and motherhood; in short, a new breed of woman, "sisters of Artemis rather than of Hebe": they differ from each other only in their reaction: Ursula II seems realistic and Gudrun only bitter.

Since in The Rainbow Ursula I was left with the chance of achieving completeness on the condition that she find a true mate - "the son of God" - it would be only coherent to think that the Ursula II whom the narrator poses before us in Women in Love as an "infant in the womb" is the Ursula I of The Rainbow. The reason why she has not been able to "break through the last integuments"[184] yet would thus be explained in terms of Ursula II's failure to establish a polarized relationship with a whole male. Anyone who knows that Woman in Love is "a potential sequel to The Rainbow"[185] expects that whoever encounters Ursula II will come into contact with a woman of integrated personality, a model of fullness of being who is only waiting for the "right" man, the integrated man, to begin her potential development.

However, already in the first chapter, the narrator warns the reader that the personality of Ursula I has

been altered: "(Ursula II) is forced to assent to Gudrun's pronouncements" even when she disagrees with Gudrun. Not even the adolescent Ursula I would acknowledge a fact in which she did not believe. "She talked and stormed ideas, she corrected and nagged at the children, she turned her back in silent contempt on her breeding mother,"[186] but she would never give up fighting for things in which she believed.

When Birkin meets her in the class-room, she is absorbed in teaching her students the reproductive system of flowers, and it is here that the change in Ursula I is further emphasized: here she is a person immersed in shadows, afraid of putting on the lights and unwilling to admit the physical reality of the flowers. Birkin not only has to call her to the hardness of the light which she wants to avoid but he also forces her to confront and acknowledge the objective reality.

Birkin's snapping-on of the light and his bold outlining of the sex act have a deep significance. These actions point out that Ursula II is living a form of self-forgetful reality in which she refuses to answer to the several levels which reality encompasses. In a desire for self-protection she is smothering part of reality. Moreover, she does not want to be pushed toward awareness. Birkin asks for crayons in order to "mark in" the pollen and the stigma but Ursula II resists his order, saying that "It will make the books untidy."[187] Birkin turns the light on and in an unconscious refusal to accept its hardness, she later turns it off. She would go on without acknowledging this other side of reality, as her taking sides with Hermione against

Birkin demonstrates. Her jeering at him, her resentment and hostility against his ideas reflect her wish to continue holding on to her position. She would like to go on "unknowing" as her tears after his departure demonstrate, yet her crying is also symptomatic of her unconscious recognition that she cannot go on ignoring the kind of light which Birkin brings any longer.

As their relationship continues, Lawrence becomes more explicit about the "why" of Ursula II's denial of one side of reality: it springs from her desire to defend herself. In the chapter entitled "An Island" the self-protective meaning of Ursula II's retreat is strongly emphasized. We are explicitly told that Ursula II deceives herself, laughing bad things away, pretending that "life is awfully jolly,"[188] that she enjoys it and is a "rose of hapiness."[189] The cold and mocking tone in Birkin's voice reveals his clairvoyant understanding of her self-deceitful nature; her fingers, "pathetic and hurt" also testify against her declaration. Later still we will see Ursula II running away from the moon, the planet of woman's power, for fear of her own destructive nature.

This portrayal of Ursula II as a person who is unconsciously retreating from a part of reality in a self-protective, self-frustrating deceit has nothing in common with the Ursula I portrayed in The Rainbow. Or, to put it another way, this portrayal reminds us of the baby Ursula I who hid under the sofe, who shut herself up against a father who could turn himself into a brutal punisher without prior explanations or reasons from one moment to the other; it also

reminds us of the dreamy Ursula I who invented phantasies in order to distance herself from reality for a while; or of the Ursula I who would run for awhile from the dark power in herself rather than acknowledge it and cope with it. In any case, there is a big difference between the two Ursulas: now she only assumes an invulnerability so as not to be touched by unpleasant realities; there, as a baby, adolescent or young adult, she sometimes retreated from reality and then again exposed herself entirely to every force, never fearing to be hurt in her search for completeness. Now she continually takes hold of only one portion of reality so as not to be harmed by the confrontation with its other aspects; there, having made her dreams stepping-stones into reality, she seized as much reality as she could, thus achieving self-knowledge by means of experience. The Ursula I of The Rainbow plunged into the unknown with courage; Ursula II leaps "as if to escape something."[190] It is not by chance that, profiting from a suggestion of Gudrun, the jumper, it is Ursula II who leaps. It is not by chance that Ursula II knows the reason why Gudrun jumps. If this protective sense of self is acknowledged, these facts acquire a deep significance: both sisters have conditioned themselves to feel and see what they want to feel and see. Gudrun has shut off creation and Ursula II denies dissolution.

Seen through this perspective, the personality of Ursula II seems to have undergone a regression. It is as if her past experiences marked her negatively and she chose to shut them off. That there were past experiences, that there was a past, we know: it is implicit in her fear of the moon and in her fear of Hermione's homosexual advances as well as

in her hatred of her father and in Birkin's allusion that she still is her "father's daughter"[191]; it is explicit in her remembrances of Skrebensky and of the Marsh.[192] Therefore her "unsure", "baffled," "helpless"[193] nature must derive from the fact that she is always in a self-defensive position, a position that she herself has chosen. Ursula II is not inexperienced; her experiences have taught her to be on the defensive.

Yet according to the precepts of the novel, this exclusion of reality, this withholding of oneself and the desire not to know what is going or around and within oneself, is wrong. Life is composite, and there are two rivers rolling in us: "the silver river of life" and the "dark river of dissolution."[194] No matter how dangerous a weapon knowledge is, knowledge of our essential condition and of the essential realities is the only medium which allows us to be at one with life in its synthetic mystery. Knowing that this is the novel's message, we understand why Ursula II has had to regress: She has been demoted. The central character, the seeker, is now Birkin. The heroine Ursula I, who had, at the end of The Rainbow, achieved completeness by going through the exploration of all kinds of possibilities of life in herself and in the world till finally she acquired wisdom, is now a secondary character, the complement to Birkin. Since she runs from half of reality, denying the vitality of corruption, wishing not to know life in its totality, she will have to learn and to acknowledge what she now denies, and incorporate this knowledge into her life. Since her refusal to acknowledge this part of reality points to her acceptance of "a false set of concepts,"[195] a hard ego, an "idea of her-

self"[196] she will have to be brought to an awareness of the necessity to break her ego and repudiate the false set of concepts by which she rules her life; since she has not overcome the problems which her identification with the father in early infancy had caused her to develop - she is her "father's daughter" - she will have to drop her phallicism and accept a new mode of sexuality dictated by the central character. In short she will have to accept a new mode of being. The author will try to show the reader that Ursula II needs two kinds of changes: first, she is regressive, therefore she must be taught; and second, her phallicism is dangerous for the male, therefore she must be subdued. For her salvation and for the salvation of her partner she needs a tutor and a tamer.

This is certainly "a radical change from the plan suggested in The Rainbow."[197] Again, Ursula II will have to go through an education program; again we are dealing with "an education plot" rather than with a "testing plot."[198] Moreover, we will not see the woman "taking her own initiative";[199] "the women cannot lead."

Yet from the first the critics have not paid attention to this education plot. They have instead seen Ursula II as a strong, wise woman, assigning to her the role of Birkin's critic. Only lately have the critics analysed Ursula II in her role as pupil. Colin Clarke, the first critic to call the reader's attention to the existence of a potent vitality in the corruption which permeates the world of Women in Love, was also the first to acknowledge Ursula II's unresponsiveness to the vitality of corruption, denouncing

her "innocence," her simple faith and optimism"[200] as responsible for the onesidedness of her critical responses to life. He acknowledges Birkin's role as teacher to her. He holds that unless she accepts the bath in dissolution, as Birkin proposes, she will go on unfulfilled, living in a "state of constant unfailing repudiatian" - hard, indifferent, disconnected."[201]

Green is another critic who has recently advocated the necessity for Ursula I to have a tutor: "Only Birkin can transfer Ursula from an Aphroditean goddess into a Demetrian goddess, a source of law as well as life. When she accepts his teaching, her education ... is complete."[202]

It seems however that Ursula II knew better than her tutor, for the reader seems justified in his reading the tale against the teller's intention. Among those who prefer thus to read the tale is Keith Sagar. He sees Ursula II's world as full of "health, vitality, purity and colour" holding that it is she who "convinces Birkin that his own position is untenable."[203]

The disparity between the responses of the above cited critics is not incommensurate. It tells only of a profound gap between Lawrence's intention and realization: the artist intended to portray a less wise yet stronger woman, one in need of a tutor and a tamer. The extraordinary character he has created is both wise and in need of a mate, not a tutor. While Clarke and Green responded to the intention, Sagar and earlier critics, Beal among these, have certainly given credit to the tale. We will read the tale rather than the intentional plan, recalling the latter only when it helps

to clarify certain aspects of the tale and when it becomes so interfering as to compromise the tale. It is our contention that Lawrence's profound ambivalence toward the woman, at this stage of his life, drove him to consciously attack,reprimand, almost repudiate the woman; yet unconsciously he is so identified with her that he makes of Ursula II a second half of himself, the critical half that tests and rejects his theories. Being determined to favour his animus he, however, advocates Birkin's cause even when his anima is the one to be heard. This we have shown already, since the protagonist is now a male. We could conjecture that Birkin's demand for Ursula II to change represents Lawrence's desire to have a women who would submit to him, not a dominant woman who would threaten him as a male; also a woman who would live up to his expectations insofar as his ideal of woman is concerned,while his depiction of Ursula II as the modern woman who stands firm to defend the mode of being that she has developed out of the conditions which modern life creates represents his empathy with the woman's right to live out her new identity, reacting against the male's imposition for her return to the old, submissive role which the woman of the past played with ease.[204] In other words, the realization of Ursula II corresponds to Lawrence's self-criticism of the impracticality of his dream and to his buried sympathy with Frieda's common-sense struggle with his own prophetic-ideological tyrannizing.

In Lawrence's unconscious sympathy and fear of the female - his ambivalence - lies the reason for Ursula II's complexity. To develop his plan Lawrence has to show a weak and strong character in the same person. Weak because

of the false position she holds onto. This is the side of Ursula II's personality which lives encased in a hard ego, forming a bright world for herself in defense against the hard reality she wants to avoid; this is the Ursula II who is "unsure, baffled, helpless"[205] and who feigns that she is "a rose of happiness" and that she "(doesn't) have vermin"[206] so as not to drop her "frightened apprehensive self insistence." According to the plan, this is the side of her personality that she will have to let go in the bath of dissolution so that she will be allowed to grow and become whole. On the other hand, Lawrence has to assign Ursula II a very strong nature because he wants the reader to take the woman as a potentially destructive being. Her power, the power of the Aphrodite, of the moon which "shoot(s) out arms of fire like a cuttle-fish, like a luminous polyp,"[207] is set out against the male to destroy his manliness and to reduce him to a baby.

When this side of Ursula II is uncovered, generally given through Birkin's point of view, we are confronted with a woman whom Birkin admires and loves because "she was so quick, and so lambent, like discernible fire, and so vindictive, and so rich in her dangerous flamy sensitiveness"; at the same time he also fears this woman, "capable of such abandon, such dangerous thoroughness of destructivity,"[208] revealed by "the strange, wicked yellow light"[209] in her eyes. It is this destructivity that she will have to drop, giving the yellow lights - symbol of the male power which modern woman has stolen from man - back to Birkin. "There is a golden light in you," he says, "which I wish you would give me." It is this side of Ursula II that attacks Birkin and her father in retaliation because they try to subdue her,

break her, bully her; it is this side of her make-up which finds in Gudrun her complement - "their knowledge was complementary, that of each to that of the other" and because of which "her father cursed his fatherhood."[210] In her alliance with Gudrun she externalizes her desire not to accept the kind of relation which the social context forces onto the woman, a refusal that places them both in the category of the modern sisters of Artemis. We then are given the two sisters as one: one eye against the people who live in Beldover, one eye against Hermione, her crowd and her domineeringness; one voice against married life as shared by their parents; one force battling for the woman's right for independence from authority, particularly from male authority, be it the father's or the husband's.

Since she is the woman who will opt for creative life, Lawrence has to make Ursula II even more complex: he has to fill her with a very strong instinct for life, so strong that it cannot be cancelled by the deathly atmosphere which envelops her in the corrupt world in which she lives. Till now this instinct has remained latent in her because her tendency to shatter reality and to assume masculine prerogatives has not allowed creative life in her to break into being. This is the reason why she is always compared to an embryo, a shoot that will yet see daylight, a sensitive bud, awaiting maturity and fulfillment. According to the plan of the novel - the author's intention - this maturity and fulfillment will be achieved when she accepts Birkin and his theories, refuses her alliance with Gudrun, gives up her past, her mode of sexuality and being.

Whether Lawrence treats Ursula II as the person

who is running from reality, whether he deals with the phallic woman or with Ursula II, the bud, a very deep sympathy for her complex being always creeps into his description of her. It is probably this unconscious sympathy that leads the reader to consider that the instinct of self-deception that cuts her off from harsh realities has somehow protected her, bringing together the best within her. She, who when brought face to face with "the dark lustre of very deep water" and with "evil-smelling" plants, pretends not to feel the smell of evil plants and the rotten smell of the marshy sides of Willey Water, seems to be wiser than Birkin. She has remained healthier than Birkin who "explore(s) into it"[211] and who wants her to do the same. She who feigns that she is a rose of happiness and that she does not have vermin is certainly "young(er)" than Birkin, her tutor, who "comes of an old race."[212] His old age is a consequence of his immersion into corruption and foulness. His "look of sickness,"[213] of phosphorescence, so repulsive to Ursula II, is the result of his exploration into the dark river of corruption: he is the more fragmented, more corrupt, "so near to being gone with the rest of his race down the slope of mechanical death."[214]

Her criticisms, dictated by her young, intuitive, spontaneous nature, are more sensible than Birkin's mental reasonings, reasonings so close to the kind of mental rhapsody which he deplores and fights against in Hermione, but which make the reader respond to him as he responds to Hermione; that is why even her phallic nature seems right. True, she is outspoken, argumentative; but she uses these masculine attributes in a feminine way. Her emotional mind, not accustomed to Birkin's philosophical theorizings, renders her

inarticulate in rational arguments. She is always "frightened of argument"[215] whenever the argument falls into the field of "pure abstraction." Her mind then becomes "dumb and almost senseless." Yet, when the discussion takes a less abstract form, as, for instance, when Birkin, in "Mind," recognizing that "he was so absurd in his words," stopped "drag(ging) in the stars,"[216] she becomes capable of using her capacity for argumentation, her capacity for analysis and judgment. And her analyses are very much to the point. She really argues (Birkin) and his theories into the ground."[217] If she agreed with Gudrun's pronouncements even she was not altogether in accord with them, she refuses to assent to Birkin's ideas, arguing them logically. It is her critical intelligence used in her feminine way and her feminine insights that reveal to the reader that Birkin is trying to dominate and subdue her and that his theory of star equilibrium, when put into practice, amounts, as she says, to "Mars and his stallite." Therefore the reader, instead of associating her with the mental Hermione and the cynical Gudrun, thinks that she is right to defend herself against his domineeringness. She views him as "the enemy"[218] who wants her to drop her female ego, and persistently, courageously, she voices her revolt against what she calls his bullying her, against what she sees as his desire to make her belong to the death-process, and against "his look of sickness"[219] and his negligent attitude toward his body, visible signs that tell her that he <u>does</u> belong to the death-process.

Ursula's critical intelligence and volubility are given to us as both attractive and repellent, yet through the narrative voice her spontaneous response certainly gains the

upper hand, for she is allowed to carry the tale more often than not. Even registering that "she gave herself away," that "she looked ill-bred, uncouth, exaggerated,"[220] the narrative voice speaks against Birkin's theories, as when she tells Birkin that his tirades against humanity are only the manifestation of his love and desire to save mankind, and denounces his tendency to preach as a flaw in his nature, an obsession to prostitute himself; or when she denounces Birkin's inverted love for Gerald as "an obstinacy, a theory, a perversity";[221] again, when she understands that Birkin's stoning of the moon reveals his hatred of woman. Even if we are sometimes repulsed by her wordy "battle-cries,"[222] as the author perhaps intended us to be, we are certainly amazed, as Birkin is embarrassed, at the truth of her denounciations.

This same critical assertiveness, allied with a very feminine "obtrusiveness"[223] appears also when she deals with the other characters in the novel: intuitively she knows that "perhaps there <u>was</u> an unconscious will "behind Gerald's killing of his brother when they both were young boys,[224] as she tells Gudrun: when Gerald is pressing the spurs into the sides of the mare she, who "alone understood (Gerald) in perfect opposition"[225] cries aloud to him that he should let the mare go. Later she will bring the same subject into the open, expressing her disapproval of his sadistic attitude toward the mare, roughly scolding him for his lack of understanding of an animal's nature. Her scolding is raw, and she is repellent here, as she will be again later in the novel, when denouncing the kind of relationship that Loerke forced upon his model. Generally these displays of "outspoken rudeness"[226] provoke in people "a stiff dislike

of her."[227] The reader usually reacts like Birkin: though sometimes repulsed by her uncouthness, he cannot help admiring her spontaneous response, her courage to express openly what she feels; her powerful, critical intelligence, and her "sharpest eyes." We take her rudeness or "vulgarity" as Hermione takes it: as part of "a certain unconscious positivity"[228] in Ursula II.

Even her phallic sensuality, which Birkin detests and which he calls "passion"," "love in the Dionysic ecstatic way,[229]" "hard kisses"[230] - bringing to the reader's mind the hard, beaked female of The Rainbow - is somehow used by Ursula II in a wiser way. She holds her phallic powers in restraint so as to be prevented from annihilating the male. This does not seem to imply simply fear, but knowledge of a power that has to be under control. It demonstrates that she takes herself se a modern, phallic woman, as a product of modern civilization. Her awareness that she can no longer enjoy the placidity of the woman of the past, because she knows she is no longer as predominantly feminine as she was before, shows that she is learning to cope with her phallic nature. She is not simply trying to assert herself, trying out her powers against the male, as she was in The Rainbow and as the author believes and Birkin tells us. It is not that Ursula II does not live out she contradictions, the confusion, the psychosexual distortion which the woman's phallicism causes the modern woman to suffer, only she does not let them take over. She can say "I'm a woman" even knowing that she is independent, mobile, vocal as her grandmother never was. Sagar himself attests to the absence of conflict in Ursula II's mind when he says that she lives in a world of health and purity; Hermione

has also attested to the fact that Ursula II is "more womanly"[231] than Gudrun. Another fact that shows that she is womanly in her new way is proven by her acceptance of her own typical femininity. It is Gudrun, less wise, perhaps less experienced than Ursula II, who envies man, who wishes she were one, as she cries in the chapter "Diver": "God, what it is to be a man!" Ursula II not only rejects the possibility - "Ugh! So cold!" - but she is even "puzzled"[232] by Gudrun's reaction. This means that Ursula II has so thoroughly assimilated the phallic powers in herself that she now is a woman in her own way and all she wants - and what Birkin and her father seem to deny her - is the possibility to live out the identity that her new condition of liberated woman confers on her.

It is, again, Lawrence's sympathy with Ursula II that makes the reader aware that Ursula II uses her phallicism in a non-destructive way. True, the author sometimes intrudes in the tale to say, as once through Ursula II's vision, that "Man must render himself up to her";[233] another time through Birkin's point of view, that "the yellow flare in her eyes (revealed) the unthinkable overweening assumption of primacy in her" a primacy that represented her holding man as "her everlasting prisoner."[234] Again, we are shown that she can be destructive, as for instance in the chapter "Water Party" when her "fierce kisses of passion" "satisfied and shattered, fulfilled and destroyed"(Birkin).[235] Yet the narrator is so torn between his admiration for Ursula II and a desire to side with Birkin that, in honestly registering his ambivalence, this ambivalence is also registered through Birkin towards Ursula II. So that, knowing both the narrator and Birkin wavering in

their sympathy for her, the reader is left with the choice to decide if she is really destructive. We see her phallicism as non-destructive because we see that it is the intruding author who, disrespecting the narrator's ambivalence, speaks through Ursula II; the author who, in "Water Party" forces her to accept an extra dose of phallicism from Gudrun, as they exchange lanterns.[236] Above all, it is Ursula II's running away from the moon, escaping "the tightness, the enclosure of Gudrun's presence"[237] that gives us ground to believe that Ursula II, though closely connected to Gudrun in their possession of a phallic nature, is alone in understanding and accepting the masculine traits inherent in the modern woman's nature. If this were not the case we would not see Ursula II, when treated as subject, holding a perfect control of her phallic powers and manifesting no desire to dominate or annihilate the male. Much to the contrary, she is even repulsed by Hermione's power over Birkin: in spite of Birkin's unwillingness, it is Hermione who furnishes his rooms, invites him for tea, gives him presents, all this a short time after having almost killed him. This repulsion of Ursula II's is more clearly emphasized in her reaction to Hermione's comparison of canaries-who go to sleep as soon as a cloth is put over their cages - with stupid husbands who can likewise be easily deceived by cloths. Ursula II's repudiation of the comparison represents her repudiation of playing with Birkin the role that Hermione does: she knows that Hermione deceives him by using carpets in place of cloths. Ursula II's repudiation of Hermione's method shows that she is not out to possess him. Furthermore she is repulsed by the male's weakness in letting himself be so easily duped: "Really, how can one have

any respect for a creature that is so easily taken in!"[238] That is why she leaves Birkin's house in a state of indignation, filled with an "unreasoning rage" against Hermione and Birkin, for seeing "how subtle (Hermione's) influence was" on Birkin: "He was her creature."[239] Being afraid of yielding "her very identity"[240] Ursula II seems to demand that the others not only respect hers but their own as well.

Lawrence's basic honesty, both in his treatment of Ursula II as subject as well as in his treatment of Birkin as subject, allows the reader to penetrate below the level of the intentional plan of the novel. We have seen that when Ursula II is treated as subject she does not show any tendency to destroy the male; only when she is seen as object, specifically, as love-object. It is when we hear Birkin's monologue of the limitations of sex, in which he admits that he "hated sex," that suddenly we come to understand <u>why</u> he has been magnifying Ursula II's destructive powers: his fear of woman and fear of his incapacity as male make him desire a kind of love other than the one she offers, "not this, not this."[241] We are so disturbed by Birkin's fear, symptomatic of a serious psychosexual distortion, that even if we do believe that sex life as it stands is unfulfilled, that crimes are committed between two people in the name of love, and that domineering women must be partially responsible for the state of married relations, yet we cannot accept the formula which he is proposing to Ursula II at face value. We believe neither in the superiority of the male nor in the need for the woman to submit to the higher being, which Lawrence thinks necessary here, so that both can arrive at "the further conjunction,

where man had being and woman had being." We take it instead as a theory to justify himself, to justify his fear of losing his identity, of becoming an "infant" in the hands of Woman, the Ursula II whom he sees as the "awful, arrogant queen of life."[242]

Seen in this light, even the sexuality which he proposes to substitute for what he calls "the old destructive fires" of passion is more regressive than this passion. He wants it changed because it does not leave room for the passive sexuality which seems to satisfy him. He wants Ursula II's "nestling" "softly, gently" beside him; he wants "to be together in happy stillness."[243] Yet he will use the need for her to be the "answer" in a perverse way: first he will want her to be passive so that he can "take (the) knowledge of her"; later she will be required to be even more phallic than she is said to be, using her delicate fingers as instruments, "to take this knowledge of him."[244] This knowledge, which Ursula II resists accepting up to "Excurse," calling it "obscene and perverse" and referring to Birkin's sex-life as symptomatic of his "foulness"[245] may refer to Birkin's need of anal sexuality to grafity his latent homosexuality. The reader senses clearly that he is afraid of passion, afraid of being physically destroyed. This fear is difficult to empathize with, though we can understand his problem: we identify with Ursula II as the healthy one, and in her clairvoyant knowledge of his sexuality as perverse, as also the wiser one. Birkin's contemplation of the statuette, symbolic of sodomitic sensuality in its crudest terms, and his calling to mind Ursula II exactly at the moment, explains why he sees her as his escape from deathly, merely perverse sexuality, as "the

third way":[246] she would save him from falling prey to the frost mystery - sex in the head - and from the African mystery: knowledge in dissolution. Also his thinking of her soon after having had a very satisfying physical encounter with Gerald, in "Gladiatorial," further corroborates the point that she is going to be used to satisfy his passive, masochistic needs in a less conflicting way.

For this reason we question if Ursula II needs to accept corruption just as we question her need to drop her phallicism. Birkin may be right in his claim that Ursula II has to transcend the ego, for she herself admits that her life is unfulfilled. Yet, since he preaches that this will happen only if she accepts the kind of corruption that satisfies <u>his</u> sexuality, and since he preaches that she has to drop her phallicism and adopt a mode of sexuality that gratifies <u>him</u>, we definitely side with Ursula II in her defense of her ego and of her mode of sexuality. We sense that she is right to stay away from corruption mainly because she has tested it before and has rejected it: "yes, thank you, we've had some" she says to him in "Excurse," after denouncing the foulness of his sex life, after calling him "scavenger dog."[247] Again she proves not only her strength but her decision to be responsible for her own choices. It is not out of "simple faith" or "innocence"[248] that she has not embarked into dissolution, as Clarke tries to prove; she has not "let dissolution set in"[249] out of her own choice. That is, she knows what it entails: she does not want to be contaminated.

As a consequence of our reading the tale, we refuse Birkin the right to consider himself master, tutor and

tamer to Ursula II. We see instead that he is applying his knowledge of the necessity for awareness in a perverse way, insofar as his relationship with Ursula II is concerned. His adoption of Gerald's dictum that the natural order calls for a master and the mastered is only to justify the unnatural double standard of his love ethic: in this position he can demand that she lose her will, whereas he will not only keep his but have it confirmed. In The Rainbow Lawrence had spoken out for merging, in which each partner equally had to go through a loss of identity out of which both emerged renewed, fulfilled. How are we going to believe, as Women in Love proposes, that it is nature's plan for the woman to be subordinate to man, if we see her throughout as healthier, wiser? Probably in reaction to this male ethic, against the author's wish "that we judge according to norms we cannot accept,"[256] we see instead the hero Birkin rapidly running towards destruction, and his holding onto Ursula II as the only way for him to make "that which was imminent in himself"[251] - his total submersion in destruction - stop its course.

In the first part of Women in Love the disparity between the tale and the intentional plan does not compromise the artistic value of the depiction of Ursula II. Moreover it does not compromise the validity of their struggle. Their wordy battles are "the most amusing and happily written scenes"[252] in the book, and the method of presenting their growing relationship is very original: their constant arguments bring into the open their qualities as well as their limitations. In his attempt to create a male of "higher understanding" and "superior wisdom" Lawrence creates a very

complex being, and this complexity cannot be dismissed simply because we do not accept his theories. And just as the narrative voice conveys ambivalence towards him, we do also, always moving from a position of exasperation with Birkin and his theories to a position of sympathy for him: sympathy for his awareness of the maladies contained in this world, for his seeking after solutions, sympathy for his sickness, that tells of his being a product of and a participant in this sick world of ours; also his effort to establish a more fruitful relationship in an era when every relationship is so badly muddled. Our disagreement with his prescription - and with the theory on which the prescription is based - does not impair our admiration for this tormented man who is so desperately looking for fulness of being.

Ursula II's limitations are brought into the open in their quarrels exactly because of Birkin's open or implied judgments of her. Through them we learn that she is hammering, even vulgar in her volubility; we also know that in spite of having "the sharpest eyes,"[253] in spite of being the carrier of part of the moral voice of the novel, she is not to be taken as a moral paragon. The inconvenience of her repetitious sermonizing is amusingly registered by Birkin's use of repetition "for satirical devolution"[254] at moments when he becomes tired of her interminable questionings.[255] Other characters also judge Ursula II's less lovable traits: Gudrun finds her sister's lack of control "foolish," while Gerald speaks of her "outspoken rudeness" and feels she is "undignified, she put a sort of vulgarity over (that which) gave man his last distinction."[256]

This bringing-out of Ursula II's limitations does not diminish her in the least: on the contrary, it makes her more plausible as a person and more complex as an artistic characterization. Also Birkin's exasperation with Ursula II is so well integrated in the tale that the reader often sympathizes with him. Our reactions to Ursula II mirror her complexity: she can weary us one moment, delight us the next. We tend to agree wholeheartedly with her when she defines herself as "an interfering female"[257] just as we do when she points her finger at Birkin and cries: "There-there- you've given yourself away! You want a satellite, Mars and his satellite!" and Birkin smiles at her" "in frustration and amusement and irritation and admiration and love."[258] Ursula II's limitations add to her psychological validity. More, her limitations and Birkin's, their strength, their equal stature are the factors that generate the artistic vitality of their courtship. It is just this equality in complexity which maintains our interest in their struggle. Had Ursula II been weak, she would have easily succumbed to him; had he been, throughout, the male of superior understanding that Lawrence, in intention, was certainly tempted to create, we would have accepted her submission easily. Thanks to Lawrence's honest rendering of complexity we are for the most part torn between an ambivalence towards them both, tending to press our sympathy on Ursula II's side because we sense that the author, behind the narrative voice, is putting his thumb in the scale against Ursula II.

Our reading the tale against the teller's intention has not prepared the reader, however, for a change in Ursula II, a change that was being elaborated only by the in-

tentional plan. When, at the climax of their violent courtship, Lawrence gives the plan its coherent development, Ursula II's nature undergoes such a metamorphosis that she becomes no longer believable, losing her artistic validity half-way through the book. For the reader, only a trick could change Ursula II's complex nature, only a trick could make her submit to Birkin, after the ardent defense - and even attack - she had displayed.

And this is exactly what Lawrence resorts to, and what he has been preparing us for. For now, certain hints that had almost escaped our attention before come clear. Several times before the author had taken up the narrator's role to give his message to the reader:[259] In "Moony" he had told us that Ursula II wants "To drink (Birkin) down - ah, like a life-draught."[260] In "Carpeting" we were told that Ursula II "was held to (Birkin) by some bond ..." which "at once irritated her and saved her"[261] and we could understand only her irritation, for it seemed as if some outside voice was telling her, and us, that she had been saved. Especially in "Sunday Evening" the reader had been puzzled when confronted with an Ursula II who digressed about the fruitlessness of passion, the hopelessness of the mechanical, routine life, admitting corruption and submission as necessary for her regeneration from this kind of death in life, only a day after he had seen her so passionately filled with life and love. Her entire soliloquy was so loaded with ontological reasoning, so completely Laurentian and so unlike the practical, down-to-earth, intuitive Ursula II that the reader could not connect her person with what had come before and

with what came after.

Then, in "Woman to Woman," the author goes much further: he makes Ursula II assume the mode of thought that is Birkin's. Usually so direct in her mode of expression, Ursula II here becomes capable of articulating abstract thoughts in a kind of language she had never uttered before. She tells herself: "He did not want an odalisk. He wanted a woman to take something from him, to give herself up so much she could take the last realities of him, the last facts, the last physical facts, physical and unbearable."[262] Though there is no change in the narrative voice here - undoubtedly it is Ursula II thinking to herself about Birkin, in reaction to what Hermione had just told her - it is easy to perceive the intruding artist's mind. Ursula II is using Lawrence's speech; or, to put it another way, she is using Birkin's abstract reasoning. Whereas we had been contextually prepared to accept her rejection of Birkin, nothing was done to prepare us to accept this mental metamorphosis. Here is the author imposing his predilection, imposing his direction on the plan he had originally built, without paying heed to the artistic truth that his honesty as an artist had until now brought into the open.

It is in the chapter "Excurse" that Lawrence finally destroys Ursula II's vivid depiction. Here, having first allowed her complexity full play in a quarrel with Birkin in which she accuses him, in wild anger, the author has Ursula II walk away, as if it were all over between them. And then, he has her return, and when she comes back to the scene she is totally changed.

In the first part of this scene, in respect for her mode of thought and being, the narrator takes pains to fully convey all the power of which Ursula II is capable: her resistance to Birkin, her volubility, her agressiveness are highly dramatized in their quarrel. Having now fully understood Birkin's theory, having totally grasped the meaning of Birkin's vague, abstract and elusive speeches, having tested his "gentle kisses," she seems ready to escape from his bullying for good. She releases an uncontrollable rage upon Birkin, a rage that could only mean her extreme repudiation of him. No matter how "degrading"[263] or how ridiculous her exhibition might seem to the narrator and to Birkin's eyes, to the reader it represents the logical argumentation of a woman at the pitch of her rage against a men who wants to "bully" her, who "want(s) to force(her) into something."[264] Birkin not only drops his elusive speeches, but his attempts at placating her fury are so ineffective that they only make him appear a fool.

In their quarrel, Ursula II's "unconscious positivity," even "her vulgarity"[265] which Hermione envies in her, are highly artistically conveyed: she throws rings at Birkin, she tears flowers and walks through the mud in a "sullen, rather ugly" way, she tells him he is a "scavenger dog," an "eater of corpses." His attempts to calm her fury by telling her that "this is a degrading exhibition" make her even angrier, and she does not stop till she calls him "a whited sepulchre," and announces that "you can go your way, and I'll go mine" ... "I don't want to go any farther with you - leave me - "[266] It is then that she pulls the rings he has given her off her fingers, throws them at him, and walks away.

Though this scene is so artistically rendered, critics since Murry have found fault with the chapter "Excurse" as a whole, focusing their analysis of its flaws on the scenes which come later in the chapter.[267] Daleski, who aptly discusses the difficulties of Lawrence's "failure to communicate a genuine mystical experience" criticizes even the title of his chapter, saying that it seems to serve "as an announcement, among other things, of a fresh sortie."[268] Though we agree with him, we also think that Lawrence's failure began earlier in the chapter, more precisely in the ring scene. For, though it is true that this quarrel, like the others of their courtship, is artistically conveyed, yet something about it is unsatisfactory. There is a "failure to communicate a genuine mystical experience" already from a certain point in their quarrel, for surely Lawrence wants us to see the whole ring scene as a kind of epiphany, and it is just here that he fails.

Each of Ursula II's actions - her throwing rings at Birkin, who picks them up and puts them in his pocket, her tearing flowers, significantly "flesh-pink spindleberries" showing up their "orange seeds,"[269] and her walk through the mud - are surely surcharged with mystical evertones. The tearing of the flowers might represent the breaking of Ursula II's resistant ego, as well as the smashing of the kind of sexuality which she has bean urging Birkin to satisfy. The flesh-pink colour of the flowers that she smashes and their orange seeds remind us of the " Red ... stigmas of the female flower" and of the "dangling yellow male catkin"[270] which Birkin drew on the blackboard, in the "Classroom" scene, and of the "yellow lights" in her eyes, the lights that the

modern queen bee has stolen from man and that he wants beck. Her walk through the mud might represent her baptism or entry into dissolution; the rings which he picks up and which have "made his hands all dirty and gritty" not only confirm that a new creature is being born, fathered by Birkin's hands and mothered in his "pocket" but also that she has agreed to accept him finally on his own terms. As Ursula II returns to Birkin, "hanging her head," she offers him a new kind of flower: its stem develops into a "tree-like, tiny branch" which supports a "clump of coloured bells."[271] If the former flower had represented the phallic, active kind of sexuality rejected by Birkin, this new flower would certainly symbolize the sexuality[272] which Birkin demands. Therefore her giving him this flower must mean her signing the pledge, a pledge which includes submission to him and acceptance of his mode of sexuality.

Our mental recognition of the mystical aspect of this ritual does not imply our participation in it. Somehow the images used by Lawrence fail to strike us as anything other than mere allegory whenever we attempt to see them as symbolic of Ursula II's purification. We take them instead as Lawrence's conscious attempt to give the version developed by the teller its proper and cogent denouement. What comes later - their experience at the inn where she discovers "the strange mystery of his life-motion ... at the back of the thighs, down the flanks," finding "a new current of passional ... energy, released from the darkest poles of the body ... deeper, further than the phallic source," or later at night in dark Sherwood Forest, away from the moon's rays, where she "take(s) this knowledge of him" going "beyond herself ...

to accept him at the quick of death" is only possible because Ursula II's submission was accomplished, as she says herself, "under a fate which has taken her."[273] She acquiesces passively, unlike the former Ursula II.

To the reader who had witnessed Ursula II's vigor and her violent defense, to the reader who had rescued her several times from the teller's hands, to the reader who had witnessed the victory of the artist's anima over his animus, the radical change of Ursula II represents not only an imposition of the author on his character and on the reader, but a violation of the artist himself; the silencing of the artist's critical self.

W.J. Harvey, discussing epiphany in the novel, says that it cannot appear isolatedly: "it must in one way or another be related to a context of life stretching before and after." The plot, both insofar as the realization of Ursula II and as the plan that the author prepared for her were concerned, was pointing to a climax, a turning point. Yet since the teller, unconscious of the gap between his plan and his tale, now gives the plan its cogent development, the reader, who has been carried along by the tale, is definitely excluded from the "moment of intense vision" which an epiphany should provide.[274] Consequently he is unable to reconcile the experience of seeing a furious Ursula II walking away, with a meek Ursula II returning, not understanding in the least what changes the author forced into her mind to make her character change so suddenly. It is not Birkin's "it was merely ruinous to try to work her by conviction. This was a paradisal bird that could never be netted, it must fly by

itself to the heart"[275] that is going to convince us that the means used by the author could have altered Ursula II so greatly. As the reader was dramatically shown that it was merely ruinous to try to work Ursula II by conviction, he also should have been allowed to see how she flew to Birkin's heart. Since he was not, her flight does not seem plausible.

H.M. Daleski sees some lack of connection between the first and second half of the novel, and he also "would like to know, for we are not told, just how it is that "(Ursula and Birkin) are metamorphosed." Daleski assumes that Birkin proposes the establishment of a strange conjunction based on a "pure balance of two beings" and that in the end this conjunction takes exactly the unilateral dimension denounced by Ursula II: Mars and its satellite. For him, the lack of connection between the two parts of the novel lies in this discrepancy, a discrepancy that makes the norm that Birkin proposes "neither clear nor cogent," and he regrets that Lawrence "demolished Cybele only to set up a new graven image in her stead-that of the triumphant male."[276]

Daleski's argument supports our belief that it was Lawrence's intention to side with the male; it also confirms our contention that there is a lack of connection in the novel; finally it reinforces our point that the reader is excluded from the epiphany. We would disagree only in his pointing to the discrepancy between what Birkin proposed to Ursula II and what he demands of her, as the reason or cause of the incoherence. All along Birkin and Lawrence had reiterated their conviction concerning the necessity for the woman to submit to the "higher being" out of "the last, perhaps

highest, love-impulse": as Birkin tells Ursula II, early in their courtship, the stable equilibrium could only be maintained if the woman submitted. In this conversation Birkin compares the woman to the horses, in that both have two wills: the will to submit and the will to bolt. Birkin makes it clear that if the woman does not submit to the male, the will to bolt will drive her to "pitch her rider to perdition."[277] Later, in "Mino", he makes his opinions still clearer by showing her that the male cat should cuff the female cat into "stability."[278] Again, parallel plots develop the same theme: Gudrun, Diana and even Hermione exemplify the necessity for the woman to submit. Above all, it is Ursula II's reaction against Birkin which most strongly convinces us that Birkin's proposal to her is a proposal that she submit to him.

For these reasons we feel justified in our contention that it is the change of Ursula II that is not convincing, and that therefore the two parts of the novel fail to connect. Furthermore we believe that the reason for the lack of plausibility lies in the gap between the intention and realization of Ursula II. Had Lawrence actually created the Ursula II that he imagined he had - the Ursula of his plan - and not the strong, wise, complex Ursula II he really did, we would have accepted the denouement and been able to participate in the ritual of her purification.

The principle of credibility, lacking in Ursula II's change, prevents us from accepting the psychological and psychic changes that Lawrence produces in Ursula II in the second part of the book. The picture which is presented

to us after her violation breaks this strong female, giving us instead a submissive woman who needs "to catch hold of Birkin's arm, to make sure of him";[279] indeed, as if the author himself did not believe it, he finds it necessary to repeat the same image on four different occasions.[280] Now the once - strong woman needs to be reassured of Birkin's love for her in a "childish" way: "she wanted proof, and statement, even over-statement, for everything seemed still uncertain, unfixed to her";[281] the Ursula II who had fought so ferociously for love now becomes a gramophone repeating Birkin's ideas, the same ideas she has spoken out against before: "Love is too human and little. I believe in something inhuman, of which love is only a little part ...[282]; her passionate, orgasmic nature has been abolished now, as is shown by her placing the stockings, which Gudrun gives her, under the pillow; she who wanted a home is contented now with the idea of following Birkin around the world.

Lawrence's violent alteration of Ursula II's character compromises the versatility of the method he had used so successfully in her portrayal. Because of Lawrence's need to treat her as an object,[283] he had practiced the multiplication of narrative voice, a device that helped to increase the validity of Ursula II's portrayal, given the several perspectives through which she was seen. After Ursula II's conversion he keeps employing the same method, seeing her either subjectively or objectively, yet since we have lost our trust in her and in her personality, and since Birkin, Gudrun, and the narrator all see her now as "a child,"[284] we tend to see all of her reactions as springing

from her newly acquired childish nature. Having cut off the "bad" side of Ursula II, the phallicism that distinguishes the modern woman from the traditional one, Lawrence now presents Birkin and the reader with a child. Definitely the reader, together with Lawrence, is plunged into the world of Lawrence's wish-fulfillment.

"Morality in the novel is the trembling instability of the balance. When the novelist puts his thumb in the scale, to pull down the balance to his own predilection, that is immorality."[285] Since his art fails to give us the justification for Ursula II's change, we cannot help using Lawrence to accuse Lawrence. In our study we have judged the artistic strength of the characters by their complexity, their psychological validity. In our introduction we said we would explain the author's own psychological problems only to explain the possible reasons for a characterization that is aesthetically unsatisfying. As this is the case with Ursula II after the chapter "Excurse," we must look into Lawrence's life to discover what has made him lose "aesthetic distance" from his character, thus provoking her flatness.

For a lifetime, Lawrence's wish was Frieda's submission to him, as one of his letters to Katherine Mansfield shows: "I do think a woman must yield some sort of precedence to a man and he must take his precedence. I do think men must go ahead absolutely in front of their women, without turning round to ask for permission or approval from their women. Consequently, the women must follow as it were unquestioningly. I can't help it. I do believe this. Frieda does not. Hence our fight."[286] Though they fought constantly

in their lifetime together, Frieda never gave in totally to him. She subjected herself to the sexuality which best suited Lawrence, but she never dropped her passionate, orgasmic nature; she was Lawrence's companion in his pilgrimage, but several times she refused to follow him; finally, unlike Ursula II who gave away the "chair"[287] - symbol of the Magna Mater in the novel - which she had just bought, Frieda never gave up her claim as mother of her children, nor her right to live out her mode of being. Whether she was "the devouring mother" in her relation with Lawrence, as he claimed, we do not know. Perhaps this was just the way Lawrence persisted in seeing her, or any modern woman. All we know is that she was not a common woman: she was a woman in her own way, and fought for what she believed in. We also know of her value from the critics' testimony of her active participation in his artistic life: her entrance into Lawrence's life marks a turning point in his career. "Her value ... is implicit in a thousand evocations by Lawrence of the flowering life she brought with her."[288] True, she never allowed Lawrence to have "the crown", to be the dominant male, but after all Lawrence himself believed that "the true crown is upon the consummation itself, not upon the triumph of one over another, neither in love nor in power."[289] Moreover, since Lawrence had so ardently advocated his theory of the novel - in which he repeatedly warned the artist to pay heed to the "Morality of the Novel" - we wonder what has made Lawrence turn against his closest feelings for art and life in his treatment of Ursula II in Women in Love.[290]

CHAPTER V

C O N C L U S I O N :

EFFECTS OF THE CHANGE OF LAWRENCE'S ATTITUDE

"It is the positivity of women you seem to deny - make them sort of instrumental."

Lawrence

The analyses above illustrate our contention that Lawrence views women as phallic beings: as we have shown, Ursula I, Gudrun and Ursula II in their assertiveness, independence, clarity of mind and critical intelligence, as well as in their potential for destructive sensuality, represent the prototype of the Laurentian woman, the archetypal phallic mother. It is true that Ursula II appears the least phallic of the three, since her phallic endowments are felt as potentials, for she has adapted herself to her role of a modern woman by assimilating these powers.

Much our analysis has been directed toward a comparison of the women in The Rainbow and Women in Love. This comparison allows us to follow Lawrence's changing relation as regard the woman: from a latent, almost imperceptible ambivalence in The Rainbow, an ambivalence hidden in his overvaluation of the woman, he changes to an attitude of profound ambivalence toward her in Women in Love. Assertiveness, independence, outwardness, critical intelligence are seen, in The Rainbow, as qualities of the soul, and the woman per-

sonifying these qualities is elevated to the condition of the necessary carrier of civilization: Ursula I's female forebears begin the process toward consciousness, a process that culminates in Ursula I's awareness that man must acknowledge both the known and the unknown in himself and find polarity in himself. Ursula I's experience, her frustrated dreams, her masculinity and even her will are necessary for her on her way towards the achievement of an integrated personality: the experiences are the trials that make her "sadder but wiser"[1]; her will as well as her dreaming nature are, together, the elements that give her courage to explore her fantasies and to live out her desires; her "masculine" attributes are described as derived from the exigencies of a mechanical modern life. Thus, though she becomes tough in her struggle to be a part of this life, she is never blamed; indeed, she is honoured and revered throughout for her courage to know the realms of her inner self, for her quest for fullness of being, even for her rejection of the purely sensuous male as well as the purely social one. Her reward is her achievement of inner balance.

In Women in Love, the woman is consciously attacked and repudiated: her tendency to espouse intellectual values is seen as deathly because the woman does not make proper use of it. Instead of making it an instrument for self-understanding she uses it as a means for power: again, the faculty of imagination in the independent, modern woman is condemned because it leads to the abstract, deathly sexuality which Lawrence calls sex "in the head" or "frost-knowledge."[2] Gudrun, who gives herself entirely to it, triumphs

over the male, but her triumph is that of one who perishes: secluded in the isolated land of her autistic phantasies, she is condemned to live out the exploration of her desires to its end. By now fully embarked into psychosis, there is no return to reality for her. But the punitive powers of the phallic woman are described not only as damaging to herself: when used against the male, women are like Delilah, who cut down whatever strength man possesses, and drive him toward annihilation. As Gudrun drives Gerald to suicide, the reader remembers that this was rebearsed before, both by Diana who choked her young rescuer and by Hermione who would smash Birkin; Lawrence blames the will for the wrong use that intellect and imagination have been put to. He points to the woman as having usurped will, and so having made of herself a destructive instrument. For this reason, Lawrence defends what has inexplicably appeared as a double standard in Women in Love: the very same will is necessary to the man who knows how to use it and who needs it as a defense against the woman. So we see Birkin using his will to keep his ego intact and forcing Ursula to drop hers, for her will is abhorrent to him; the woman's assertiveness is punished with submission to the male: since her assertiveness wounds him, he can bring her into submission as the male cat Mino does his mate. It is a long way from The Rainbow, where admiration and respect were paid the woman for her rejection of the weaker male, to this masculine protest against a fate that places man into the hands of a potentially destructive Magna Mater.

In spite of Lawrence's conscious repudiation of

the woman for what she represents to man, he unconsciously identifies with her, and this identification makes his treatment of her profoundly ambivalent: his vivid depiction of her tells of his identification with, and fascination for, a woman of this kind. Thus, like Ursula I, Gudrun and Ursula II of the first half of Women in Love retain the symphathetic identification which Lawrence dedicates to rebellious women. And this identification that allows him to experience the feminine world from inside the woman awakens the reader's symphathy for his female characters. It is because he sees Gudrun's struggle with and against her own powers through her eyes, and because this vision from within is sustained during her crises of intense suffering, that we come to understand how she lives the contradiction of the "liberated woman," both a participant in and a product of the society she represents. Thus, through identification we sympathize with her and feel compassion for her in spite of her perverse, distorted nature.

In his treatment of Ursula II, this identification with the assertive woman and his vision from within are present again, rousing the reader's symphathy for her. It is this sympathy that gains for Ursula II the title of Birkin's critic, critic of his insecurity, his fear of woman and of his inadequacy as a man; it is this sympathy that opens the reader's eyes to the fact that the imposition of a male ethic that favors the male and assigns the independent woman a submissive role is only a justification for this inadequacy; finally it is this sympathy that calls the reader's attention to the author's basic honesty, for Lawrence, the artist, does not believe in the metaphysic that Lawrence, the man,

tries to create in order "to justify himself, to justify his failure as a man."[3] Though the teller tries to silence the critical, artistic self, the artist wins, because the artistic truth is given first. The reader knows that if the woman for Lawrence is daemonic, is assertive, she is expressing Lawrence's strongest convictions, and her artistic rendition is the extent of his belief. Therefore no trick can possibly make her assume an identity that the ideal of the man behind the artist wants to force on her - and on the artist - without seriously shaking our belief in the character, the tale and the teller. When the trick is used - in the second half of the book - it stands out as the mark of the author's violation on the character and on himself. The woman's positivity cannot be jeopardized without the jeopardy of the whole character.

The author's ambivalence towards his female characters leads us to conclude that Women in Love is transitional: although it already points to the road that will lead Lawrence to pursue his idea that woman must lose her primacy, must be made submissive, together with The Rainbow it is poised between the female and male worlds. There is still the hope that there can be an ideal of happy, balanced relatedness between the sexes, even if this can only be achieved in the further conjunction with a male. Ursula II's role as Birkin's critic is most vividly played in the very scenes in which Lawrence/Birkin is most seriously occupied with his hope for, and doubt about, the man-woman relationship. Birkin is patient in his task of persuading Ursula II that there will be reciprocity in their relationship. He will later agree

with her when she wishes to go to Italy. Compared to the relationship between Kate and Cipriano, in the period which follows Women in Love, the relationship of Birkin and Ursula II is very satisfactory. Again, Gudrun's only partial responsibility for Gerald's death - Lawrence is not so chauvinistic as not to show that Gerald has helped to prepare his own fate - shows that Lawrence was not determined to blame woman entirely, as he will in The Plumed Serpent, where the narrator, through Kate's inside view, accuses her of having murdered her first husband. If Gudrun is punished with her psychosis and Ursula II with submission to the male, they are not, at this stage, required to undergo sacrifice for man's redemption as the women in "The Woman Who Rode Away" and in other Sacrifice Stories will be. Therefore, even if Women in Love marks a turning point in Lawrence's relation with the phallic woman, it marks only the beginning of his path towards his intention to conquer her.

As for the effect of the change of attitude on the portrayals, it can be said to have been both positive and negative. Positive because it made Women in Love become more complexly realized; negative because it motivated Lawrence to tamper with his characters.

The complexity of Women in Love derives from the fact that it contains a much richer net of interrelationships, necessary to express the varying degrees of corruption in individuals within the most varied layers of a corrupt society at one chosen historical moment. Whereas in The Rainbow one couple was singled out to convey the historical continuity in three different moments of chronological time,

beginning with a simple, certainly healthier society, in Women in Love everybody is engaged in the same process of dissolution and each of the characters, implicitly or explicitly, becomes both an exponent and a critic of his society.

But within this broader theme is enclaved another one: that of the two roads, of self-destruction through corruption and reduction, or salvation through the conscious incorporation of corruption and flight to creative life. These two possibilities are evidently antagonistic, and since in Lawrence the ultimate result is always dependent on the man-woman relationship, he has to work out each of these possibilities by using two couples. It is in this sense then that we see the change of attitude generating complexity: if Lawrence had not set out to make a judgment of woman in her role of sexual partner, if he had not had to prove that the woman is pernicious to man unless she submits to him, he would certainly not have had to execute one of his plans, conceived in his apprenticeship:

> "The usual plan is to take two couples and develop their relationships .. I shall try two couples for a start."[4]

We see the change of attitude generating complexity in another sense: since Lawrence wants to make a judgement of woman he cannot make her the centre of consciousness as he did in The Rainbow. There, both the narrator and the reader follow Ursula I throughout her trial toward self-knowledge, seeing the world as she saw it, taking her as she took herself, with her limitations and her basic humanity. We see

her evolving toward a greater "positivity," becoming attracted to a sheer sensuality, subjecting herself to the rules of the man's world, becoming at times almost inhumanly destructive. Yet, because the narrator sustains an inside view of Ursula I throughout her performance, we sympathise with her so thoroughly as to lose the "degree of distance"[5] necessary to respond to her experiences without having the same reactions and feelings she has: her emotions are our emotions, her judgment of the world and of herself become our judgment. We share with the narrator his respectful, almost reverential attitude toward his character: we take her misdeeds as necessary for her arrival at self-knowledge, never reproaching her for her behaviour, accepting that "she received the understanding that would not come before."[6]

Women in Love is more complex and subtle in this matter: Lawrence's plan to analyse the woman's role as the male's sexual partner pressuposes the necessity for the narrator's judgment of his female characters. This certainly implies distancing, since, according to Derrick, only that which is seen is judged. Lawrence, then, places a male surrogate at the centre of consciousness. He will not only function through the character but will judge the character as well: Gudrun, shown as a hunter goddess, is explicitly referred to as a "sister(s) of Artemis."[7]

Given however that Lawrence cannot do without the woman's vision, he then splits the main centre of consciousness into several other centers, giving the woman the right to speak for herself in the position of an assistant narrator, so to speak; a position that he confers on the males as well. Equip-

ed with a capacity for divination and judgment, each of the characters clarifies something about the other that neither the reader nor the character who is being talked about knows: Ursula II's clairvoyance and telepathetic vision tells us of Birkin's Messianic impulses many chapters before the letter read aloud by Halliday reveals to the reader the extent of Birkin's tendency to preach; it is she who protests that Gerald has not killed his brother by accident and points to the existence of a hidden motive for the action; it is likewise she who interprets Loerke's description of his statue as the expression into art of Loerke's brutality. Gudrun, who is blind to the origin of her own problem, is able to divine Gerald's problem before he does. Her "Mene! Mene!" attests to her clairvoyance: even Gerald, "so unconscious,"[8] is equipped "with an insight that amounted to clairvoyance" when he looks at Gudrun and sees her as "a dangerous, hostile spirit."[9] Hermione, the stereotype of the phallic woman, is at times given the role of a reliable narrator, as for instance when she denounces Birkin's perversity in his attraction to and desire for foulness.

At first reading we take these divinations as the intruding voice of the chief narrator, the omniscient narrator of the novels of the Nineteenth Century, a narrator who is everywhere and knows about everything. Later we learn to distinguish each of these voices. Then, we understand that in Women in Love Lawrence has practiced multiplication of narrative voices. The chief narrator operates more as refractory force and as the controller of distance, allowing each character to speak for himself. Each character will thus pass from the position of centre of consciousness and judgment to the

position of the one who is seen and judged. Even Birkin, who more frequently is assigned the function of centre of vision and on whose side the narrator ends up by tipping the balance, changes from one position to the other frequently, especially in his arguments with Ursula II.

These multipersonal centers of consciousness and the consequent movement of perspectives demand more from the reader than the uniform response which the complete identification with Ursula I evoked in The Rainbow. There, understanding and sympathy sufficed. In Women in Love the constant variation of the degree of distance makes the reader turn from a sympathetic to an unsympathetic response towards the same character. As Booth puts it, our sympathy is aroused when the character is granted "the right to reflect his own story"[10]; when this right is withheld from him and given to another character, our sympathy decreases. So we feel sorry for Gudrun when, "tormented with violent wakefulness," she reflects on "her childhood, her girlhood ... everybody" ... "she drew and drew and drew (the rope of knowledge) out of the fathomless depths of the past, and still it did not come to an end ..."[11]; we feel sorry for her helplessness in her failure both to uncover the cause of her suffering and to escape from her present state of torment. Yet our sympathy vanishes when Gerald sees, "with subtle recognition, her sullen passion of cruelty."[12] Also, there are so many inside views and so many judgments to be put together, compared, and weighed, that it calls for "a real effort, a real psychological adjustment on our part."[13] This effort becomes even greater because every character is, to some extent, ambivalent toward every other,

an ambivalence that the narrator, for the most part, respects and communicates to the reader, thus increasing the complexity of each character and the difficulties of judgment for the reader. Birkin loves Ursula and hates her as well: seen through Birkin's eyes she will be given both as a woman capable of a "dangerous thoroughness of destructivity," a woman "full of dangerous power," "the awful, arrogant queen of life"[14] and elsewhere as "sensitive and delicate," "new," "helpless."[15] The narrator, sharing this character's ambivalence toward her, gives her as a "demoniacal soul" who has the "diabolical knowledge of the horror of persistence"[16] and whose eyes, if "tender," show a "curious devilish look lurking underneath." Yet the tender, soft, "beautiful light of her nature"[17] more often than not carries the tale as, for instance, when she sits down and cries after her interview with Birkin in "Class-Room"; or at Breadalby where the narrator describes the talk between Birkin and the others in terms of black magic, giving Ursula II the perspective which allows her to see the talkers as "witches, helping the pot to bubble."[18] Her repulsion from their talk (a canal, rather than a stream) and her isolation tell of her beautiful nature.

At first, the reader is torn between sympathy with and antipathy toward the characters, confused by the fragmentation of the narrative voice, disturbed by the narrator's ambivalence. We want to label him incoherent since what he says one time does not coincide with what he says another. Yet after our psychological adjustment we end up by understanding that the use of these devices has brought about the fragmentation of reality in order to make it correspond to the

modern, relativistic view of the universe. It has also intensified the character's density, making of him a sum of opposites which, no matter how irreconcilable they may at first appear, carry with them their own laws. The reader is left with the task of joining all the fractions, of resolving the several perspectives into his final, unipersonal vision, a vision that will certainly keep the rich, complex and ambivalent dimension projected by the author.

But if Lawrence's change of attitude toward the woman has caused a positive result in greater complexity and modernity for the novel as a whole, it has also motivated him to tamper with certain of his characters with very negative results to his art. The character tampered with is the woman, specifically the phallic woman, whose presence at times brings out his fears and hatred to such an extent that he, the artist, finds it impossible to keep distance, to let the character speak for herself through the narrative voice, but intrudes first into her thoughts and later into her actions, himself warning the reader about her. This shocks the reader, who, till now secure in the artist's detachment, has accepted the same character as having completely different attributes.

In Women in Love it is Ursula II who is tampered with in this way. At the beginning of the chapter "Moony", the narrative voice has taken pains to describe Ursula II's complexity and self-mistrust: she shrinks from the moon, for she fears its power to make her sadistic, and "she wished for something else, ... not this moon-brilliant hardness."[19] With the distance needed to show her ambivalence, the artist

has shown that Ursula II is not simply a phallic woman ready to use her powers against the male: artistically in accordance with her mode of being, she is shown, some pages later, as wavering between the attraction to Gudrun and to Birkin. Then, unexpectedly, at the end of the same chapter, the author's misogeny takes over the narrative voice, and the reader is presented with a hateful Ursula II whose wish is "To drink (Birkin) down, like a life-draught." That this is the author's fear and not Ursula II's own wish can be seen in the following violation of her thought, "He must be quaffed to the dregs by her,"[26] in which the passive voice, as well as the choice of words used, betray the author's presence.

This false note has already been given in the chapter "Sunday Evening": the first part of this chapter is totally controlled by the artist's intruding voice, which, prevailing over the fair ambivalence given till now by the narrative voice, insists on siding with the male in his claim that the woman is dangerous and must be made subservient. This intruding voice makes Ursula II reflect on her past and concludes that there was nothing vital in it; she is then made to recite the male's message for the necessity of the woman to accept the kind of dissolution and surrender proposed by the male.

Since, however, in "Sunday Evening" the reader is plunged into what seems to be Ursula II's mind from the very first lines, it takes him longer to detect the falsity of the voice which speaks in this first part of the chapter. It is only in retrospect that the reader realizes that the conclusion Ursula II makes about her past is contrived, that the

situation she reflects on has nothing to do with what came before, and that this part of the chapter remains an artificial element intended to prepare the reader for the author's premeditated decision to make her submissive. Therefore the reader rescues Ursula II, saving her from the teller's intention. As we did in the end of "Moony," here, again, we penetrate beneath the apparently ordered surface of false artistry, identifying the trick and recognizing the true Ursula II when the impartial narrator is allowed to take back his role, which he does with a vengeance, allowing Ursula II to divine in Birkin "the enemy," one who "denied her altogether, revoked her whole world."[21]

Yet, as was shown in our discussion of Ursula II, the author ends up by assuring his right to keep his thumb in the balance, pressing it on the side of his misogeny and thus breaking Ursula II's integrity beyond repair. Her dual nature had been too well presented to be cancelled by the "predilection d'artiste."[22] When he violates her, the artist takes just the phallic (the "bad"), away, leaving her too good, insipid, really flat.

We have shown, in our analysis of The Rainbow and Women in Love, that Lawrence is a good portrayer when he grants his women the phallic powers that colour his vision of the woman. Then, whether he treats her subjectively or objectively - as a potentially dangerous, fascinating antagonist - he succeeds. He even succeeds when he gives her a prescriptive role, one meant to illustrate how destructive a woman can be. It is only when he submits to his inner wish to have a non-phallic woman obedient to him and when, in order to

achieve this end, he cuts the heroine's phallicism off, that he fails. The heroine then loses her artistic appeal.

Therefore it is not alone Lawrence's change of attitude toward woman that directly weakened his artistry, but his graping after a solution to mitigate his fear. Had Lawrence respected Ursula II's nature, the nature he had taken pains to build till "Excurse," she would have been as good a portrait as those of Ursula I and Gudrun. Proof of this can be found if we compare the two sisters at the beginning of Women in Love, where both are shown as part of the same vision, a vision of the phallic woman, descendant of Artemis. The first chapters show an intricate image in which the sisters, two sensitive beings who shrink from the corrupt and ugly social context, form a unit, one eye against the world. United in a unipersonal fear of the future, fear of marriage, fear of the crowd, hostility to the father, picknicking together, exchanging confidences, refusing to swim in reaction to the unnaturalness of Hermione's bullying and the deadness of the people gathered in Breadalby, the two sisters share so many qualities in common as to become, at times, truly one: one "pair of scissors," one "intelligence,"[23] one invulnerable body of "knowledge," united in a bond of intimacy and understanding.

Up to the point that their similarities are maintained, both are alive and equal as artistic creations. Then as the divergence between them widens - Gudrun seeking dissolution and Ursula veering toward creative union - it is Gudrun, the symbol of what should not be, the negative, who gains artistic ascendancy over Ursula II. Coincidentally Ursula II's artistic presentation fails when she is forced to put

her phallic nature in abeyance. It is as if Ursula II's phallicism and artistic power had been transfered to Gudrun whose phallicism becomes stronger and whose portrayal becomes more vivid, more artistic. Significantly it is Gudrun who keeps some coloured stockings for herself, especially giving her grey ones to Ursula II who places them under the pillow as if to say that though they are at hand they have become useless to her. The moment she does this she is definitely out of character.

FOOTNOTES

NOTES: CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

1. The von Richthofen Sisters, p. 134.
2. See Murry's essay "A Review of Women in Love", D.H. Lawrence: The Rainbow and Women in Love, p. 75.
3. Phoenix, p. 530.
4. D.H.Lawrence/Novelist, pp. 57-58.
5. This quote, from Lady Chatterley's Lover, chapt. IX, sums up Lawrence's belief in the regenerative power of the novel. For this reason we have chosen it in place of the one quoted by Leavis in his D.H.Lawrence/Novelist, p. 30: "you can see, plainly, when the man goes dead, the woman goes inert. You can develop an instinct for life, if you will, instead of a theory of right and wrong, good and bad."
6. D.H. Lawrence/Novelist, p. 55.
7. Ibid., p. 233
8. Quoted by Leavis, D.H.Lawrence/Novelist, p. 57.
9. D.H. Lawrence/Novelist, p. 128.
10. Ibid., p. 232.
11. The Love Ethic of D.H.Lawrence, p. 3.
12. D.H. Lawrence: Portrait of a Genius But ... , p. 54.
13. The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence, p. 62.
14. Ibid., p. 160.
15. Ibid., p. 127.
16. D.H. Lawrence: A Basic Study of his Ideas, p. 19.
17. Ibid., p. 60.
18. Ibid., p. 73.
19. Ibid., p. 62.
20. The Dark Sun., p. 77.
21. Ibid., p. 70.
22. Ibid., p. 66.
23. Ibid., p. 180.
24. The Second Sex, p. 206.
25. Sexual Politics, p. 268.
26. Ibid., p. 246.
27. Ibid., p. 243.
28. Ibid.,pp. 258 - 259 Kate Millett sees Lydia and Anna as representatives of a generation of "towering matriarchs."
29. Though both feminists quarrel with Lawrence on almost the

same terms - Lawrence's ethic of male supremacy, his advocating a double standard which only favours the male, his claim for Feminine Devotion - they diverge insofar as Lawrence's vision of the woman is concerned. Simone de Beauvoir holds that the woman in his works "sum(s) up the feminine sex in general" and that this criterion of excellence is necessary to make the hero feel triumphant when the woman is made submissive to him; also her richness, her queenliness reassure him when she exalts his male virility. In contrast, Millet holds that Lawrence creates mainly witches out of his vision of the modern woman as a "terrible thing."

30. The Second Sex, p. 209.
31. The Prisoner of Sex, p. 100
32. Ibid., p. 98.
33. Ibid., p. 102.
34. See Spilka's "Introduction" to D.H.Lawrence: A Collection of Critical Essays, p. 9.
35. Freud: The Mind of the Moralist, p. 134.
36. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 171
37. Ibid., p. 234.
38. D.H. Lawrence and the New World, p. 30.
39. Phoenix, p. 818.
40. D.H. Lawrence: A Personal Record, p. 138.
41. Phoenix, p. 632.
42. Sadism and Masochism, p. 46, Volume 2.
43. D.H. Lawrence: Sex For The Anti-Puritanical Puritan, p.4.*
44. Phoenix, p. 818.
45. Quoted by Daniel A. Weiss, Oedipus in Nottingham: D.H. Lawrence, p. 97.
46. The term "phallic woman" derives from the term "phallic mother" which is used to designate the mental woman drawn from the child's fantasy of "the all-powerful mother, the mother who is capable of everything and who possesses every valuable attribute," as Ruth Mack Brunswick explains. The difference between the two terms lies, according to her, in this: whereas the phallic woman exists in reality - she is active, assertive, verbal, punitive - "the phallic mother is

---

* unpublished

pure fantasy," a fantasy which has its origins in the child's discovery of his mother's castration. Lawrence's reprojection of the phallic woman in his works certainly derives from his introjection of the phallic mother. Since however, she herself was a phallic woman, "a dominant woman who herself identified with her father" (Widdershins: Reversed Parental Identification and Narrative point of View in the Work of D.H. Lawrence, p.27), it can be said that the Laurentian phallic woman is both a product of his fantasy and an example of what Lawrence undoubtedly thought of as a new type of individualistic woman - an objective phenomenon of the time. See p.13 above. Quotes by Ruth Mack Brunswick are from Female Sexuality, p. 26.

47. The "Two in One Period" is the title which Daleski gives to the period of Lawrence's career - from about 1913 to 1916 - in which both The Rainbow and Women in Love, his two masterpieces, were written. Daleski gives the period this name in order to emphasize the theory behind Lawrence's works of this period: that each individual is a mixture of male and female elements, therefore incomplete. To find completion he will have "to join himself as complement" with the other sex: "He must know that he is half, and the woman is the other half: that they are two, but that they are two - in - one" (Phoenix, p. 515). As a consequence of this theory, his art of this period will show a profound concern with the establishment of a successful relation between the man and the woman, a relation based on equality and togetherness. Daleski contrasts this period with that in which Lawrence posits a male ethic, which Daleski has named "One Up, One Down."

48. We have considered Lawrence's heroines abnormally bisexuals because, unlike the mature woman described by psychology, they exhibit, using Marie Bonaparte's terminology, an "excessive bisexuality." Therefore they live out the contradictions which a masculine, "clitoroidal" woman does. As Maria Bonaparte says.

> "When a woman protests so energetically against her masochism, her passivity, and her feminity, it is because the makeup against which she protests is already over-determined, owing to constitutionally preponderent bisexuality. But for

> that, she would perfectly and without any great conflict have accepted the feminine masochism essential to her sex."
>
> Quoted by Kate Millett in Sexual Politics, p.205

49. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 282.
50. Oedipus in Nottingham: D.H. Lawrence, p. 17.
51. Ibid., p. 28.
52. Quoted by Daniel A. Weiss, Oedipus in Nottingham: D.H. Lawrence, pp. 57-60.
53. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 565.
54. Oedipus in Nottingham: D.H.Lawrence, p. 101.
55. Quoted by Weiss, Oedipus in Nottingham: D.H. Lawrence,p.53.
56. D.H. Lawrence: Body of Darkness, p. 24.
57. "Autism in Ritual: An Aspect of D.H.Lawrence's Later Style," p. 2.
58. Widdershins: Reversed Parental Identification and Narrative Point of View in the Work of D.H. Lawrence, p. 80. For Derrick, the woman in Lawrence is the ego consciousness; and the male is the object, the "other." Derrick postulates that, throughout his art, Lawrence "instinctively sees object and subject as different in gender." Widdershins, p. 27.
59. "Autism in Ritual: As Aspect of D.H. Lawrence's Later Style," p.2.
60. Widdershins: Reversed Parental Identification and Narrative Point of View in the work of D.H. Lawrence, p.9.
61. Ibid., p. 242.
62. See p. 43 below for the definition of round character, the character who, according to Forster, has "the incalculability of life about it" (Aspects of The Novel, p.78) and whose coherence will be judged by the use of "psychological data" (Oedipus in Nottingham: D.H.Lawrence, p.6.)
63. Phoenix, p. 497.

NOTES: CHAPTER II - LAWRENCE'S MODE OF CHARACTERIZATION

1. Por um Novo Romance, p. 22.
2. The Situation of the Novel, p. 61. The supremacy of character in the novel is defended not only by Bernard Bergonzy, the writer of the book mentioned above, but also by Murdock, Harvey and Sholes.
3. Leon Edel, Shiv K. Kumar and Robert Humphrey.
4. The Situation of the Novel, p. 16.
5. The Rise of the Novel, pp. 336-337.
6. An essay from The Common Reader, First Series, appraised by Martin Steinmann Jr., in From Jane Austen to Joseph Conrad, p. 290.
7. Modern British Fiction: Essays in Criticism, p. vii.
8. Phoenix, p. 418.
9. Freudianism and the Literary Mind, p. 298.
10. Hamlet e o Complexo de Édipo, p. 53.
11. What I Believe, p. 6.
12. The Rhetoric of Fiction, p. 51.
13. Ibid., p. 293.
14. D.H. Lawrence: Portrait of a Genius But ... , p. 144.
15. The Collected Letters of D.H.Lawrence, p. 281.
16. D.H.Lawrence: The Rainbow and Women in Love, p. 70.
17. Phoenix, p. 801.
18. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 273.
19. Ibid., pp. 281-282.
20. D.H. Lawrence: The World of the Major Novels, p. 101. To us the difference lies mainly in that revelation, to the Laurentian character, comes when the character is passing through a turmoil of transformation in which he experiences several states of being and which leaves him and the reader - and sometimes even other participants in the novel - mesmerized by the whole process and its consequences. In contrast, revelation to Virginia Woolf's characters seems to take place quietly. Clarissa, for instance, in Mrs. Dalloway, after having heard the news about Septimus' death, changes her mode of being as absolutely as Gudrun after having heard the letter read alout by Halliday in the Cafe Pompadour. Yet while Claris-

sa changes for the better without showing either outward sign or inward conflict, Gudrun's change is violently lived by Gudrun herself and witnessed by the Halliday crowd. The experience is communicated to the reader with the same intensity, for he sees her confronting powerful inhuman forces, much stronger than her capacity for reasoning, forces beyond her control to which she succumbs. She is so shocked into awareness that she accepts that self-destruction is the only possibility left to her.

21. The Nature of Narrative, p. 200.
22. Sexual Politics, p. 257.
23. See "The Originality of The Rainbow" by Marvin Mudrick and "Women in Love and Death" by Mark Shorer, both published in D.H.Lawrence: A Collection of Critical Essays, pp. 29-71.
24. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, pp. 281-282.
25. Ibid., p. 298.
26. Phoenix, pp.418-420
27. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 291.
28. Phoenix II, p. 276.
29. The Forked Flame, p. 14.
30. Phoenix, p. 460.
31. Women in Love, p. 208.
32. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p.281.
33. The Nature of Narrative, p. 205.
34. The Rainbow, p. 322.
35. Women in Love, p. 135.
36. Ibid., pp. 221-222.
37. Ibid., p. 295.
38. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 157.
39. Character and the Novel, p. 129.
40. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, pp. 281-282.
41. Character and the Novel, p. 129.
42. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 282.
43. The Nature of Narrative, p. 205.
44. Sea and Sardinia, p. 211.
45. Phoenix, pp.482-483.
46. Ibid., p. 540.
47. Ibid., p. 763.
48. Ibid., p. 540.
49. In Lawrence's conception and realization of identity as

flux lies another proof of his modernity.

50. Phoenix, p. 525.
51. Ibid., p.537.
52. Ibid., p. 541.
53. Phoenix II, p. 456.
54. Ibid., p. 373.
55. Phoenix, p. 762.
56. Ibid., p. 481.
57. Ibid., p. 475.
58. Ibid., pp. 527-528.
59. See Langbaum's article "Lords of Life, Kings in Exile: Identity and Sexuality in D.H. Lawrence," The American Scholar, p. 813, Volume 45.
60. Ibid., p. 807.
61. Character and the Novel, p. 129.
62. Phoenix, p. 708.
63. Aspects of the Novel, pp. 67-69
64. Ibid., p. 78.
65. Oedipus in Nottingham, p. 6.
66. Phoenix, p. 525-528.
67. Oedipus in Nottingham, p. 6.
68. Phoenix, p. 528.
69. Ibid., p. 528. Lawrence, in his "Study of Thomas Hardy", detects a discrepancy between Hardy's judgment of his characters and his unconscious feelings for them: Lawrence uncovers Hardy's "predilection d'artiste for the aristocrat" and a "private symphathy" for the rebellious characters. Holding that this kind of conflict might be present in any work of art, since the author is a liar, Lawrence assigns the reader the task of rescuing the tale - which is given unconsciously by the artist - from the author's hands.

In answer to his claim that the reader should trust the tale, not the teller, we will analyse the Ursula II brought out by the tale, probably against the writer's intention. See chapter IV below, pp. 134-167.

NOTES: CHAPTER III - LOVE TRIUMPHANT

1. The Rainbow, p. 8.
2. Ibid., p. 8.
3. Ibid., p. 13.
4. Ibid., pp. 7-8.
5. Ibid., p. 13
6. Phoenix, p. 514.
7. The Rainbow, p. 9
8. Ibid., pp. 9-10
9. Ibid., pp. 10-11
10. Ibid., p. 97.
11. Ibid., p. 138.
12. Ibid., p. 91.
13. See Goldberg's article "The Rainbow: Fiddle-Bow and Sand," published in D.H. Lawrence: The Rainbow and Women in Love, a selection of critical essays edited by Colin Clarke, p. 119.
14. The Forked Flame, p. 81.
15. The Rainbow, p. 129.
16. Ibid., p. 210.
17. Ibid., p. 195.
18. Ibid., p. 238.
19. Ibid., p. 260.
20. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 273.
21. D.H. Lawrence: The World of the Major Novels, p. 80.
22. Phoenix, p. 443.
23. Ibid., p. 492.
24. Ibid., p. 459.
25. Ibid., p. 515
26. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 280.
27. Phoenix, p. 468.
28. Ibid., p. 154.
29. Ibid., p. 460.
30. The Rainbow, p. 171.
31. Ibid., p. 173.
32. Ibid., p. 237.
33. Cf. table organized by Daleski. See his The Forked Flame pp. 20-31.
34. Phoenix, p. 514.
35. Ibid., pp. 818-819.

36. The Rainbow, p. 9. For Lawrence, the woman is the carrier of civilization, the source of culture. Therefore, no matter how misogynous he can be said to be, his misogyny will never be equivalent to that of Freud who conceives women as "ethically and intellectually limited by their complex libidinal development", as Phillip Rieff has observed in his Freud: The Mind of the Moralist, p. 55.
37. D.H. Lawrence and Edward Carpenter: A Study in Edwardian Transition, p. 99.
38. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 130.
39. Ibid., p. 171.
40. Ibid., p. 280.
41. The Complete Poems of D.H. Lawrence. From the poem "Death is Not Evil, Evil is Mechanical." p.714.
42. Phoenix, p. 418.
43. The Rainbow, p. 283.
44. Ibid., p. 417.
45. Ibid., p. 406.
46. Ibid., p. 268.
47. Ibid., p. 283.
48. Ibid., p. 358.
49. Ibid., p. 191.
50. Ibid., p. 220.
51. Ibid., pp. 219-220
52. Ibid., p. 215.
53. Ibid., p. 219.
54. Ibid., p. 224.
55. Ibid., p. 218.
56. Ibid., p. 225.
57. Ibid., pp. 225-226
58. Ibid., p. 267.
59. Ibid., p. 275.
60. Ibid., p. 221.
61. Fantasia of the Unconscious and Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious, p. 121. It may seem paradoxical that Lawrence, unlike Freud, denied the existence of infantile sexuality, since the scenes in which Ursula I takes part in games with the father are heavily loaded with sexual connotations. Yet, for Lawrence, it is the existence of an incestuous bond between parent and child that awakens the child's sexuality.

These scenes are therefore the artistic realization of his belief in the pernicious influence of parental love and the enactment of the narrator's claim that (Ursula)"was awakened too soon."

62. The Rainbow, p. 269.
63. Ibid., p. 287.
64. Ibid., p. 268.
65. Ibid., p. 283.
66. Ibid., p. 283.
67. Ibid., pp. 281-282.
68. Ibid., pp. 292-293.
69. Ibid., p. 291.
70. Ibid., p. 294.
71. Ibid., p. 293.
72. Ibid., p. 288.
73. Ibid., p. 314.
74. Ibid., p. 316.
75. Ibid., p. 303.
76. Ibid., p. 299.
77. Ibid., pp. 304-305.
78. Ibid., p. 300.
79. Ibid., p. 306.
80. Ibid., pp. 320-321.
81. Ibid., p. 322.
82. Ibid., p. 326.
83. Ibid., p. 333.
84. Ibid., p. 338.
85. Ibid., p. 333.
86. Ibid., p. 316.
87. Ibid., p. 321.
88. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 282.
89. The Rainbow, p. 205.
90. Ibid., p. 258.
91. Ibid., p. 357.
92. Ibid., p. 361.
93. Ibid., p. 367.
94. Ibid., p. 398.
95. Ibid., p. 405.
96. Ibid., p. 485.

97. Ibid., p. 406.
98. Ibid., p. 360.
99. Ibid., p. 400.
100. Ibid., p. 411.
101. Ibid., p. 343. The same idea appears on pages 405-407 where the narrator says that though she has "to brutalize herself"... "her soul was left to rest, it had the time of torpor in which to gather itself together in strength again."
102. Ibid., p. 349.
103. Ibid., p. 406.
104. Ibid., p. 401.
105. Phoenix II, p. 374.
106. The Rainbow, p. 436.
107. Ibid., p. 435.
108. Ibid., p. 437.
109. The Rainbow, p. 435
110. Ibid., pp. 440-441.
111. Ibid., p. 442.
112. Ibid., p. 411.
113. Ibid., p. 263.
114. Ibid., p. 443.
115. Ibid., pp.473-474.
116. Ibid., p. 460.
117. Ibid., p. 463.
118. Ibid., p. 481.
119. Ibid., p. 492.
120. Ibid., p. 485.
121. Ibid., p. 488.
122. Ibid., p. 490.
123. Ibid., pp.493-494.
124. Phoenix, p. 191.
125. The Rainbow, pp. 495-496.
126. Phoenix, p. 528. For further commentaries on the aptness of the rainbow image to express Ursula I's transcendence see Engelberg's article "Escape from the Circles of Experience: D.H. Lawrence's The Rainbow as a Modern Bildungsroman," Critics on D.H. Lawrence, edited by W.T. Andrews, 66-80.
127. The Rainbow, p. 493.

NOTES: CHAPTER IV - TURNING POINT

1. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p.519
2. Women in Love, p.45
3. Ibid., p. 407.
4. Ibid., p. 260.
5. The Forked Flame, p. 128.
6. Phoenix II, p. 275.
7. Women in Love, p. 434.
8. Ibid., p. 45.
9. Ibid., p. 334.
10. Ibid., p. 287.
11. Phoenix II, p. 276.
12. Women in Love, p. 482.
13. Phoenix II, p. 275. See also his letter of July 1917 where he tells Waldo Frank: "There is another novel, sequel to The Rainbow, called Women in Love."
14. Women in Love, p. 286.
15. Ibid., p. 230.
16. Ibid., p. 520.
17. Ibid., p. 433.
18. Ibid., p. 322.
19. Ibid., p. 115.
20. Ibid., p. 480.
21. Ibid., p. 225.
22. Ibid., p. 223.
23. Ibid., p. 210. See also The Rainbow, p. 480.
24. Ibid., p. 281.
25. Ibid., p. 398. As Birkin says: "... a permanent relation between man and woman isn't the last word - it certainly isn't ... I believe in the additional perfect relationship between man and man additional to marriage." 397-398.
26. D.H. Lawrence: The World of the Major Novels, p. 95.
27. D.H. Lawrence and Edward Carpenter: A Study in Edwardian Transition, p. 233.
28. D.H. Lawrence: The World of the Major Novels, pp.133-134.
29. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 383.
30. This is the title which Moore gives to his book on Lawrence's life in homage to the man who had claimed that "I

shall always be a priest of love ... I'll do my life work, sticking up for the love between mand and woman." The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, pp. 172-173.

31. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 422.
32. Women in Love, p. 541.
33. Ibid., p. 432
34. Ibid., p. 286
35. Phoenix II, pp. 275-276.
36. Double Measure, p. 177.
37. Phoenix II, p.276.
38. Character in English Literature, p.192.
39. Women in Love, p. 433. See also p. 90 above.
40. Since we have chosen to study Gudrun's story as a psychic drama we will base our analysis on Bleger's theory of symbiosis. This theory is grounded on the belief that a person who forms a symbiotic bond has a psychic split-there are two sides to his personality - the neurotic which encases the more integrated side of the personality, and the psychotic which "is psychotic, fundamentally, because it cannot discriminate between interior reality and the external world" ... Symbiosis y Ambiguidad, p. 90.
41. Simbiosis y Ambiguidad, p. 152.
42. Women in Love, p. 10
43. The Rainbow, p. 261.
44. Women in Love, p.11.
45. Ibid., p. 105.
46. Ibid., p. 426.
47. Ibid., p. 42.
48. Ibid., p. 15.
49. Ibid., p. 97.
50. Ibid., p. 508
51. Ibid., p. 10.
52. Ibid., p. 297.
53. Ibid., p. 11.
54. Ibid., p. 28.
55. Ibid., p. 105.
56. Ibid., p. 185.
57. Ibid., p. 13.
58. See footnotes 40-41 of this chapter, and p. 100 above;see also page 132 below for the ultimate reason for her return

home.

59. We have applied Cavitch's theory which holds that Gudrun is a "man as woman". See Cavitch's D.H. Lawrence and the New World, pp. 67-76. See also p. 129 below for further explanation.

60. Women in Love, p. 102.

61. Ibid., p. 196.

62. Ibid., p. 105.

63. Ibid., p. 8.

64. Ibid., p. 273.

65. Ibid., p. 198.

66. Ibid., p. 135.

67. Ibid., p. 199.

68. Ibid., pp. 268-270.

69. Ibid., p. 425

70. Ibid., p. 451.

71. Ibid., p. 16.

72. Ibid., p. 124.

73. Ibid., p. 199.

74. Ibid., pp.203-206

75. Ibid., pp.450-451

76. Ibid., p. 503

77. Ibid., p. 374.

78. Ibid., p. 507.

79. Ibid., p. 471.

80. Ibid., p. 393.

81. Ibid., p. 500.

82. Ibid., pp. 466-467.

83. Phoenix, p. 179.

84. The Love Ethic of D.H.Lawrence, p. 135.

85. D.H. Lawrence: The Failure and the Triumph of Art, p. 245.

86. Women in Love, p. 92.

87. Ibid., p. 127.

88. Ibid., p. 467. Note the similarity between these two images: the clock (described on p. 107 above) and the box, both feminine symbols, contain strong phallic images - the hands of the clock and the snake-like bird.

89. Simbiosis y Ambiguedad, p. 26 - Bleger explains that in every symbiotic relation each participant unconsciously accepts the role of depository: this means he accepts his role

as recipient of the psychotic part of the personality of his partner in the symbiotic bond. At the same time, since the symbiotic relation is mutual depositing and not merely projecting in one direction only, the "depositario" will place his regressive personality in his partner.

90. Women in Love, p. 15.

91. Sadism and Masochism, V.2, p. 61.

92. See p. 113 below where Freud posits the copresence of opposing impulses inside any emotion.

93. "Debido a la existencia y mantenimiento de esta disociacion o divisiõn de la personalidad, el yo mãs maduro puede - paradõjicamente - integrarse mejor." Simbiosis y Ambigüedad, p. 103.

94. Simbiosis y Ambiguedad, p. 56.

95. Women in Love, p. 203.

96. Ibid., p. 237.

97. Ibid., p. 263.

98. Ibid., p. 16.

99. D.H. Lawrence: The Failure and the Triumph of Art, p. 245.

100. The Forked Flame, p. 156.

101. Três Ensaios sobre a Teoria da Sexualidade, p. 60. Since every active perversion is accompanied by its passive equivalent. the sadistic side of her nature which she places on Gerald will return to her if the symbiotic chain is ruptured. We see Gudrun's sadism in full play just before their bond is established and we will see it again when the relation is broken. In the meantime she will experience it through Gerald.

102. Women in Love, p. 191.

103. Ibid., p. 434.

104. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 282.

105. Women in Love, p. 271.

106. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 282.

107. This may be the reason why Gerald, in spite of seeing marriage with Gudrun as "A doom," preferred to commit himself with her rather than to accept Birkin's offer: "the bond of pure trust and love with the other man, and then subsequently with the woman," Women in Love, p. 398.

108. Women in Love, 266 and 273.

109. Ibid., pp. 285 and 287.

110. Ibid., p. 16.

111. Ibid., p. 274.
112. Ibid., p. 324.
113. This rotation or alternation of roles within the fixity of the symbiotic bond is certainly meant to satisfy the opposing impulses inherent in the nature of any emotion. Provided that the control of the distance between both partners is maintained, that is, that each partner is true to the pact, they can exchange roles. It is only when the control is lost that the exchange of roles is no longer possible. A sudden breakup of the relation would necessarily force each partner to reintroject the side of his personality which he fears and which he has placed into the other person. This would lead to a dissolution, a breakdown into psychosis. See Simbiosis y Ambiguedad, p. 43.
114. Women in Love, pp. 372 and 374. Although Lawrence's words remind us of what to Birkin meant an ideal mode of sexuality, the knowledge Gudrun takes from Gerald has very negative connotations. Gudrun sees in Gerald a mysterious power which she wants to capture through knowledge and then use towards her own self-destruction. For Lawrence, this desire to know can only be destructive. In contrast, Birkin wants Ursula to "mindlessly connect with him" in a "knowledge which is death of knowledge," connoting both reciprocal fulfillment and respect for the inviolated self of the other, for in their sensual contact both are said to have discovered a "sensual reality" of "real otherness." These quotes are from p. 359 and 361, Women in Love.
115. Ibid., pp. 388 and 393.
116. Ibid., p. 374.
117. Ibid., p. 392.
118. Pritchard calls Gudrun the "belle dame sans merci" out of his feeling that Gudrun's perversion is "equivalent to an unacceptable one in Lawrence." He sees only the destructive side of Gudrun, only the Gudrun who laughs "a silvery little mockery," her voice "crooning and witch-like." Her suffering escapes him. See his D.H. Lawrence: Body of Darkness, pp.88-94. Refer to p. 130 below for further explanation about the genesis of Gudrun's psychosexual distortion.
119. Women in Love, p. 370. Gudrun's emphatic insistence that

Gerald respect some limit in their relationship reminds us of the necessity for a rigid control of the symbiotic bond postulated by Bleger; this control can only be maintained if each partner does not penetrate into the kind of world that this new bond has made possible for them both. We will see that as long as Gerald heeds Gudrun's order to keep distance in their relation - respect the pact - Gudrun will not want to break the bond, and will not use her repressed sadism against him.

120. Women in Love, p. 391.
121. Ibid., p. 424.
122. Ibid., p. 392.
123. Ibid., p. 511.
124. Simbiosis y Ambigüedad, pp. 52-53.
125. Women in Love, p. 480.
126. Ibid., p. 442.
127. Ibid., p. 509.
128. Ibid., p. 494.
129. Ibid., p. 501.
130. Ibid., pp. 424 and 425.
131. Ibid., p. 297.
132. Ibid., p. 286.
133. Ibid., p. 440.
134. Ibid., pp. 523-524.
135. Ibid., p. 445.
136. Ibid.,pp. 441 and 444.
137. Ibid., p. 272.
138. Ibid., p. 285.
139. Ibid., p. 445.
140. Ibid., p. 286.
141. The Symbolic Meaning, p. 37.
142. Women in Love, p. 448.
143. Ibid., p. 501.
144. Ibid., p. 498.
145. Ibid., p. 452.
146. Ibid., p. 473.
147. Ibid., pp.503 and 507.
148. Ibid., p. 500.
149. Ibid., p. 464.
150. D.H. Lawrence: The Failure and the Triumph of Art,p.252.

151. Women in Love, p. 508.
152. Ibid., p. 285.
153. Ibid., p. 508.
154. Ibid., p. 497.
155. Ibid., p. 506.
156. Ibid., p. 530.
157. Ibid., p. 36.
158. Ibid., p. 532.
159. Another name for the moon goddess.
160. Women in Love, p. 298.
161. Ibid., p. 196.
162. Ibid., pp. 535 and 540.
163. The Symbolic Meaning, p. 117.
164. Women in Love, p. 286.
165. Quoted by Bleger, Simbiosis Y Ambigüedad, p. 302. We know that Gudrun has regressed because at the end of the book she has become totally detached from the external world: she seeks refuge with Loerke in "the suggestion of primitive art" - "Art and Life were to them the Reality and the Unreality" - and in "the obscene religious mystery of ultimate reduction ... of diabolic reducing down ... " "The world was finished now, for her." The quotes given in this footnote are from pages 504 and 508, Women in Love.
166. Women in Love, p. 504.
167. Ibid., 432.
168. D.H. Lawrence and the New World, p. 76. Though Cavitch does not illustrate his hypothesis, the unpublished Prologue to Women in Love supports him strongly. As Sanders has shown in his analysis of Women in Love, both Gudrun and Birkin of the Prologue are attracted to Gerald's "clear northern flesh" and to the "maleness" which the men "in the street" display; both are artists compelled to sample the Bohemian life; both are restless and misanthropic; both have homoerotic tendencies; both love Ursula. Also the Foreword to Women in Love supports Cavitch: "This novel pretends only to be a record of the writer's own desires, aspirations, struggles; in a word, a record of the profoundest experience in the self." As a matter of fact Gudrun's story mirrors that of Lawrence's. Yet since we believe that Lawrence has managed to give his book a

separate life of its own, we have chosen not to see Lawrence's art as disease. We will call on Lawrence's problems only to explain an artistic flaw. See page 22 above.

169. Women in Love, p. 391.
170. The Rainbow, pp. 220 and 213.
171. Freudianism and the Literary Mind, p. 9.
172. The Rainbow, pp. 220 and 261.
173. Ibid., pp. 261 and 270.
174. Ibid., p. 220.
175. Ibid., pp. 261 and 270.
176. Women in Love, p. 237.
177. Ibid., p. 92.
178. Ibid., p. 135.
179. The Rainbow, 220.
180. Ibid., p. 261.
181. Ibid., p. 220.
182. Ibid., p. 335.
183. Women in Love, p. 13.
184. Ibid., pp. 8 - 10
185. Phoenix II, p. 275.
186. The Rainbow, p. 354.
187. Women in Love, p. 39.
188. Ibid., p. 139.
189. Ibid., p. 193.
190. Ibid., p. 11.
191. Ibid., p. 137.
192. Ibid., pp. 170 and 460.
193. These adjectives are frequently used by Lawrence in his description of Ursula II: "Ursula ... was never very sure of anything. Things she knew perfectly well, at one moment, seemed to become doubtful the next"; "She was usually nervous and uncertain"; "anxious and puzzled": "troubled and bewildered"; "frightened of argument"; "Ursula's dangerous helplessness... " Women in Love, pp. 177, 354, 140, 140, 492, and 102, respectively.
194. Women in Love, pp. 192-193.
195. Ibid., p.45.
196. Ibid., p. 275.
197. Quoted from Tony Slade's D.H. Lawrence, p.71.
198. See Friedman's article "Forms of the Plot," published in

The Theory of the Novel, edited by Philip Stevick, pp. 145-166.

199. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 273.

200. River of Dissolution, pp. 76 and 135.

201. Quoted by Colin Clarke, River of Dissolution, p. 101. Clarke's position in untenable because Ursula II is not to be seen as inexperiencend. She is often described as a person who is "struggling with her own self-deception," (see Women in Love, p. 139) and a person who is capable of self-deception has the capacity to understand himself and the world. Yet Clarke's testimony holds good to demonstrate that Ursula II plays the role of the one who is being taught.

202. The von Richthofen Sisters, p. 342.

203. The Art of D.H. Lawrence, pp. 83-91.

204. This is the first time we call on Lawrence's problems to explain his art. We feel entitled to do this because Lawrence, in his characterization of Ursula II, puts his thumb in the balance to express his own "predilection." See page 22 above. See also Beal's D.H. Lawrence, pp. 47-49.

205. See footnote 193 of this chapter.

206. Women in Love, pp. 193 and 180.

207. Ibid., pp. 283 and 278.

208. Ibid., pp. 167 and 171.

209. Ibid., p. 145.

210. Ibid., pp. 281 and 296.

211. Ibid., p. 138.

212. Ibid., pp. 333 and 417.

213. Ibid., p. 144.

214. Ibid., p. 417.

215. Ibid., p. 493.

216. Ibid., pp. 162 and 165.

217. The Deed of Life, p. 75. For proof of "Ursula's retaliatory challenge" see Leavis D.H.Lawrence/Novelist, p. 186-187. See also Frank Kermode's D.H. Lawrence, p. 69. Kermode considers Ursula "Birkin's critic." Tony Slade, who noticed "the shift of emphasis from Ursula (to Birkin)" seeing it as "a radical change from the plan suggested in The Rainbow," also believes that Ursula "has most commonsense about the ideas discussed" (in Women in Love). See his D.H.Lawrence, p. 71. See also Beal's

D.H. Lawrence, pp. 47-49.
218. Women in Love, p. 222.
219. See footnote 213 of this chapter.
220. Women in Love, p. 339.
221. Ibid., p. 540.
222. Ibid., p. 284.
223. Ibid., p. 485.
224. Ibid., p. 53.
225. Ibid., p. 124.
226. Ibid., p. 181.
227. Ibid., p. 485.
228. Ibid., p. 330.
229. Ibid., pp. 285 and 283.
230. Ibid., p. 210.
231. Ibid., p. 92.
232. Ibid., p. 52.
233. Ibid., p. 299.
234. Ibid., p. 224.
235. Ibid., p. 210.
236. In the "Water-Party" scene Ursula II holds back from Birkin's "soft, gentle kisses," covering his gentleness with "hard, fierce kisses of passion." Her passion here is said to be really destructive. It shatters Birkin's "other self," the self that, as implied by the tale, fears woman. A little earlier in the scene, Ursula II had exchanged one of the lanterns she had received - that which had the flight of storks and underwater sea life - for Gudrun's beautiful but frightening underwater cuttelefish, symbolic of destructive female power. Even if resentful at having to accept the cuttle-fish, Ursula II keeps it fearlessly and uses its power against Birkin who pathetically asks another kind of passion, "not this, not this." See Women in Love, pp.195-196, 209-210.
237. Ibid., p. 14.
238. Ibid., p. 150.
239. Ibid., p. 335.
240. Ibid., p. 208.
241. Ibid., p. 210.
242. Ibid., p. 224.
243. Ibid., p. 284.
244. Women in Love, p. 360. See Wilson Knight's article

"Through ... Degradation to a New Health - A Comment on Women in Love" in which he analyses the mode of sexuality Birkin professes and adopts in his relation with Ursula. His article appears in D.H. Lawrence: The Rainbow and Women in Love, edited by Colin Clarke, pp. 135-141.

245. Women in Love, p. 287.

246. Birkin calls it "the remaining way", Women in Love,p.287.

247. Women in Love, p. 346. She might have allowed him "to take the knowledge" of her in their encounter described at the end of the "Mino" scene. Here she says "yes" to him, "nestling very sweet and close to him." In retrospect we understand why she had not let Birkin be "the accusative" in her denial of the redemptive aspect of dissolution. She herself is the refuser. See Women in Love, pp. 172 and 218, respectively.

248. See footnote 200 above in this chapter.

249. Women in Love, p. 215.

250. The Theory of the Novel, p. 99.

251. Women in Love, p. 285.

252. The Forked Flame

253. Women in Love, p. 204.

254. See Draper's D.H. Lawrence, p. 19.

255. See the questioning that characterizes Ursula II's mode of thought in "Excurse," where Ursula asks Birkin several times the same question: "Why did you buy (the rings)?" In "An Island" she presses him with her questioning: "Why do you hate man?" In "Moony" she asks him why he hates the moon. In "Exeunt" she becomes so insistent that Birkin "(does) not trouble to answer." Kate Millett sees Ursula II's "docile questions" as the leading form for the development of Birkin's opinions and ideas (See her book Sexual Politics, p. 264). Yet Ursula II is not a mere foil: her questionings always show her clairvoyance, her critical nature, har detection of some hidden meaning in the attitudes or words of her interlocutor. She insistently asks Birkin to explain to her why he bought the rings because she immediately understands the motive behind Birkin's attitude. She wants him to acknowledge it.

256. Women in Love, pp. 484, 181, and 485, respectively.

257. Ibid., p. 159.

258. Ibid., p. 167.

259. See chapter V, p. 179 below, for further explanation.

260. Ibid., p. 299.
261. Ibid., p. 159.
262. Ibid., p. 331.
263. Ibid., p. 346.
264. Ibid., p. 295.
265. Ibid., p. 330.
266. Ibid., p. 346-347.
267. They find fault with the hotel scene and the drive parts. See Daleski's The Forked Flame, pp. 174-180. See also Leavis' D.H.Lawrence/Novelist, pp. 154-155.
268. The Forked Flame, p. 174.
269. Women in Love, p. 345.
270. Ibid., pp. 39-40
271. Ibid., pp. 349-350.
272. Curiously, the branched stem of the flower which Ursula II offers Birkin reminds us of the "polymorphous perverse" phase in the development of man's personality, the phase which encompasses the pre-Oedipal sexuality. In contrast, the flower which Ursula II smashes - its stem develops only one flower - reminds us of a more mature sexuality. Coherently, the description of their sexual encounter at the Inn not only tells the reader of the presence of anal, but also oral components in their sexuality: "They laughed and went to the meal provided. There was a venison pasty, of all things." Women in Love, p.354.
273. Women in Love, chapter 23: "Excurse" pp. 353-354, 360, 343, and 350, respectively.
274. Character and the Novel, p. 64.
275. Women in Love, p. 282.
276. The Forked Flame, pp. 174-176.
277. Women in Love, p. 157.
278. Ibid., p. 166.
279. Ibid., p. 402.
280. See Women in Love, pages 402, 407, 447 and 458.
281. Women in Love, p. 416.
282. Ibid., p. 493.
283. See chapter I, pp. 15 and 22 above. See also Chapter V, p. 175 below.
284. Women in Love, p. 414.
285. Phoenix, p. 528.
286. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, p. 565.
287. Women in Love, p. 402.

288. The Von Richthofen Sisters, p. 133.
289. Phoenix II, p. 381.
290. The essentially autobiographical character of Lawrence's writings gives us ground to believe that the reason for the change of attitude toward the woman, as revealed by the comparison of The Rainbow and Woman in Love, is to be looked for in his life.

The Lawrence who wrote The Rainbow, as the biographers testify, was a well balanced man, a man who was content to exist in spite of his problems. He had escaped from death, had found liberation from the haunting image of his dead mother, had imposed himself as writer, and above all, had got Frieda. The Rainbow in its positive view of the woman can be seen as a product of the happiest period of his sex life with Frieda. Somehow, feeling secure in his love with her, more balanced and strongest in his own nature, Lawrence, paradoxically, feels freer to manifest his identification with the modern phallic woman, openly and without resentment.

Women in Love is a testimony of Lawrence's inner misery: "Lawrence's increasing bitterness against the war and the war-intoxicated authorities who suppressed The Rainbow"; his troubles concerning his reversed Oedipal situation; Murry's rejection of his offer of Blutbrüderschaft; the breaking of his relation with the Cornish William Henry Hocking, which Frieda reports as sexual; his leaving Cornwall under the accusation of spying, all build the tone of despair which underlies Woman in Love. In this troubled spirit he throws part of the blame for his despair on the woman he writes about, denying his identification with her and placing himself on the side of the male.

NOTES: CHAPTER V. CONCLUSION

1. The Rainbow, p. 270.
2. Women in Love, pp. 48 and 287.
3. Phoenix, p. 479.
4. Quoted by Moore, The Priest of Love, p. 73.
5. The Rhetoric of Fiction, p. 249.
6. The Rainbow, p. 270.
7. Women in Love, p. 8.
8. Ibid., pp. 464 and 469.
9. Ibid., p. 135.
10. The Rhetoric of Fiction, p. 282.
11. Women in Love, p. 391.
12. Ibid., p. 270.
13. Character and the Novel, p. 54.
14. Women in Love, pp. 171, 102, and 224, respectively.
15. Ibid.,pp.287, 416, and 102, respectively.
16. Ibid., pp. 142 - 143.
17. Ibid., p. 171.
18. Ibid., p. 101.
19. Ibid., p. 277.
20. Ibid., p. 299.
21. Ibid., p. 222.
22. Phoenix, p. 432.
23. Women in Love, pp. 56 and 296.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

A. Works by D.H. Lawrence

The novels and short stories cited and used in this work are Penguin Books, published by Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth. The Rainbow and Women in Love are the 1971 and 1972 editions, respectively.

The prose work appears in Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers (1936) of D.H.Lawrence, edited by Edward MacDonald. New York: The Viking Press, 1972; Phoenix II: Uncollected, Unpublished and Other Prose Works by D.H.Lawrence (1968), edited by Warren Roberts and Harry T. Moore. London: Heinemann, 1968. It also appears in Fantasia of the Unconscious and Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious (1923). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1975.

The Letters are contained in The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, edited by Harry T. Moore (1962). London: Heinemann, 1970. Two Volumes.

The poems appear in The Complete Poems of D.H. Lawrence (1964), edited by Vivian de Sola Pinto and Warren Roberts. London: Heinemann, 1972. Two Volumes.

B. Biography and criticism

Aldington, Richard. D.H.Lawrence: Portrait of a Genius But ... New York: Collier Books, 1961.

Arnold, Armin. ed. The Symbolic Meaning: The Uncollected versions of "Studies in Classic American Literature". London: Centaur Press, 1962.

Andrews, W.T.. ed. Critics on D.H. Lawrence. George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London: 1971.

Beal, Anthony. D.H. Lawrence. New York: Capricorn Books, 1972.

Beauvoir, Simone de. The Second Sex. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1961.

Bleger, José. Simbiosis Y Ambigüedad. Buenos Aires: Editorial

Paidōs, 1975.

Bergonzi, Bernard. The Situation of the Novel. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1972.

Bertocci, Angelo P. "Symbolism in Women in Love", Schorer, Mark, ed. Modern British Fiction: Essays in Criticism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961, 267-284.

Booth, Wayne C. The Rhetoric of Fiction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Cavitch, David. D.H.Lawrence and the New World. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Chambers, Jessie. (E.T.) D.H. Lawrence: A Personal Record.London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd., 1965.

Chassequet-Smirgel, Janine. ed. Female Sexuality: New Psychoanalytic views. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1970.

Clarke, Colin. River of Dissolution. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

_____. ed. D.H. Lawrence: The Rainbow and Women in Love: A Selection of Critical Essays. London: The Macmillan Press, 1973.

Daiches, David. The Novel and the Modern World. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Daleski, H.M. The Forked Flame. A Study of D.H. Lawrence. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1965.

Delavenay, Emile. D.H. Lawrence and Edward Carpenter: A Study in Edwardian Transition. New York: Taplinger, 1971.

*Derrick, John B. Widdershins: Reversed Parental Identification and Narrative Point of View in the Work of D.H. Lawrence. Berkley: University of California.

*_____. "Autism in Ritual: An Aspect of D.H. Lawrence's Later Style."

Draper, R.P. D.H.Lawrence. New York: Humanities Press, 1969.

---

* unpublished

Edel, Leon. The Modern Psychological Novel. Gloucester, Mass. Peter Smith, 1972.

Engelberg, Edward. "Escape From the Circles of Experience: D.H.L.'s The Rainbow as a Modern Bildungsroman." Andrews, W.T. ed. Critics on D.H.Lawrence. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1971, 67-80.

Ford, George H. Double Measure: A Study of the Novels and Stories of D.H. Lawrence. New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 1969.

_____. "An Introductory Note to D.H.L.'s Women in Love", D.H.Lawrence. The Rainbow and Women in Love: a Selection of Critical Essays. London: Macmilan,1973.

Forster, E.M. Aspects of the Novel. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1955.

Freeman, Mary, D.H.Lawrence: A Basic Study of His Ideas. New York: The Universal Library Grosset & Dunlap, 1955.

Freud, Sigmund. New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. Inc., 1965.

_____. Civilization and its Discontents. New York: W.W.Norton & Company Inc., 1962.

_____. "Sexualidade Feminina".

_____. "Tres Ensaios Sobre a Teoria da Sexualidade" Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Psicológicas de Sigmund Freud, 1974. Respectivamente, Livro 9, 77-97 e Livro 2.

Friedman, Norman. "Point of View in Fiction: The Development of a Critical Concept," Stevick Phillip. ed. The Theory of the Novel. New York: The Free Press, 1967, 108-137.

_____. "Forms of the Plot." idem. ibidem. 145. 166.

Gillie, Christopher. Character in English Literature. London: Chatto & Windus, 1970.

Goldberg, S.L. "The Rainbow: Fiddle-Bow and Sand." Clarke, Colin, ed. The Rainbow and Women in Love: A Selection

of Critical Essays. London: Macmilan, 1973, 117-134.

Green, Martin. The Von Richthofen Sisters. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1974.

Gregory, Horace. D.H.Lawrence: Pilgrim of the Apocalypse. New York: Grove Press, 1957.

Grillet, Alain Robbe. Por um Novo Romance. São Paulo: Editora Documentos S.A., 1969.

Hamalian, Leo. ed. D.H.Lawrence: A Collection of Criticism. New York: Mcgraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Harvey, W.J. Character and the Novel. New York: Cornell University Press, 1968.

Hoffman, Frederick J. Freudianism and the Literary Mind. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1967, 151-176.

Hough, Graham. The Dark Sun: A Study of D.H.Lawrence. London: Duckworth, 1975.

Humphrey, Robert. Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel. California: University of California Press, 1972.

Huxley, Aldous. Introduction. Aldington, Richard. Selected Letters of D.H.Lawrence. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books in Association with William Heinemann Ltd., 1971, 5-31.

Jarrett-Kerr, Martin. D.H.Lawrence and Human Existence. New York: Chip's Bookshop Booksellers & Publishers, 1971.

Jones, Ernest. Hamlet e o Complexo de Edipo. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores, 1970.

_____. Papers on Psychoanalysis. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.

Kazin, Alfred. "Sons, Lovers and Mothers," Hamalian, Leo. ed. D.H.Lawrence: a collection of Criticism. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Kermode, Frank. D.H.Lawrence. New York: The Viking Press,1973.

Knight, G. Wilson. "Through ... Degradation To a New Health" A comment on Women in Love. Clarke, Colin. ed. D.H. Lawrence: The Rainbow and Women in Love: A Selection of Critical Essays. Macmilan, 1973, 135-141.

Kumar, Shiv K. Bergson and the Stream of Consciousness Novel. New York: New York University Press, 1970.

Langbaum, Robert. "Lords of Life, King in Exile: Identity and Sexuality in D.H.Lawrence." The American Scholar. United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa. Washington: Winter 1975/76, Volume 45 Number 1, 807-815.

Lawrence, Frieda. The Memoirs and Correspondence. ed. Tedlock, E.W., Jr. New York: Knopf, 1964.

_____. Not I But the Wind. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1974.

Leavis, F.R. D.H.Lawrence, Novelist. Harmondsworth: England, 1970.

Mailer, Norman. The Prisoner of Sex. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971.

Millett, Kate. Sexual Politics. New York: Equinox Books, 1971. 237-293.

Moore, Harry T. The Priest of Love. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1974.

_____. The Life and Works of D.H.Lawrence. London: Unwin Books, 1963.

Moynahan, Julian. The Deed of Life. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.

Mudrick, Marvin. "The Originality of the Rainbow". Spilka, Mark. D.H. Lawrence: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963, 29-49.

Murry, John Middleton. "A Review of Women in Love" and "The Rainbow". Clarke, Colin. ed. D.H. Lawrence: The Rainbow and Women in Love. Macmilan, 1973, 67-77.

Nahal, Chaman. D.H.Lawrence: An Eastern View. New York: A.S. Barnes and Company, 1970.

*Pinto, Bonifácio Moreira. D.H.Lawrence: Sex for the Anti-Puritanical Puritan. Florianõpolis: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, 1975, MS.

*unpublished

Pritchard, R.E. D.H.Lawrence: Body of Darkness. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1971.

Rieff, Philip. Freud: The Mind of the Moralist. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc. 1961.

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

Sanders, Scott. D.H. Lawrence: The World of the Major Novels. London: Vision Press, 1973.

Scholes, Robert and Kellogg, Robert. The Nature of Narrative. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Schorer, Mark. ed. Modern British Fiction: Essays in Criticism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.

_____. D.H.Lawrence. New York: Dell Publishing Co. Inc., 1970.

_____. "Women in Love and Death." Spilka, Mark. ed. D.H.Lawrence: a Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963, 50-60.

_____. "Techinique as Discovery," The Theory of the Novel. New York: 1967, 65-84.

Slade, Tony. D.H.Lawrence. London: Evan Brothers Limited, 1973.

Spilka, Mark. ed. D.H.Lawrence: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1963.

_____. The Love Ethic of D.H.Lawrence. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971.

Steinmann, Martin Jr. "The Old Novel and the New," ed. Rathburn, Robert C. and Steinmann, Martin Jr. From Jane Austen to Joseph Conrad. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1967, 286-306.

Stekel, Wilhelm. Sadism and Masochism, New York: Washington Square Press, 1968.

Stevick, Philip. The Theory of the Novel. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Tedlock, E.W.Jr. D.H.Lawrence: Artist and Rebel. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1965.

Vivas, Eliseo. D.H.Lawrence: The Failure and the Triumph of Art. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

Watt, Ian. The Rise of the Novel. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books in association with Chatto & Windus, 1974.

Weiss, Daniel. Oedipus in Nottingham: D.H.Lawrence. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1962.

West, Anthony. D.H.Lawrence. Denver: Alan Swallow, 1950.