-44916

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE | THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/NOM DE L'AUTEUR Gregory Owen Jones

TITLE OF THESIS/TITRE DE LA THÈSE From Christian Concerns to Sexuality in Action: A Study of D. H. Lawrence's Thought from a Metaphysic to a Philosophy for the Novel.

UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITÉ Simon Fraser University

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE Master of Arts

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE 1980

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE Dr. Jerald Zaslove

DATED/DATÉ April 9/1980 SIGNED/SIGNÉ

PERMANENT ADDRESS/RÉSIDENCE FIXÉ [redacted]

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

FROM CHRISTIAN CONCERNS TO SEXUALITY IN ACTION: A STUDY OF D. H. LAWRENCE'S THOUGHT FROM A METAPHYSIC TO A PHILOSOPHY FOR THE NOVEL

by

Gregory Owen Jones
B.A.(Hons.), Simon Fraser University, 1973

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
in the Department
of
English

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

From Christian Concerns to Sexuality in Action: A Study of D. H. Lawrence's Thought from a Metaphysic to a Philosophy for the Novel

Author:

(signature)

Gregory Owen Jones

(name)

April 9, 1980

(date)

APPROVAL

Name: Gregory Owen Jones

Degree: Master of Arts

Title of Thesis: From Christian Concerns to Sexuality in Action: A Study of D. H. Lawrence's Thought from a Metaphysic to a Philosophy for the Novel.

Examining Committee:

Chairperson: Dr. Paul Delany

Dr. Jerald Zaslove,
Senior Supervisor

Dr. Stephen Black,
Professor of English

Dr. Dan Callahan,
Assistant Professor of English

Dr. John Doheny,
External Examiner
Assistant Professor
Department of English
University of B.C.

Date Approved: April 8, 1980

A B S T R A C T

It is my thesis that contrary to accepted critical opinion D.H. Lawrence's aesthetic intent and didactic purpose exist harmoniously in his last novels. From the time when Lawrence writes "Study of Thomas Hardy," he attempts to unite aesthetic intent and didactic purpose but he is immersed in Christian language or metaphysics which hinder his progress. He insists on and expresses dichotomies which he considered central to life. I study the relationship between doctrine and narrative in these essays to show how he is searching for an idiom which will unite the two. I demonstrate that critics and readers (like F.R. Leavis) who reject the sexual and the use of colloquial language, also reject Lawrence's intent that his novels be read at the emotional level. The thesis shows that the sexual philosophy and aesthetic intent merge his last works.

In chapter one, I examine Lawrence's essays as vehicles for synthesizing his values and aesthetics, because in them he develops his "polemical" ideology and subsequently his idiom for his last novels. The early essays are treated primarily as statemnts of metaphysic while subsequent essays indicate a movement away from metaphysical concerns toward a philosophy for Lady Chatterley's Lover and The Escaped Cock. In chapter two, I show "Sun" as a story that reveals Lawrence's progression beyond the Christian idiom toward a more liberal use of sexuality. In chapters three and four, I illustrate the type of emotional reading which I believe Lawrence's last two novels, Lady Chatterley's Lover and The Escaped Cock require.

I have concluded among other important issues discussed, that it is almost impossible to read such potentially objectionable language as Mellor's boyish statement to Connie - "Here tha shits an' here tha pisses; an' I like thee for it." - without any emotion, and if the novel is read correctly, then the reader's emotional response must be positive, as Lawrence intended it to be. This thesis ultimately shows that if the characters in Lady Chatterley's Lover and The Escaped Cock are responded to emotionally in the way Lawrence intended then this would lead to a critical re-appraisal of Lawrence's development as a thinker and writer, and would clarify the relationship between his thought and his late fiction.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Dr. Jerald Zaslove for his patience and guidance in the writing of this thesis and to my wife, Irene, for her dedicated support.

Gregory Owen Jones

Nanaimo, B.C.

March 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In his extensive biography of David Herbert Lawrence, Emile Delavenay writes that between 1914 and 1917, Lawrence begins "for the first time to include what he called 'philosophy' in : "Study of Thomas Hardy", "The Crown", "Reality of Peace" . . . . Taken together, the novels, such short stories as were actually finished during the period, and the 'philosophy' show us a man searching for an ethical and aesthetic synthesis, endeavoring to form a comprehensive view of character and human destiny."[1] What Lawrence begins to include in his essays is a loosely assembled metaphysic, which is synthesized throughout his essays and other art, into a philosophy for his last novels, Lady Chatterley's Lover[2] and The Escaped Cock.[3] I shall examine the "polemical" ideology in Lawrence's essays to show that the early "metaphysic" develops into a philosophy expressed in a very personal, Lawrencian idiom. Only by studying the "polemical," ideological Lawrence is it possible to understand the artist Lawrence and to appreciate the artistic intent and didactic purpose of the last two novels.

It is my thesis that Lawrence's artistic intent and didactic purpose exist harmoniously in his last novels if they are read as Lawrence explicitly intended, as in "A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover." However, critics often attempt to separate the two, expounding one and apologising for the other. Philip Rieff, in his introduction to Psychoanalysis and the Unconcious and Fantasia of the Unconcious writes:

> [in both books] To the evident pleasure of his meaner critics, Lawrence the artist had strayed too far from his art and thus exposed the incompetence of the prophet who urged the artist on. Those few critical friends Lawrence had at the time kindly ignored both books, preferring to avoid the embarrassment of defending the artist against his urges toward prophecy. The embarrassment lingers; friendly readers generally assume still that the artist in Lawrence can be distinguished from the prophet, that his fiction can be properly enjoyed without the pathos of learning from it those lessons that Lawrence considered uniquely true to life.[4]

I believe that Lady Chatterley's Lover and The Escaped Cock cannot be enjoyed properly, that is enjoyed both intellectually and even physically, without experiencing the "pathos" and it is only with an emotional reading of these novels that we can accept the artistic intent and didactic purpose of them. To understand how this is possible, it is necessary to examine some of Lawrence's major essays.

I choose to examine Lawrence's essays as vehicles for the synthesizing of his values and aesthetics rather than his early novels, because it is in his essays that Lawrence "works out" his ideology and subsequently his idiom for his later novels. The essays are the laboratories of his art because in them he analyses the many permutations of his ideology before and after writing his novels and stories. So too, Lawrence's essays are part of his art and should not be seen as end product or regarded as mere criticism although they possess much critical value. They are a process in the development of a philosophy for the novel and offer much insight, although often polemical, into the generally accepted forms of his art.

Lawrence wrote at least a dozen essays which deal directly with the novel and the novelist. In these, he sets forth the relationship between the tale and the teller and he emphasizes that the novel is the genre with a future. In "Why the Novel Matter," he writes:

> The novel is the one bright book of life. Books are not life. But the novel as a tremulation can make the whole man alive tremble. Which is more than poetry, philosophy, science, or any other book - tremulation can do.[5]

Lawrence maintains that the novel has been slowly dying as a result of exploring old "emotions" rather than revealing new "feelings." To reveal these new "feelings" will be dangerous for the novelist as Lawrence explains in "Surgery for the Novel - Or a Bomb":

> The novel has a future. It's got to have the courage to tackle new propositions without using abstractions; it's got to present us with new, really new feeling, a whole line of new emotion, which will get us out of the emotional rut . . . . And the public will scream and say it is sacrilege . . . .[6]

But Lawrence is willing to listen to the screams and is not willing to sacrifice his passional inspiration to his philosophy. If the novel is to succeed, then both must be balanced. In "The Novel" he writes:

> In a novel, everything is relative to everything else, if that novel is art at all. There may be didactic bits, but they aren't the novel. And the author may have a didactic "purpose" up his sleeve. Indeed most great novelists have . . . . But even a didactic purpose so wicked as Tolstoi's or Flaubert's cannot put to death the novel.
>
> You can tell me, Flaubert has a "philosophy", not "purpose". But what is a novelist's philosophy

> but a purpose on a rather higher level? And since every novelist who amounts to anything has a philosophy - even Balzac - any novel of importance has a purpose. If only the "purpose" be large enough, and not at odds with passional inspiration.
>
> It is such a bore that nearly all great novelists have a didactic purpose, otherwise a philosophy, directly opposite to their passional inspiration. In their passional inspiration, they are all phallic worshippers.[8]

Lady Chatterley's Lover and The Escaped Cock both evoked screams of sacrilege from his contemporaries as neither novel subordinated passional inspiration to didactic purpose. Lawrence created a polemical fiction which critics are still trying to interpret correctly.

In a critical exchange among George Ford, Colin Clarke and Frank Kermode, Kermode writes:

> Each of Lawrence's most important novels is the product of a fight between narrative choices partly set up by and in their turn partly creating "metaphysical" positions. It was his method to rewrite a great deal, and what that amounts to is a progressive clarification of the third force that issues from a conflict or tension between the narrative possibilities offered by relatively unstructured experience and the demands of the metaphysic. It's a complicated situation, because the metaphysic itself changes, but anybody who has looked at the relations between "Hardy" and The Rainbow and "The Crown" and Women in Love will have a certain grasp of it.[9]
>
> . . . the most important consequence of all is that the presence of the metaphysic in the narrative gets increasingly blurred. Lawrence's whole view of the novel, and the relations between artist and tale, ensure that one effect of rewriting will be to increase the complexity of the relation between narrative and doctrine, to reduce the doctrinal pressures by "hedging bets" or "having it both ways."[10]

As the "presence of the metaphysic in the narrative gets increasingly blurred," the philosophy which evolved for the novel becomes more evident. The rewriting of Lady Chatterley's Lover complicated the relation between narrative and doctrine but it is not only the rewriting which complicated the relationship. The "metaphysic" itself changed. Kermode continues:

> . . . In Lady Chatterley there may be another element - the conviction that a woman serves a man more completely by allowing buggery, because she is no longer using her sex as an instrument to gain control over him - but primarily the issue is the same -- climactic (*pace* Spilka) and apocalyptic because of the new turn taken in the intervening years by the "metaphysic".[11]

The "metaphysic" or system of ideals develops into a philosophy for the novel and what emerges in Lady Chatterley's Lover is not a "metaphysic" but a philosophy tempered by the artistic intent and didactic purpose.

Wayne Burns in "Lady Chatterley's Lover: A Pilgrim's Progress for Our Time," writes:

> To suggest that D. H. Lawrence was a philosopher (as well as a novelist) may scandalize those who would reserve the name philosopher for such thinkers as Santayana and Bertrand Russell. But Lawrence never wanted to be a philosopher, as he made unmistakably clear in his own letters to Bertrand Russell 12

> But in his earlier novels he subordinated the positive basis of his message, his philosophy, to the dramatic portrayal of the difficulties that inevitably stand in the way of its fulfillment. It was not until Lady Chatterley's Lover . . . that he gave full and direct fictional expression to his concept of the good life.[13]

The relationship between doctrine and narrative is complex but the philosophy is evident in Lady Chatterley's Lover because, as Burns writes, Lawrence at last gave his philosophy "direct fictional expression."

It is evident to anyone who has read Lawrence that in Lady Chatterley's Lover and to a lesser extent in The Escaped Cock, Lawrence gives "direct fictional expression" to his beliefs about relationships between adults. The expression is "direct" in the sense that not only are the sexual encounters blatantly described but also in the sense that the social factors which tend to impinge upon the sexual conduct are realistically portrayed. Many of his essays hint at sexual conduct and some, such as "A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover," deal with sex directly. One major reason, I believe, that it is not until Lady Chatterley's Lover that Lawrence gives"direct fictional expression" to his philosophy of sexual conduct which, as revealed fictionally in Lady Chatterley's Lover, clearly differs from the Christian sexual code, is because he had not emotionally isolated himself sufficiently from the Judaeo-Christian metaphysic. The following chapters will attempt to show the progression of Lawrence's efforts to first isolate himself, his philosophy and his art from what he believed to be a Christian stigma, and later how he develops a personal idiom which he eventually generalizes in the novel.

Lawrence's efforts to emotionally isolate himself are reflected in his struggle to escape the Judaeo-Christian idiom and symbolism with which he had grown up. Although he never completely isolates himself from these, he revises and consolidates many of his earlier beliefs with a philosophy for the novel. He is able to integrate philosophy and fiction because of his

ability to go beyond generally accepted artistic ideals and social values. Anais Nin writes:

> His philosophy was not a coolly constructed formula, an assemblage of theories fitting reasonably together: it was a *transcending of ordinary values*, which were to be verified and fecundated by instincts and intuitions. To such intuitional reasoning he submitted himself and all his characters.
>
> Thus to begin to realize Lawrence is to begin immediately to realize philosophy not merely as an intellectual edifice but as a passionate blood-experience.[14]

Because Lawrence's philosophy cannot be "formulated," it is often expressed in polemics and thus has been subjected to various interpretations. Treating his philosophy as a coherent system negates the opportunity to perceive Lawrence's philosophy as a "passionate blood experience" or, as Burns writes:". . . his attempt to bring us back to the body, the guts."[15] Nin goes on to say:

> Lawrence has no system, unless his constant shifting of values can be called a system: a *system of mobility*.[16]

Attempts to systemize or "pigeonhole" Lawrence's philosophy deny Lawrence's artistic vision. F. R. Leavis, in D. H. Lawrence: Novelist writes:

> Lady Chatterley's Lover is a courageous, profoundly sincere and very deliberate piece of work; if it errs, it is not through lack of calculation. The trouble rather lies in its being in certain ways too deliberate - too deliberate, at any rate, to be a wholly satisfying work of art, appealing to imaginatively sensitized feeling. What may be called the hygenic undertaking to which it is devoted commands one's sympathy - the undertaking to cleanse the obscene words and to redeem from

> the smirch of obscenity the corresponding physical facts. But the willed insistence on the words and the facts must, it seems to me, whatever the intention, have something unacceptable, something offensive about it; it offends, surely, against Lawrence's own canons - against the spirit of his creativity and against the moral and emotional ethic that he in essence stands for.[17]

Leavis acknowledges that Lady Chatterley's Lover "commands one's sympathy" (must be read emotionally), yet he also writes it "offends . . . against the moral and emotional ethic that he in essence stands for." It seems that Leavis contradicts himself because the "moral and emotional ethic" of Lady Chatterley's Lover is the one which Lawrence "stands for," if he can "stand for" any ethic in his "system of mobility." There is no more effective way for the novelist "to bring us back to the body, the guts," than by writing for and about the body and the guts. This Lawrence does in Lady Chatterley's Lover and Leavis contradicts himself when he fails to realize (or does not express such a realization) that Lawrence operates within a "system of mobility," and that the novel is part of that system.

The mobility of Lawrence's philosophy can be more fully appreciated when it is realized that the fluid nature of his vocabulary represents the continual revision of dichotomies which fascinated him since his youth. Lawrence's metaphysic is based upon dichotomies. Although I shall not explore all dichotomies as has been done by others,[18] I shall consider, in particular, the man - woman and man - cosmos dichotomies. I shall look at the permutations of these dichotomies in the major essays and see how they are eventually manifested aesthetically in the novel and how the novel illustrates Lawrence's

sexual philosophy in an idiom that makes the novel's intent believable.

After studying the relationship in D. H. Lawrence's essays, between doctrine and narrative, this thesis attempts do demonstrate that critics and readers (like F. R. Leavis) who reject the sexual and the use of colloquial language also reject Lawrence's intent that his novels be read at the emotional level.[19]

I

THE ESSAYS

Lawrence's early essays reflect the idealism of his youth as it is tempered with the responsibility of adulthood. There arises in them a realization that Lawrence is indeed vulnerable to the harsh realities of a wartime England. His prewar friends include such notable philosophers and thinkers as Edward Garnett, Middleton Murry and Bertrand Russell, each of whom had considerable influence on Lawrence at various times. As Lawrence assembles the metaphysic of his youth and begins to include it in his essays, he strives to develop a personal idiom for his metaphysic which will somehow differ from the idioms of those whom he often admires and despises concurrently. Furthermore, Lawrence is attempting to depart intellectually from the Judaeo-Christian metaphysic of his youth.

A. The "Study of Thomas Hardy" not only exemplifies the religious dogma engrained in Lawrence since childhood but it also foreshadows the conflict between the Lawrence who, as an intellectual, seeks to develop a metaphysic and who, as an artist, realizes that the world of experience is not based upon metaphysics but upon relationships and interactions. It is part of Lawrence's attempt to find a language other than religious language to explain man's relationship with the cosmos. Lawrence begins to construct his complex principles of polar opposites, the dichotomous relationships which

were to be near the center of his writings for the next sixteen years.

The male-female or active-passive dichotomy is central to Lawrence's polemic:

> The conscious element [of early Judaism] was a resistence to the male or active principle. Being female, occupied in self-feeling, in realization of the age, in submission to sensation, which would deny the age and refuse sensation, seeking ever to make transformation, desiring to be an instrument of change, to register relationships . . . . In the whole of the Ten Commandments, it is the female who speaks.[1]

Lawrence writes "that the supreme God is forever He" but he perceives that the words of God, as transmitted by Moses, are female. The female is content to leave God as Monotheistic. She is "obsessed with the oneness of things" but the male demands a dual God: flesh and mind must be separate. Therefore Christ arose:

> Such is the cry of anguish of Christianity: that man is separate from his brother, separate, maybe, even in his measure, inimical to him. This the Jew had to learn. The old Jewish creed of identity, that Eve was identical with Adam, and all men children of one single parent, and therefore, in the absolute, identical, this must be destroyed.[2]

> With Christ ended the Monism of the Jew. God, the One God, became a Trinity, three-fold. He was the Father, the All-containing; He was the Son, the Word, the Changer, the Separator; and He was the Spirit, the Comforter, the Reconciliator between the Two.[3]

The Holy Ghost is created. The Trinity is Christian, not Jewish, and it is with Christianity that Lawrence struggles.

For Lawrence, Christianity, particularly in his own life and art, is like a shackle. Emile Delavenay writes:

> In the 'Hardy' he tries to fuse the Christianity of his childhood, from which he has broken away intellectually, but not emotionally, with his new religion of love. He sees it as his mission to contribute, by sexual education, to the increase and universal spreading of the joy of living and loving, and to attune men and women to the great natural rhythm of life.[4]

Lawrence "has broken away intellectually" from Christianity, yet he is not a self-proclaimed "missionary" of sex as Delavenay seems to imply. Rather Lawrence is an "explorer," communicating his discoveries to those willing to listen. He finds that the "great natural rhythm of life" cannot be satisfactorily expressed in Christian terminology. Even the Holy Ghost, Reconciler in the Trinity, cannot account for Oneness in real life, for the "blood-conscious" ebb and flow between male and female which Lawrence desires to express novelistically. He continues to use the Holy Ghost, however, for some time to come.

In "Study of Thomas Hardy" Lawrence writes that the Renaissance artists, particularly Botticelli and Corregio, partially achieved an unconscious mastery of the male-female flux. This perfect flux Lawrence calls Oneness:

> The goal of the male impulse is the announcement of motion, endless motion, endless diversity, endless change. The goal of the female impulse is the announcement of infinite oneness, of infinite stability. When the two are working in combination, as they must in life, there is, as it were, a dual motion, centrifugal for the male, fleeing abroad, away from the centre, outward to infinite vibration, and centripetal for the female, fleeing into the eternal centre of rest. A combination of the

> two movements produces a sum of motion and stability at once, satisfying. But in life there tends always to be more of one than the other.[5]

Here is Lawrence's ideal of Oneness presented pseudo scientifically. It is an awkward summation of his metaphysic of perfect love. He writes that man and woman "must work" in combination and that this dual cooperation does not always succeed in life. As if a scientific definition of male-female balance is not enough, Lawrence continues with a pseudo psychological explanation of a male-female balance within the individual.

The concept of the sexually balanced male is found throughout Lawrence's works, both consciously and unconsciously, from the effeminate Paul to the balanced Mellors. Lawrence seeks to create a character who will incorporate both the maleness which was denied him as a child by his mother and his health, and the female attribute of tenderness which his father, in rare moments, exhibited. Lawrence believes tenderness is a prerequisite to a true love relationship and it is a central concern in many of his works. Here he presents his metaphysic of sexual balance:

> The body it is which attaches us directly to the female. Sex, as we call it, is only the point where the dual stream begins to divide, where it is nearly together, almost one. An infant is of no very determinate sex: that is, it is of both. Only at adolescence is there a real differentiation, the one singled out to predominate. In what we call happy natures, in the lazy, contented people, there is a fairly equable balance of sex. There is sufficient of the female in the body of such a man as to leave him fairly free. He does not suffer the torture of desire of a more male being. It is obvious even from the physique of such a man, that in him there is a proper proportion between male and female, so that he can be easily balanced, and without excess.[6]

Lawrence is aware of his own weak physique, of his enjoyment of doing dishes and scrubbing floors, and of the joy he receives from other traditionally "feminine things," such as fashioning hats. So he attempts metaphysically to explain the lack of conventional "maleness" of some men. Paul, in Sons and Lovers,[7] experiences a similar struggle with "maleness" when he is pitted against Baxter Dawes, "a big, well-set man," for the love of Clara Dawes, Baxter's estranged wife. In the struggle, Dawes wins a physical battle with Paul, who is more accustomed to helping "his mother get tea ready" than fighting. Paul lacks the "maleness" necessary to defend against aggressors. This apparent weakness implicitly means his loss of Clara as Paul eventually returns to his mother. In Lady Chatterley's Lover and The Escaped Cock, Lawrence will call this apparent weakness, "tenderness." As his metaphysic is evolving into a philosophy for the novel, Lawrence is developing a "system" of symbols.

Lawrence has both a conscious and unconscious fascination with symbols which reflects his deep immersion in, and dissatisfaction with, Biblical symbolism. In a letter to Gordon Campbell in 1914, Lawrence writes:

> I think there is the dual way of looking at things: our way, which is to say 'I am all. All other things are but radiation out from me'. - The other way is to try to conceive the whole, to build up a whole by means of symbolism, because symbolism avoids the I and puts aside the egoist; and in the whole, to take our decent place. That was how man built the cathedrals. He didn't say 'out of my breast springs this cathedral!' But 'in this vast whole I am a small part, I move and live and have my being'.

> You should try to grasp, I think - don't be angry at my tone - the *complete tone* which the Celtic symbolism made in its great time . . . . We see only the *symbol* as a *subjective expression:* as an expression of ourselves . . . .
>
> The old symbols were each a word in a great attempt at formulating the whole history of the soul of Man. They are *unintelligible* except in their whole context . . . .[8]

In this same letter he says he and Frieda are immersed in Mrs. Jenner's book on Christian symbolism. Sometimes Lawrence is egocentric, "an expression of ourselves," and other times, particularly in later work, symbolism culminates in "the whole." Symbolism becomes more than mere symbol: it becomes the image of the thing. In "Hardy" though, Lawrence tacitly accepts and uses Judaeo-Christian symbolism, for example, when he attaches a special meaning to light:

> Since the Renaissance there has been the striving for the Light, and the escape from the Flesh, from the Body, the Object. And sometimes there has been the antagonism to the Father, sometimes reconciliation with Him. In painting, the Spirit, the Word, the Love, all that was represented by John, has appeared as light. Light is the constant symbol of Christ in the New Testament. It is light, actual sunlight or the luminous quality of day, which has infused more and more into the defined body, fusing away the outline, absolving the concrete reality, making a marriage, an embrace between two things, light and object.[9]

The sun becomes a central symbol in Lawrence's cosmos and as such, it is charged eventually with not only Christian but pre-Christian meaning. "The broadest and most authentic interpretation sees the sun as the cosmic *reductio* of the masculine force, and the Moon of the feminine. This implies that the active faculties (of reflection, good judgment or will power) are solar, while the passive qualities (imagination, sentiment

and perception) are feminine with intuition possibly androgynous."[10] Lawrence will go beyond even this universal definition of the sun symbol. The sun will become our image of the power of sexual reawakening.

The "Study of Thomas Hardy" is not only Lawrence's first important essay to set forth his metaphysic but also an opportunity to present his theory of the novel and novelist:

> It is the novelists and dramatists who have the hardest task reconciling their metaphysic, their theory of being and knowing, with their living sense of being. Because a novel is a microcosm, and because man in viewing the universe must view it in the light of a theory, therefore every novel must have the background or the structural skeleton of some theory of being, some metaphysic. But the metaphysic must always subserve the artistic purpose beyond the artist's conscious aim. Otherwise the novel becomes a treatise.[11]

The artist requires a theory of being which must "subserve artistic purpose." Theories developed by Lawrence's "peers" are not sufficient to survive the aesthetic and cultural demands of the novel, so Lawrence must himself formulate a philosophy which will withstand the pressures of that novel he will eventually call Lady Chatterley's Lover. However, in "Hardy," he is still entangled in Christian and pseudo scientific terminology as he confronts the love-law, male-female dichotomies; the ideal of Oneness; and Christian symbolism. The greatest task yet facing Lawrence is to reconcile his "metaphysic" with his "artistic purpose."

B. In 1915, Lawrence contributes "The Crown" to the magazine "The Signature," and although many Lawrencian issues are

treated, language and symbols change. "The Crown" is a mixture of an artist attempting to formulate a workable "metaphysic" and a man's discontent with the events of the Great War. In "The Crown," Lawrence begins his gradual break with Christian imagery: God is represented by the lion and Christ by the unicorn. Both are symbols manifesting Lawrence's effort to create a "system" of symbols partially divorced from the Biblical God and Jesus which, as symbols in themselves, represent conflicting aspects of ideal and experience. As Murry asserts, Lawrence is particularly uncomfortable with Jesus who presents for him the greatest difficulty in the Holy Trinity:

> The agonizing problem for Lawrence was the validity of Jesus as the incarnation of love. He could and did . . . admit it as giving the final perfection to the relations of individuals, and above all to the relation of man and woman. But as a social ideal it seemed impossible to him - or half of him. As he saw history it was men's specious obedience to obey Jesus's impossible command that they should love one another which had produced the society of democracy and industrialism that was hastening to its doom.[12]

The Biblical Jesus is a metaphysical problem because the type of love He represents cannot withstand the socially real pressures imposed on it by the type of novel Lawrence writes. This presents Lawrence with two problems - how to consolidate within the novel the love Jesus symbolizes with love which Lawrence experiences and how to consolidate Jesus, son of God, with Jesus the man. The agony continues for Lawrence until he recreates a Jesus, not a metaphysical Jesus, but a Jesus of his own experience in The Escaped Cock. Meanwhile Lawrence must agonize, even in the presence of the Great Reconciler, the Holy Ghost.

As in "Hardy," Lawrence establishes the great dichotomies of light and dark, man and woman, but the ebb and flow between male and female - the flux - is presented as two streams rather than as centrifugal motions:

> And there is no reconciliation [between light and dark - unicorn and lion] save in negation. From the present, the stream flows in opposite directions, back to the past, on to the future. There are two goals, at opposite ends of time. There is the vast original dark out of which Creation issued, there is the eternal light into which all mortality passes. And both are equally infinite, both are equally the goal, and both equally the beginning.[13]

The past is the dark confine of the womb where a man deposits his semen in the negative act of sex. Sex is a negation because it is a movement backward in time, from adulthood to childhood, as opposed to the positive forward motion of maturation represented by light. Lawrence is also concerned in 1915 with the apparant backward or negative movement society has taken in war:

> within the closed shell of the Christian conception, we lapse utterly back, through reduction, back to the Beginning. It is a triumph of death, of decomposition.[14]

His language is rich with negative images.

Language of genital immediacy intensifies, "womb" and "loins" occur, but so does the language of negation. In "Hardy," the language of dissolution and reduction is used to describe the relationship between Sue and Phillotson. Sue "felt all the time the ghastly sickness of dissolution upon her, she was a void unto herself,"[15] while of Phillotson Lawrence asks: "Why was Phillotson like a newt? What is it, in our life or in our feeling, to which the newt corresponds? Is it that life has the two sides, of growth and of decay,

symbolized most acutely in our bodies by the semen and the excreta?"[16]

In "The Crown," Lawrence writes of a "flux of corruption," social corruption, scientific corruption and sexual corruption:

> We are capable of nothing but reduction within the envelope. Our every activity is the activity of disintegration, of corruption, of dissolution, whether it be our scientific research, our social activity - (the social activity is largely concerned with reducing all the parts contained within the envelope to an equality, so that there shall be no unequal pressure, tending to rupture the envelope, which is divine) . . . .[17]

The proof of Lawrence's contentions in Lawrence's view, is the war which is of great concern to him. Of greater concern to him in "The Crown" is the dissolution in sex:

> Sensationalism progresses in the individual. This is the doom of it. This is the doom of egoistic sex. Egoistic sex-excitement means the reacting of the sexes against one another in a purely reducing activity. The reduction progresses . . . . It is the progressive activity of dissolution within the soul.[18]

Egoistic sex is a reductive process for Lawrence now and later. In "A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover," written in 1930, Lawrence states "the mentality of a boy of fourteen, who still has a little natural awe and proper fear in fact of sex, is more wholesome than the mentality of the young, cocktaily . . . whose mind has nothing to do but play with the toys of life, sex being one of the chief toys, and who loses his mind in the process."[19]

The ideal of Oneness created out of twoness is introduced in

"Hardy" with the Holy Ghost as the Great Reconciler between man and woman, light and dark. In "The Crown," Lawrence tells how the presence of the Holy Ghost is manifested in sex:

> [Time] passes away, but it is not in any sense lost. Our souls are established upon all the revelations, upon all the timeless achieved relationships, as the seed contains a convoluted memory of all the revelations in the plant it represents. The flower is the burning of God in the bush: the flame of the *Holy Ghost*: the actual Presence of accomplished oneness, accomplished out of twoness. The true God is *created* every time a pure relationship, or a consummation of twoness into oneness takes place . . . . And a man, if he win to a sheer fusion in himself of all the manifold creation, a pure relation, a sheer gleam of oneness out of many-ness, then this man is God created where before God was uncreated. He is the Holy Ghost in tissue of flame and flesh, whereas before, the Holy Ghost was but Ghost.[20]

This is pure metaphysic. Man becomes God and embodiment of the Holy Ghost. This image of God in man is egoistic and cannot be reconciled with Lawrence's aesthetic, even though it is merely symbolic [see above p. 15]. Eventually the symbolic God and Holy Ghost are omitted as Lawrence realizes that man is only man and that sex, detached from the Christian symbolism, is a powerful cosmic force in itself. In Lady Chatterley's Lover the "sheer fusion" in man becomes the Apocalypse of sex and the flame manifests itself in both man and woman.

After Lawrence is washed down the stream of reduction into blackness, he envisions an idyllic, Apocalyptic return to the heart of "rainbow" land:

> . . . I fall down into the flame, I lapse into intolerable flame, a pallid shadow I am transfused into the flux of unendurable darkness, and am gone.

> Nor spark nor vestige remains within the supreme dark flow of the flames. I am contributed again to the immortal source. I am with the dark Almighty of the beginning.
>
> The new journey, the new life has begun, the travelling to the opposite eternity, to the infinite light of the Spirit, the consummation in the Spirit.
> My source and issue is in two eternities, I am founded in the two infinities. But absolute is the rainbow that goes between; the iris of my very being.[21]

Death and rebirth in Lawrence's works stem from his fascination with John's "Book of Revelations." This interest is present in his early metaphysic and increases until he writes Apocalypse in 1931. Apocalypse remains a metaphysical concept in Lawrence's writings except in rare moments, particularly in Lady Chatterley's Lover and The Escaped Cock, where characters experience a personal Apocalypse based on the reality of sex. This personal Apocalypse is not redemptive but rather is a fulfillment. The body, long dead, is reborn into the great cosmos. Age old connexions are realized and, as with a baby, the body is sensitized to human tenderness. That which Lawrence hints at in "The Crown" as metaphysic is already included in his early novels. Frank Kermode, in "Lawrence and the Apocalyptic Types (1968)," writes:

> As we have seen, this programme [of 'ritual decent into hell, followed by rebirth'] already implicit in the Hardy Study, requires not only a new ethics and new philosophies of culture, but also its own art; so it is not surprising that the novels Lawrence wrote during the war have much apocalyptic figuration. The Rainbow came to represent the Old Testament (Law) and Women in Love the New Testament (Love). The rainbow

> at the end of the first novel is the symbol of the old Covenant; the apocalyptic climax of the second reflects the structure of the New Testament. Women in Love is an end, where The Rainbow was a beginning; it represents the destruction of the old, and enacts the pause before the new world. It projects a kind of Utopia; but it is subjected, like the rest of the apocalyptic material to Lawrence's brand of scepticism.[22]

In Lady Chatterley's Lover, the symbols of Apocalypse are transformed into images of sexual reawakening as Lawrence becomes less sceptical about the ability of human tenderness to herald a new era of bodily awareness. Lawrence understands the finality of death but he is sceptical of the finality of Apocalypse and of a new world Utopia. The final section of "The Crown" is a vision of what a chicken sees when it bursts out of its shell.

The chicken is man and when he escapes his shell, he sees the sun but "the sun is not the sun as it appears to be." Lawrence implies that man will view a sun which will no longer be a mere symbol of power but which will be actual power and life. It will be "something tingling with magnificence." Lawrence gradually detaches the sun from perceived Judaeo-Christian symbolism, and as he becomes more impatient with Christianity, a philosophy for the novel emerges. In his last years, Lawrence fully revels in the experience of the sun in both his art and his life, an experience he might never have attained had he clung to the metaphysic of his youth.

C. Moreso than the two major essays which precede it, "The Reality of Peace" is directly concerned with social decay and eschatology. More-

over, Lawrence temporarily abandons much of the Christian dogma and symbolism evident in earlier works. Genital immediacy - "womb," "loins" - has all but disappeared. His main concern is with peace - inner peace and social peace - and how to achieve it in a world gone mad:

> We cling tenaciously to the old states, we resist our own fulfilment with a perseverance that would almost stop the sun in its course. But in the end we are overborne. If we cannot cast off the old habitual life, then we bring it down over our heads in a blind frenzy. Once the temple becomes our prison, we drag at the pillars till the roof falls crashing down on top of us and we are obliterated.[23]

With war, the world is willing its own death and the only way to peace is to abandon "the old way of death" for "the new way of creation."

"The Reality of Peace" is a dare and a plea combined. Lawrence dares his readers to "leap off from the old world into the inception of the new" and he pleads with them to abandon their "death-passion." The language is sometimes Apocalyptic:

> It is a secret desire that there shall be new strife! Is there a prophecy that the worst is yet to come, is there a subtle thrill in the anticipation of a fearful tearing of the body of life at home, here, between the classes of men in England; the great darkness coming over England; the sound of a great rendering of destruction?[24]

Although he recognizes an apparant desire to destroy, he is not concerned with the outcome of social upheaval. The overthrow of the rulers by the masses is not an indication of new life, but is rather a "prophecy from the inspiration of death." Lawrence does not propose a bloody revolution here.

In section two he continues to refine the polar directions of light and dark but with different language.

He abandons Judaeo-Christian symbolism but retains his metaphor of the"river of life" - "we must know that we, ourselves, are the living stream of seething corruption . . . as well as the bright river of life." The language is simple and "anal" as he describes how corrupt the stream is:

> Then how shall it be a shame that my blood exudes the bitter sweat of corruption on the journey back to dissolution; how shall it be a shame that in my consciousness appear the heavy marsh-flowers of the flux of putrescence, which have their natural roots in the slow stream of decomposition that flows for ever down my bowels?[25]

He would like to write "why should I be ashamed of farting" and then fart, or so I can imagine. An artist of "puritan" upbringing who deviates from properness will attract critics who will focus on his deviations. Lawrence's references to dissolution and bodily processes have flushed a number of such critics into a stream of heated controversy; critics whose purpose, it seems, is to rationalize emotion and be overly critical of Lawrence's concerns with dissolution.

Dissolution is the focus of numerous articles and books about Lawrence's concerns with bowels and their movements.[26] There are two streams up which most critics navigate, the excremental and the sexual. In defense of his own book, River of Dissolution, Colin Clarke refutes Mark Spilka in an effort to clear the air of misunderstandings about Lawrence's anal "metaphor":

> "Lawrence," [Spilka] says," clearly grounds his metaphor in the digestive process". I thought at first he had exclusively in mind here that passage about digestion and dissolution in "The Reality of Peace" which in the next sentence he begins to comment on to illustrate his point: "what was put together in the pure grain now comes assunder, the fire now mounts up into my blood, the watery mound washes back down my belly to the underneath . . ." and so on. But to say that the metaphor in that passage is grounded in the digestive process would be scarcely to rise above tautology . . . . For obviously this class of metaphor is grounded not only in other bodily processes as well as the digestive (or excremental), the sexual . . . but in kinds of melting and fusing that refer beyond bodily processes althogether.[27]

The significance of dissolution in Lawrence's art is not whether he "rises above tautology" but that he is concerned with the body and its processes. David Gordon, in D. H. Lawrence as a Literary Critic, in effect cautions critics not to extend Lawrence's metaphors much beyond the "literal truth" they express:

> The effort to present the felt quality of thought leads naturally to metaphor, and Lawrence often employs metaphors as conceptual categories in his criticism. But, having turned to them for their greater emotional precision, he seems to resent their logical imprecision and to insist, in both art and criticism, that he is *not* using metaphor but expressing the literal truth.[28]

Lawrence confronts numerous problems when he deals with scatology in his essays. He is dealing with shitting, a most avoided topic in "polite society," and he is attempting to develop an idiom which can be handled by the novel in a way which is emotionally acceptable to the reader. Everyone knows "Celia shits," says Lawrence in "A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover":

> Who doesn't? And how much worse if she didn't. It is hopeless. And then think of poor Celia,

> made to feel iniquitous about her proper natural function, by her "lover." It is monstrous. And it comes from having taboo words, and from not keeping the mind sufficiently developed in physical and sexual consciousness.[29]

Lawrence eventually develops a philosophy for the novel which subserves his artistic purpose in such a way that readers with a "sufficiently developed . . . physical and sexual consciousness" accept the fact that "Celia shits" as readily as they accept the fact that Celia eats.

Few critics are content to take Lawrence at his word as he writes metaphorically. But Lawrence's metaphors, particularly "the flux of putrescence," change.[30] Lawrence wants to call "stream of decomposition,"shit. Metaphorically, society in 1917 is in a state of rapid dissolution: later Lawrence writes, "it is the shits." Such dramatic shifts in thought and language are most obvious in Lady Chatterley's Lover where dissolution and anal intercourse are not implied, as they are in Women in Love, but are exposed unashamedly for all the world to view. From his deep concerns with the "flux of putrescence," Lawrence proceeds in section three of "Reality" to "the will of the flock that is the obscenity of obscenities."

Lawrence has a great fear of the mass of society. This is not only a remnant of his youth when he was bullied by the miners as he stood in line for his father's check[31] but also a very immediate reaction to his encounters with the British bureaucracy during World War One. He says, "it is not the will of the overweening individual we have to fear today, but the

consenting together of a vast host of null ones" because they quite literally force him to move from Cornwall in 1917.[32] The fear is quite real when "Peace" is written. His solution to the problem is idealistic[33] and is expressed in apocalyptic language: "smash humanity, and make an end to it. Let there emerge a few pure and single men - men who give themselves to the unknown of life and death and are fulfilled."[34] He does not tell *how* to "smash humanity" although revolution is not the answer [see above p. 23]. The problem of how to cope with the mass is not resolved novelistically until Lady Chatterley's Lover . In section four, Lawrence writes "we must ignore the static nullity of the living dead." Again, he does not indicate how.

The language of "The Orbit" section is different but the dichotomies are similar to those of earlier essays. There are however, permutations. Society is described as various forms of flora and fauna:

> -Humanity is like a mass of beetles.
> -We are a vast colony of wood-lice fabricating elaborate social communities like bees or wasps or ants.
> -The road of life has buttercups and wild birds.
> -The proprietor may sit at the end of his no-road, like a cabbage.
> -"We" are described as sheep, lions, tigers, does, pear-blossoms, roses, fawns, wolves.

The two central animals to emerge are the lion and the lamb as Lawrence, ultimately asks "where, then, is a law of dual attraction and repulsion, a law of polarity. How does earth pulse round her orbit save in her overwhelming haste towards the sun and her equivalent rejection back from the sun?"[35]The lion and the lamb are seen as polar opposites.

Within man, within Lawrence, the polar opposites of love and law co-exist in peace:

> And this is peace. The lion is but a lion, the lamb is but a lamb, half and half separate. But we are the two halves together. I am a lion of pride and wrath, I am a lamb with Christ in meekness. They live in one landscape of my soul; the roaring and the tremulous bleating of their different voices sound from the distance like pure music.[36]

In "The Crown" the lion represents God-law and the unicorn represents Christ-love while the Holy Ghost is the Reconciler. In "The Orbit" there is no mention of the Holy Ghost. Lawrence offers instead a pseudo scientific explanation for reconciliation between the lion and the lamb:

> It is when I am drawn by centripetal force into communion with the whole, and when I flee in equivalent centrifugal force away into the splendor of beaming isolation, when [the lion and the lamb] balance and match each other in midspace, that suddenly, like a miracle, I find peace in my orbit.[37]

The language is extracted from physics, astronomy and religion. Lawrence's metaphors are mixed but the metaphysic remains basically unaltered. The ideal of Oneness is as central to his metaphysic as the sun.

The precise relevance of the sun to Lawrence's experience is not revealed in "Reality" and the relationship between the sun and earth is still a perfect push-pull equipoise. Direct sexual imagery is avoided while social unrest is the focus. Lawrence attacks the dissolution of society in as bold a language as his readership and conscience permit. In so doing, he again reveals his concern with society's rush toward dissolution and its lack of backbone to reject the will of the mob. In section three,

Apocalypse is the only solution to the problem of the "mass of beetles." In "The Orbit," the solution becomes the realization of inner peace or isolation. Within man there exists the potential of reconciliation between the ferocity of the lion and the love of the lamb and with peace comes "a new heaven on the earth." Holy Ghost is not mentioned, although it recurs in subsequent essays. Lawrence's "system" of symbols is still altering as are his "metaphysical" solutions to very real problems. "The Reality of Peace," in spite of its being written during one of the blackest periods of Lawrence's life in England, is optimistic as Lawrence suggests that perhaps the future will offer a fulness and a Oneness not found in today's world.

In "Life," written in February, 1918, Lawrence continues with the concept of "man is born unfulfilled from chaos" with which he ended "The Reality of Peace." The language of "Life" is considerably more subdued - no beetles, putrescence or cabbages - but the theme is the same. The blind Lawrence looks into the sun, and although blind, he receives the sun because "I am never sealed and set apart." The sun germinates the seed and Lawrence welcomes "primal creativity and begin[s] to be fulfilled." Of particular significance is the mention of the Holy Ghost:

> Where do I pay homage, whereunto do I yield myself? To the unknown, only to the unknown, the Holy Ghost. I wait for the beginning, when the great and all creative unknown shall take notice of me, shall turn to me and inform me. This is my joy and delight. And again, I turn to the unknown of the end, the darkness which is final, which will gather me into finality.[38]

"Life" is pure metaphysic as Lawrence avoids all mention of practical issues

important to his life but instead emphasizes his place between the darkness of creation and the light of finality. The sun remains a symbol of life yet Lawrence makes no vital personal connexion with it.

In his introduction to the American edition of New Poems written in mid-1919, Lawrence says, "life, the ever-present, knows no finality, no finished crystallization."[39] The introduction is a defense of free verse poetry and its power to fully express a continuum of the present. He is not interested in "perfected bygone moments" nor "in the glimmering futurity." Rather he is enveloped by "the immediate present [where] there is no perfection, no consummation, nothing finished." He does not deal with the contentious issues in these two short essays. He expresses a contentment (perhaps out of frustration) with his immediate present although in "Life," he should have no practical reason for doing so. However, between "Life" and New Poems, in late 1918, Lawrence writes "Education of the People" in which he is not at all content with the system.

D. "Education of the People" might well be called Lawrence's "Republic" because not only does he deal with many issues dealt with by Plato but he sometimes arrives at conclusions similar to those of Plato, particularly when consolidating social issues such as democracy and class system. "Education" is an unburdening of a teacher's idealism and is, at times, self-contradictory as Lawrence attempts to rectify misgivings about

the current education system - "if ever there is a poor devil on the face of the earth it is the elementary teacher."

Moreso than all the essays which precede it, "Education" is bitter and negative but in it Lawrence "philosophizes" on a number of problems which recur in his novels. Lawrence condemns women *en masse:*

> Man would rather be the ideal god inside his own automaton than anything else on earth. And woman is ten times worse. Woman as the goddess in the machine of the human psyche is a heroine who will drive us, like a female chauffeur, through all the avenues of hell, till she pitches us eventually down the bottomless pit. And, even then she'll save herself, she'll kilt her skirts and look round for new passengers. She has a million more dodges for automatic self-stimulation than man has.[40]
>
> Men, after all, don't get much more than aeroplane thrills and political thrills out of their god-in-the-machine reactions. But women get soul-thrills and sexual thrills, they float and squirm on clouds of self-glorification, with a lot of knock-kneed would-be saints and apostles of the male sort goggling sanctified eyes upwards at them, as in some sickening Raphael picture.[41]

Lawrence defines his Hermiones, his Berthas and his Mrs. Boltons. All womankind is included in the lot of these women. They sustain an unqualified thrashing. Even a shy, little girl would by seized "by her pigtail" and given "a good knock." Lawrence is saying that women should not be worshipped, Raphael-style, but should be removed from their pedestals and put on an equal footing with men. He proposes that men take the lead "hovering at the tip of life and on the verge of death, the men, the leaders, the outriders." The ideals of Oneness and Holy Ghost are

absent and there is no ideal reconciliation between male and female. Even the great Sun appears to darken as a symbol of Oneness and sexual unity.

Section VIII deals with the chicken bursting its shell and discovering the sun but the language differs from "The Crown" - "we've got to get on to a different tack: snap! Off the old tack and veer on to a new one." And instead of discovering the symbolic Sun, man should discard the "mass of homogenity" and emulate the stars:

> This symbol of Light, the homogeneous and universal Day, the daylight, symbolizes our universal mental consciousness, which we have in common. But our *being* we have in integral separateness, as the stars at night. To think of lumping the stars together into one mass is hideous. Each one is separate, each one his own peculiar way. So the universe is made up.
>
> And the sun only hides all this . . . . [42]

The sun is little more than an interference in man's attempt to discover a greater individuality of the stars. Instead, it "symbolizes our universal mental consciousness" for which, in 'The Reality of Peace," Lawrence expresses unmitigated contempt. As a metaphor the sun reaches an unprecedented low point on the horizon of his metaphysic as he writes:"the great sun is instrumental to [men's] living, even as the powerful arc-lamps high over Piccadilly only serve to illuminate the little feet of foot-passengers."[43] Lawrence's sarcasm can be more fully appreciated if the reader can picture Juliet of "Sun"[44] reclining naked and brown in the middle of Piccadilly Circus. He is despondent at the way men look symbolically at the sun, unable to appreciate its full meaning because they cannot see beyond it to the stars and the cosmos. Their little egos are firmly attached to it. In later

works, Lawrence points to how man can fully appreciate the sun as more than mere symbol.

Emile Delavenay writes:

> Having rejected the dogma of his own childhood religion, Lawrence quickly reverts to authoritarian and hierarchic doctrines, in the name of a religion of life, and seeks in botany in static forms of life, the stability of species and of individuals invariably invoked by those denying the perfectibility of man.[45]

It is ironic that Lawrence should be concerned with authoritarianism when during the war he is so unmercifully abused by authority. Of the mother-child relationship he writes: "Quick, quick, mothers of England, spank your wistful babies" and destroy the spell of Oedipal lust. This is where authority is established - "here we need sharp, fierce reaction: sharp discipline, rigour; fierce, fierce severity."[46] The bitterness and absurdity of Lawrence's proposal is not sustained in "Sun" where Juliet is observing her child:

> He turned and looked at her. Almost, from his blue eyes, it was the challenging, warm look of the true male. And he was handsome, with the scarlet in the golden blond of his skin. He was not really white. His skin was gold-dusk.
> 'Mind the thorns, darling," she said.[47]

Lawrence is no longer concerned with the spell of Oedipal lust in "Sun." 'Education of the People" was never published during Lawrence's lifetime, having been rejected by the Times. H. T. Moore postulates: "Lawrence's motive in writing the first draft of these essays . . . was possibly that he wanted to establish himself as something of an authority on

education in order to obtain an administrative position in that area."[48] Lawrence says it was to "earn a little weekly money."[49] In either case, the Times did Lawrence a favour. From the "practical" solutions designed to cure the ills of the English education system and its students, Lawrence moves to a more thematic essay in mid-1919 entitled "Two Principles."

E. After "chucking overboard" pseudo science in "Education" to make way for the "three R's," Lawrence proceeds in "The Two Principles" to explain in pseudo scientific language the parallel between Christian World creation and scientific world creation. He then engages in a pseudo medical-religious discourse on the division of the human body.[50] As Lawrence now deals with more than one "system," he is moving toward a more personal idiom of philosophical expression. And yet, he can still generalize, as he does when he describes a "systematic" relationship between body and nature:

> There certainly does exist a subtle and complex sympathy, correspondence, between the plasm of the human body, which is identical with the primary human psyche, and the material elements outside. The primary human psyche is a complex plasm, which quivers, senseconscious, in contact with the circumambient cosmos. Our plasmic psyche is radioactive, connecting with all things, and having first knowledge of all things.
>
> The religious systems of the pagan world did what Christianity has never tried to do: they gave the true correspondence between the material cosmos and the human soul. The ancient cosmic theories were exact, and apparantly perfect. In them science and religion were in accord.[51]

Lawrence offers a semi-biblical, semi-scientific explanation for the creation

of the world, saying that the primordial universe split into "mystic Earth" and "mystic Heaven" and these can be symbolically represented by water and fire with "the Spirit of God" oscillating between the halves. The cosmology is personal yet recognizable in terms of recent scientific acknowledgements: "so the ancient cosmology, always so perfect theoretically, becomes, by the help of our scientific knowledge, physically, actually perfect."[52] This explanation of the creation of the universe - dividing and creating, expanding forever - is similar to the Big-Bang expanding universe theory debated so intensely by today's cosmologists. (This reflects Lawrence's interest in the new cosmology generated by Albert Einstein's theories in which he is interested.) Lawrence simply brings the theory a few steps closer to the human body:

> In the cosmic theories of the creation of the world it has been customary for science to treat of life as a product of the material universe, whilst religion treats the material universe as having been deliberately created by some will or idea, some sheer abstraction. Surely the universe has arisen from some universal living self-conscious plasm, plasm which has no origin and no end, but is life eternal and identical, bringing forth the infinite creatures of being and existence, living creatures embodying inanimate substance. There is no utterly immaterial, no spirit. The distinction is between living plasm and inanimate matter. Inanimate matter is released from the dead body of the world's creatures. It is the static residue of the living conscious plasm, like feathers of birds.[53]

The novel, too, is a product of the material universe and cannot be created by "some sheer abstraction," some metaphysic. Matter can arise from energy

and energy from matter. The two are but different states of the same thing but both are "living conscious plasm." Using more pseudo scientific chemistry, Lawrence looks at "life midway between fire and water."

He discusses the "simplest symbol," the divided circle and asserts that it represents the "sex mystery" as well as the "dual psyche, sensual and spiritual." All ancient symbols have "multiple reference" and are not "merely phallic indication[s]." Moreover, these symbols are not static. Light, in "Hardy," represents male while darkness represents female, and the Holy Ghost flows between the "two great cosmic principles" of fire and water. However, male sex is not "identical" with fire nor female sex with water, "nevertheless, if we must imagine the most perfect clue to the eternal waters, we think of woman, and of man as the most perfect premiss of fire."[54] It is no longer of prime importance for Lawrence to define as clearly as he did previously, the interconnexions between male-light and female-darkness. The relationships are implicit as he removes from symbols their static properties. In real life, the dichotomies and their symbolic representations are not always explicit, "even if we imagine" this to be so. Thus having re-established the duality of male-female, Lawrence proceeds to explain the "four-fold motion" of sex.

Lawrence refines his ideas of sex quite substantially. In "The Crown," he writes "there is no reconciliation [between light and dark] save in negation." The sexual act is negative. Now he states:

> The coming-together of the sexes may be the soft, delicate union of pure creation, or it may be the tremendous conjunction of opposition, a vivid struggle . . . . From either of these consummations

> birth takes place. But in the first case it is the birth of a softly rising and budding soul, wherein the two principles commune in gentle union, so that the soul is harmonious and at one with itself. In the second case it is the birth of a disintegrative soul, wherein the two principles wrestle in their eternal opposition: a soul finite, momentaneous, active in the universe as a unit of sundering. The first kind of birth takes place in the youth of an era, in the mystery of accord; the second kind preponderates in the times of disintegration, the crumbling of an era. But at all times beings are born from the two ways, and life is made up of the duality.[55]

In the first encounter a couple achieves a Oneness or unity of souls, as do Connie and Mellors, when they herald in a new era of tenderness. However, the second encounter is a rendering or tearing apart of a couple - pure destruction without rebirth. Lawrence begins to acknowledge a softness in sex that is not explicitly expressed in his novels and short stories until later. Now his main concern turns from sex to the polarity of the individual into "upper and lower man."

Lawrence defines one of the most contentious dichotomies of his art - the mind versus the body. The definition is more metaphysical than philosophical in the sense that it is ideal, egoistic and still abstract. Man is divided into two halves, the spiritual upper body and the sensual lower body:

> By *spiritual being* we mean that state of being where the self excels into the universe, and knows all things passing into all things. It is that blissful consciousness which glows upon the flowers

> and trees and sky, so that I am sky and flowers, I, who am myself. It is that movement towards a state of infinitude wherein I experience my living oneness with all things.
>
> By *sensual being*, on the other hand, we mean that state in which the self is the magnificent centre wherein all life pivots, and lapses, as all space passes into the core of the sun. It is a magnificent central position, wherein the being sleeps upon the strength of its own reality, as a wheel sleeps in speed on its positive hub. It is a state portrayed in the great dark statues of the seated lords of Egypt. The self is incontestable and unsurpassable.[56] [italics mine]

The ideal of "blood-consciousness" is seated in the lower regions while mental awareness rests in the nerves and the upper body. The most significant aspect of this pseudo biological-psychological branch of his metaphysic is that it enables Lawrence to remove himself a step further from Judaeo-Christian symbolism and metaphysic. God, Jesus and Holy Ghost do not dominate the language of his metaphysic although "Principles" does not signify the end of the use of these words.

In "The Two Principles" Lawrence establishes a relationship between "material Cosmos and the human soul" by juxtaposing Christian and scientific theories of creation, concluding that they are similar, with woman and man the ultimate result of each. He recognizes the current scientific theory of relativity which he "marries" with religious explanations of the universe. (In pagan system, "science and religion were in accord"). He will later state, in The Escaped Cock, that the cosmos is "great beyond all gods."

Using Christian and pre-Christian symbols, he reiterates how these symbols form "some indefinable connection" with the sexes. Having formed

the "duality of sex," he breaks considerably with previous essays by explaining both the "creative" and "disintegrative" effects on the soul which the joining of the two sexes can have. He writes not only about the literal union but also about the union of "maleness" and "femaleness" within a single body.

From his polarity of the sexes, he proceeds to the fourfold division of the body in a pseudo biological explanation about which bodily centers are responsible for how a human acts:

> Any man who is perfect and fulfilled lives in fourfold activity. He knows the sweet spiritual communion, and he is at the same time a sword to enforce the spiritual level; he knows the tender unspeakable sensual communion, but he is a tiger against anyone who would abate his pride and his liberty.[57]

The "perfect and fulfilled" man is best exemplified by Mellors in Lady Chatterley's Lover and by the man who dies at the end of The Escaped Cock. "The Two Principles" is the last essay to be published in England before Lawrence's departure but it is only the beginning of his pseudo psychological and pseudo biological explanations which he writes over the next few years, particularly in Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious.

F. Written in 1920 and 1921 respectively, Psychanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious are, according to Phillip Rieff, Lawrence's "main efforts to explain the doctrine otherwise expressed in his creative work."[58] Fantasia is more significant because

it is a "continuation" and a reiteration of Psychoanalysis and it indicates more precisely the permutations occurring in Lawrence's "pollyanalytics." Both essays cover old ground and foreshadow new. Sex is referred to explicitly and boldly, but not "obscenely." The Holy Ghost is present and somewhat changed, as is the symbolic sun, and social decay is discussed in terms of poison gas.

Lawrence is upset with the public response to Psychoanalysis and openly challenges the reader of Fantasia to understand its ideas but to throw it away if the reader is incapable of understanding. He claims he does not want to convince anyone of anything - "it is quite in opposition to my whole nature" - so he proceeds "by intuition" to refute, often bitterly, academic efforts to fathom the human psyche. The importance of this essay, as he forms a philosophy for the novel, is not so much what he says but how he says it. There is an extensive new freedom in his language (there always has been a freedom but it has often been tempered with an urge to please) as he addresses the distant and, at times, belittled readers in America. As in other essays where he engages in "polemical" ideology, Lawrence "contradicts" earlier, apparently stable, metaphysical statements.

Lawrence retains the biological language of "The Two Principles" as he refines the bodily division of man. Man is not only divided four-fold but is divided into numerous modes and centres. Man is held together by "magnetism" and interacts with others by gravitational attraction (Einstein would confirm this). There is a "circuit of polarity" with

positive and negative poles and the hands are the "live end of the wire." By employing this mechanical and scientific jargon, Lawrence contradicts one of his "messages" where he states clearly that man must become more spontaneous and less mechanical. To do this is paradoxical, but typical of his attempts to find a functional idiom with which to express his thoughts. Likewise, he exhibits contradiction as he refutes Idealism.

Lawrence admonishes the readers for their Idealism - "the Ideal is *always* evil, no matter what ideal it be."[59] He is particularly incensed by the idealization of sex which is "sex in the head." We were driven from Paradise, "not because we sinned but because we got our sex in the head." This is the most blatant abuse of Idealism. But Lawrence still has his own Ideals:

> We can't go on as we are. Poor, nerve-worn creatures, fretting our lives away and hating to die because we have never lived. The secret is to commit into the hands of the sacred few the responsibility which now lies like torture on the mass. Let the few, the leaders, be increasingly responsible for the whole. And let the mass be free: free, save for the choice of leaders.[60]

A paradox can be seen as he initially refutes Idealism as evil and then proposes the Ideal of leadership. In Lady Chatterley's Lover Connie and Mellors are "guides" toward sexual fulfilment but they are neither leaders nor do they exhibit leadership. Lawrence's attitude alters substantially before he distinguishes between leaders and guides.[61] Fantasia is to date his most powerful statement on sex.

Lawrence, as do his psychoanalytical contemporaries, touches most

aspects of sex, from "girlish men" and masturbation ("leave yourself alone") to mutual sexual fulfillment. The sexual act is expressed metaphorically in both mechanistic and natural terms:

> Every wireless station can only receive those messages which are in its own vibration key. So with sex in specialized individuals. From the powerful dynamic centre the female sends out her dark summons, the intense dark vibration of sex. And according to her nature, she receives her responses from males. The male enters the magnetic field of the female. He vibrates helplessly in response. There is established at once a dynamic circuit, more or less powerful.[62]

> At the last hour of sex I am no more than a powerful wave of mounting blood. Which seeks to surge and join with the answering sea in the other individual. When the sea of individual blood which I am at that hour heaves and finds its pure contact with the sea of individual blood which is the woman at that hour, then each of us enters into the wholeness of our deeper infinitude, our profound fullness of being, in the ocean of our oneness and our consciousness.[63]

In both descriptions, the male helplessly responds to the call of the female and when the two complete their blood contact, the Oneness of the male-female relationship is achieved. Lawrence uses the second description in his novels: sometimes Oneness is achieved and sometimes it is not. In Women in Love, Gerald approaches Gudrun in much the same way but with different results:

> As he drew nearer to her, he plunged deeper into her enveloping soft warmth, a wonderful creative heat that penetrated his veins and gave him life again. He felt himself dissolving and sinking to rest in the bath of her living strength. It seemed as if her heart in her breast were a second unconquerable sun, into the glow and creative strength of which he plunged further and further. All his veins, that were murdered

> and lacerated, healed softly as life came pulsing in, stealing invisibly into him as if it were the all-powerful effluence of the sun. His blood, which seemed to have been drawn back into death, came ebbing on the return, surely, beautifully, powerfully.[64]

This second encounter does not culminate in Oneness as Gudrun "knew he had got of her" that which she had been unwilling to release. It has been essentially a masturbatory exercise for Gerald even though it follows the initial stages of Lawrence's idealized sexual encounter rather closely. In the first sexual encounter in Lady Chatterley's Lover, Connie, under the rosy sun, "arrives at the clearing flushed and semi-conscious," attracted by the vibrations of Mellors' body and Mellors responds sexually to Connie's teardrop.[65] The attraction is spontaneous and mutual.

What Lawrence metaphorically disguises in Fantasia is vividly expressed in his novels. The perfect male-female attraction is expressed most completely in Lady Chatterley's Lover. In the year following the publication of Psychoanalysis and Fantasia, Lawrence writes the first of his two "leadership" novels. His struggle with Christianity and the almighty monotheistic God continues in 1923 in Kangaroo[66] and in 1923-24 in two essays on religion.

G. In late 1923, Lawrence writes the beginning of his essay "On Being Religious," which Harry T. Moore called "an extremely important statement about his religious beliefs":

> There is not real battle between me and Christianity. Perhaps there is a certain battle between me and nonconformity, because, at the depth, my nature is catholic . . . .
>
> But I cannot believe in a Church of Christ. Jesus is only one of the sons of Almighty God. There are many saviours - there is only one God. There will be more saviours: but God is one God.
>
> Yet I must seek another way. God, the great God, is always God. But we have always to find our way to him. The way was Jesus. And the way is no longer Jesus.[67]

This "seed article," as Moore calls it, states explicitly a belief in one God which was hitherto more or less implicit in Lawrence's metaphysic. Lawrence does not "believe in the Church of Christ": he is not Christian. In a comparison between Rozanov, whom Koteliansky translates, and Lawrence, H. A. Stammler in "Apocalypse: V. V. Rozanov and D. H. Lawrence," writes:

> Here the student discovers a tenuous but essential link which both Lawrence and Rozanov maintained with their Christian heritage, the doctrine of Resurrection. And in this respect they both found the *kerygma* of historical Christianity wanting. Christianity had become a religion of renunciation, of sin, death, pain. In their eyes, it did not sufficiently stress the glad tidings of the resurrection of the flesh, rebirth, and life everlasting which had been announced in the Gospel. Both were deeply aware of the need in human nature of a much more powerful source of inspiration than that which "puritanical" or "ascetic" historical Christianity offered . . . .[68]

Lawrence has as yet not written any novel which stresses "the glad tidings of the resurrection of the flesh, rebirth and life" but the philosophy which will enable him to do so is slowly consolidating. In spite of what Lawrence

writes in the "seed article," there are irreconcilable differences between his own metaphysic and Christianity, one of which will be clearly manifested over the next two years - the belief in one God.

He states in "Hardy" that "with Christ ended the Monism of the Jew. God, the One God, became a Trinity, three-fold. He was the Father, the All-containing; He was the Son, the Word, the Changer, the Separator, and He was the Spirit, the Comforter, the Reconciliation between the Two."[69] But Lawrence has already renounced the Son of Christianity and the Holy Ghost is disappearing. He eventually resurrects a Jesus but not before the Holy Ghost and the monotheistic Christian God are subordinated within his philosophy.

"On Being Religious" restates not only the central position of the Holy Ghost within man but also describes a polytheistic God:

> The Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost is within you. And it is a Ghost, for ever a Ghost, never a Way or a Word. Jesus is a Way and a Word. God is the Goal. But the Holy Ghost is for ever Ghostly, unrealizable. And against this unsubstantial unreality, you may never sin, or woe betide you.
>
> Only the Holy Ghost within you can scent the new tracks of the Great God across the Cosmos of Creation. The Holy Ghost is the dark hound of heaven whose baying we ought to listen to, as he runs ahead into the unknown, tracking the mysterious, everlasting departing of the Lord God, who is for ever departing from us.[70]

Lawrence believes in God but this God is shifting across the cosmos like polaris of the night sky. The problem is that man must reach Him but without Jesus, who is "no longer our Way to Salvation." We must find this

shifting God through the Holy Ghost within us. Lawrence states more firmly his belief in a polytheistic God privately in a letter to Rolf Gardiner in July, 1924:

> Myself, I am sick of the force of cosmic unity, or world unison. It may exist in the abstract - but not elsewhere. And we may all find some abstract ground to agree on. But as soon as it comes to experience, to passion, to desire, to feeling, we are different. And the great racial differences are insuperable. We may agree about abstract, yet practical ideas like honesty, speaking the truth, and so on. And there it ends. The spirit of place ultimately always triumps . . . .
>
> To tell the truth, I am sick to death of the Jewish monotheistic string. It has become mono-maniac. I prefer the pagan many gods, and the animistic vision.[71]

A shifting God, that is, a God who appears in more than one place, is actually many gods. The "animistic vision" is explained by Frazer in The Golden Bough:

> Animism is passing into polytheism. In other words, instead of regarding each tree as a living and conscious being, man now sees in it merely a lifeless, inert mass, tenanted for a longer or shorter time by a supernatural being who, as he can pass freely from tree to tree, thereby enjoys a certain right of possession or lordship over the trees, and ceasing to be a free soul, becomes a forest God.[72]

In Lawrence's metaphysic, there appears to be some confusion between polytheism and animism. Perhaps he cannot satisfactorily reconcile animism and many pagan gods because of the monotheistic God of his past. He recognizes that each tree is part of the living cosmos and yet he believes, that within itself, it has an existence of its own, separate from any

egocentric existence thrust upon it by man. Lawrence seems to be working backwards, from polytheism into animism. Such a reversal would be consistent with his subordinating the Holy Ghost to another, more tangible force, which could put man and woman in the vital touch not only with the greater cosmos and pagan past but also with their own physical selves. A more tangible force would also be necessary to withstand the demands which would be imposed on it by the polemics of a novel.

In Fantasia of the Unconscious, Lawrence relates Oneness to the Holy Ghost:

> It is the individual in his pure singleness, in his totality of consciousness, in his oneness of being: the Holy Ghost which is with us after our Pentecost, and which we may not deny. When I say to myself, "I am wrong," knowing with sudden insight that I *am* wrong, then this is the whole self speaking, the Holy Ghost.[73]

"On Being Religious" reaffirms the concept of the Holy Ghost. However, it is still Ghost, still metaphysic. But it too is changing, as in Kangaroo, where it is compared to a fly - "and yet it is the bott fly of the Holy Ghost, unlistened to, that is the real cause of everything".[74] Lawrence is becoming increasingly conscious of his *preaching* so he is seeking a new language and philosophy for the novel to present to his readers. Purposefully he must begin to slip down the slopes of Pisgah toward the unfulfilled "promised land."

H. In his introduction to Fantasia of the Unconscious, Lawrence implores the reader to "climb down Pisgah." In 1924, in "Climbing Down Pisgah,"

he implicitly states that he is not satisfied with a Universal Oneness and explicitly states he wishes to change. Like Moses, Lawrence has gone to the top of Pisgah and has viewed the promised land: "Pisgah's a fraud, and the Promised Land is Pittsburgh, the Chosen Few, there are billions of 'em, and Canaan smells of Kerosene."[75] And like Moses, he has been a preacher of his metaphysic. His essays and articles have not only been statements of metaphysic and factories of philosophical development but have also been sermons and pleas to do something about the deplorable condition of humanity. But the mass of humanity has not been interested in the knowledge that the accumulation of their "Universal Spirits" combined to form an "addled omelet." Paul Delany writes:

> [In 1916]as a writer, he considered his relation to his audience to be as organic and mutually binding as any personal intimacy. His art had never been for art's sake but for everyone's sake, so when it was jeered at and suppressed this was to him foul and calculated ingratitude.[76]

The sermons have not been activity oriented. The essays and articles do not reveal *how* to climb down Pisgah or how to "get out of the vicious circle" of man and machines. Nor have his novels succeeded in this. In short, Lawrence says, "What on earth am I doing it for? . . . For the sake of humanity? Pfiu! For the sake of the Spirit? *Tampoco!*"

Lawrence has been writing for the spirit, the sense of Universal, Intellectual wholeness. Graham Hough writes:

> Lawrence distinguishes between [soul and spirit] . Soul is an attribute of the flesh, and is associated with nature and the senses. Spirit is opposed to it and is associated with intellect and consciousness. 'Soul' is the soul of primitive animism: 'spirit' is what Plato in the *Phaedo* concludes to be the immortal part of man, though Lawrence of course does not share his valuation of it.[78]

His readers have not responded appropriately to his appeal to human intellect and he is sick of the effort of trying to change the whole society. The ideal of Oneness within the individual is replacing Universal Oneness while the Holy Ghost as reconciler between soul and spirit is gradually losing its idealistic aspect in Lawrence's art.

His perspective of humanity gained in his climb up Pisgah has left him "dehumanized" and disillusioned with Human Oneness:

> The factory smoke waves much higher [than golden corn] . And in the sweet smoke of industry I don't care a button who loves whom, nor what babies are born. The sight of it *en masse* was a little too much for my human spirit, it dehumanized me. Here I am, without a human sympathy left. Looking down on Human Oneness was too much for my human stomach, so I vomited it away.[79]

All that remains within him is a demon "that says *Basta! Basta!* to all my oneness."

The language of "Pisgah" shifts considerably from the language of other 1924 articles. There is no mention of Christ, the Holy Ghost or the Great God of Humanity. Instead, Lawrence drifts along with the Great Dog of Humanity which spins the hedgehog earth with its paw and the"great inscrutable demon" within him is "for ever willing and unwilling to surpass the *Status Quo*. Like a bird he spreads wings to surpass himself. Then

like a serpent he coils to strike at that which would surpass him."[80] As a preacher of change Lawrence almost surpasses himself in "Pisgah" and perhaps because of this it is not published in 1924. He concludes "let us scramble out of this ash-hole at the foot of Pisgah" and put on new bright pants" to show our willingness and ability to do it. As a socio-political statement this does not amount to much but it certainly foreshadows Mellors' political appeal to don red pants[81] and Lawrence's political article "Red Trousers" in 1928. Altough Lawrence's effort of writing for everyone often fails, he continues to write, not "for art's sake but for everyone's sake."

II

"S U N"

In the year following "Pisgah," 1925, Lawrence almost approaches death in Mexico. His bout with malaria, influenza, a near tubercular relapse and an earthquake force upon him the realization that his extensive travelling is coming to an end.[1] From Italy in November of 1925, he writes to Vera Colins, "I'm sick to death to this maudlin twaddle and England's rotten with it. Why doesn't somebody finally and loudly say Shit! to it all!"[2] (see above p. 26). His philosophy for the novel is consolidating. He finds the sun once again the center of his life. Widmer writes:

> The sources of Lawrence's sun worship appear several and various. The personal intensity of the sun experience very likely was increased by Lawrence's slow death from consumption; even more, sun-worship goes with the alienation that drove him in a world-wandering pursuit of the sun and some sense of organic relatedness to place.[3]

But Lawrence now sees the sun as more than a mere symbol of maleness and rejuvenation.

In "Aristocracy" Lawrence says we are "fools" if we believe the sun and moon are mere symbols:

> The sun, I tell you, is alive, and more alive than I am, or a tree is. It may have blazing gas, as I have hair, and a tree has leaves. But I tell you, it is the Holy Ghost in full raiment, and walking, and alive as a tiger is, only more so, in the sky.
>
> And when I can turn my body to the sun, and say: "Sun! Sun!" and we meet - then I am come

> finally into my own. For the universe of day, finally, is the sun. And when the day of the sun is my day too, I am a lord of all the world.[4]

But even here, he uses sun as a symbol. By equating the sun with the Holy Ghost, he still sees symbolic representation in the sun. That is, the sun is symbolic of inner experience and so carries with it human ego. It is still ideal and remains nothing more than a metaphysical center piece in spite of Lawrence's "passionate blood-experience" indicating the sun is much more. However, in 1925, he brings the "blood-experience" to paper, and a new sun emerges.

This shift in the significance of symbols is partially explained by Stanley Diamond:

> Like the ordinary man [the] artist focuses on the object; but for him the object has become incandescent. He is perpetually recovering his primitivism.
>
> The uniqueness of the object inheres in the immediate concentrated response of the unaided, humanly experienced eye. The object is connotative. Through the structure of analogy and metaphor that defines discourse among primitive people, it reveals a manifold and spontaneous reality. No decisive denotative statement can be made about the object, no mathematical or metaphysical statement can define it. This heightened perception is, of course, an aspect of the definition of art and commands a focus on the singularity of the object to such a degree that everything seems at once marvelous, strange, familiar and unexpected. No category can exhaust such an object, it saturates the perceiving subject. That is what William Blake, who despised Plato, meant when he said he could look at a knothole in a tree until he became terrified. This existential perception, which is also that of the artist and the mystic, cannot be trimmed to fit a metaphysical class, and it is the converse of a theoretical construct.[5]

Before his metaphysic developed beyond the Christian idiom, Lawrence could not express terror when he looked into the sun. He gazed and saw the Holy Ghost. Perhaps he *was* terrified, but he could not tell of this terror. Instead, he felt more compelled to explain what it was in the sun that could turn him into a "lord." That is, he imposed human ego on the sun. As the Holy Ghost is used less frequently, Lawrence approaches a philosophy for the novel. He seeks to recapture the "non-Platonic or 'concrete' abstractions [which] comprise the customary mode of primitive thinking."[6] The sun and moon had contained the Holy Ghost but this was too denotable for a man who knows that he is merely a man within the great cosmos. The Holy Ghost is dropped as the Great Reconciler and Lawrence sees the sun for what it is.

The shift away from the Christian idiom is becoming more obvious. Although the shift may appear to be sudden, it has been organic.[7] As Lawrence abandons the Holy Ghost, his essays exhibit a more liberal use of street language and outright contempt for the Christian idiom. This process is repeated in the rewriting of Lady Chatterley's Lover. By 1929, in "Introduction to these Paintings," Lawrence is writing:

> And then the great symbols of this salvation. When the evangelical says: Behold the lamb of God! What on earth does he want one to behold? Are we invited to look at a lamb, with woolly, appearance, frisking and making its little pills?[8]
>
> And so we can return to modern French painting, without having to quake before the bogy, or the Holy Ghost of Significant Form: a bogy which doesn't exist if we don't mind leaving aside our self-importance when we look at a picture.[9]

> As for *l'esprit* said Cézanne, I don't give a fart for it.[10]

So, having given up the Holy Ghost, Lawrence now seeks a "non-Platonic or concrete" abstraction to reconcile man and woman and bring individuals into "fulness of being."

The relationship between man and woman is central to Lawrence's philosophy for the novel. In "Morality and the Novel" he writes:

> If a novel reveals true and vivid relationships, it is a moral work, no matter what the relationships may consist in. If the novelist *honours* the relationship in itself, it will be a great novel.[11]

He generalizes this relationship still further when he writes:

> The great relationship, for humanity, will always be the relation between man and woman. The relation between man and man, woman and woman, parent and child, will always be subsidiary.[12]

The "concrete" abstraction Lawrence uses in his art is orgasm. He begins with the individual.

"Sun" is about a woman, Juliet, who leaves New York and her businessman husband, Maurice. Under doctor's orders, she takes her child to a place "in the sun." She arrives in Greece, disrobes, and in spite of her initial scepticism, spreads naked beneath the sun. Lawrence uses "sensual" language which so submerges any didactic purpose that the reader forgets momentarily Juliet is even married to Maurice:

> She slid off all her clothes and lay naked in the sun, and as she lay, she looked up through her fingers at the central sun, his blue pulsing roundness, whose outer edges streamed brilliance. Pulsing with marvellous blue, and alive, and streaming white fire from his edges, the sun!

> He faced down to her with his look of blue fire, and enveloped her breasts and her face, her throat, her tired belly, her knees, her thighs and her feet.[13]

Juliet soon ritualizes her life with the sun. The sun becomes, during a period of development when Juliet experiences a personal Apocalypse, the central issue in her life, beyond her husband and even her son. A reciprocal movement develops between the sun and her: "with her knowledge of the sun, and her conviction that the sun knew her, in the cosmic carnal sense of the word, came over her a feeling of detachment from people."[14] The mutual connexion goes beyond carnal *sense* and eventually culminates in carnal *movement:*

> It was not just taking sunbaths. It was much more than that. Something deep inside her unfolded and relaxed and she was given. By some mysterious power inside her, deeper than her known consciousness and will, she was put into connection with the sun, and the stream flowed of itself, from her womb. She herself, her conscious self, was secondary, a secondary person, almost an onlooker. The true Juliet was this dark flow from her deep body to the sun.
>
> She had always been mistress to herself, aware of what she was doing, and held tense for her own power. Now she felt inside her quite another sort of power, something greater than herself, flowing by itself. Now she was vague, but she had power beyond herself.[15]

The reciprocal mode is Christian but the carnal communication is Dionysiac and hence pagan revelry.[16] What the Christians did to the body, Lawrence undoes in this passage. The mind denied, Juliet's womb unfolds, relaxes and flows "from her deep body to the sun." Lawrence, having momentarily at least, severed himself from Christianity,

now expresses himself in an idiom which does not compromise his artistic intent (portraying the reawakening of the female body) with the Christian "dead body" vision he despises.Another aspect of his philosophy for the novel has been developed. Sexuality becomes a central issue. The didacticism of the story emerges when Juliet cannot overcome the forces of reality. Juliet does not say "shit" to the old ways.

As a realist, Lawrence is faced with the dilemma of portraying the return of Juliet to the outside world. She had contemplated an extra-marital affair with a peasant, but Lawrence reveals this only when she is "safely" in the orbit of Maurice. The line is drawn at adultery and Juliet, having given to and received from the sun an awareness of the cosmos beyond the symbolic sterility imposed on the sun by the mind, returns the "fetter" and "mongrel cowerings" of Maurice.

"Sun" not only accentuates a transition from pure metaphysic to a philosophy for the novel but it also indicates that Lawrence's fluctuating attitude toward personal Apocalypse is reviving. The yoke of Christian morality, language and symbolism is no longer fettering his writing as it once did. Yet he remains conscious of moral limitations imposed on his art by his audience. This does not trouble him for long. Juliet's "next child will be Maurice's. The fatal chain of continuity would cause this." But the fatal chain has been loosened, and in his next major novel, Lawrence attempts to break the chain which has so long bound him to retrace his steps back across the social hurdles, just as Juliet must return to Maurice.

III

LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER

Lady Chatterley's Lover is a novel of tradition yet it breaks with English literary tradition. Scott Sanders writes:

> The fairytale aura not withstanding, in many respects Lawrence's final novel marks a return to conventional realism. It has a simple unified plot, which is at least of Roman vintage: a servant absconds with his master's wife. Its setting of woods, mining village and stately home is described in the best nineteenth-century manner. Unlike their counterparts in earlier novels, characters here resemble the old stable egos that he scorned in the works of contemporaries such as Galsworthy or Bennet; they are coherent personalities chiefly defined by their social positions; their motives are rarely obscure, they dwell almost wholly in daylight.[1]

The novel has "a simple unified plot, which is at least of Roman vintage," yet it awakens in the genre of the English novel all the carnal universe, the existence of which the English novel has so long denied. Lady Chatterley's Lover does not progress directly out of Lawrence's early metaphysic, as Leavis suggests - "[Lady Chatterley's Lover] offends, surely, against Lawrence's own canons - against the spirit of his creativity and against the moral and emotional ethic that he in essence stands for"[2] - but it is a consolidation of ideas from within that metaphysic and from without. These ideas or "philosophy" were hitherto not able to withstand the pressures of a novel in which the didactic purpose was so near and often on the surface. John Doheny writes:

> What we witness when we read The First Lady Chatterley, John Thomas and Lady Jane, and Lady Chatterley's Lover is not a smooth development of Lawrence's didactic statement into a powerful and convincing "apologue" in the final draft, but the struggle within Lawrence's creative imagination between the intuitive novelist of the early years, who wishes to explore the human dilemma of his characters in depth, and the impatient philosopher of his last years straining to tell the reader of the good life and how to live it.[3]

There is no "smooth development" in Lawrence's art as Leavis seems to indicate. Lawrence does not "stand" for any "moral" or "emotional" ethic which would allow him to write Lady Chatterley as he did; at least not an "ethic" Leavis has in mind. Lawrence made quantum jumps in his "philosophy" which allowed him not only to write Lady Chatterley but, as Nin says, "to transcend ordinary values." Permeated with encounters of carnal love, Lady Chatterley's Lover is an expression, not of an ideal world, but of a possible world tempered by reality. The final version of Lady Chatterley's Lover achieves the balance between mind and body and between man and woman which Lawrence so long wished to express.

Frieda's favorite version is the first draft: "he wrote as she came out of him, out of his own immediate self. [But] In the third version he was also aware of his contemporaries' minds."[4] The third version is more didactic than the first.[5] It is where Lawrence makes his most powerful and conscious statements, not only about sex but also about society. Lady Chatterley's Lover reflects most intensely his bitter experiences with society. Just how bitter Lawrence can be is shown in a comparison drawn by

Stephen Gill between two version of Clifford's wheelchair excursion:

> . . . the following comparison of passages will show, by the last version of the novel gentle direction has become tasteless bullying. In the scene where Clifford's mechanical chair fails in the wood, he envelops Clifford in his own earlier image of the Wragby ship sailing into the unknown:
>
> > And the chair began slowly to advance down the gentle slope till it came to the great sheets of bluebells and rode through them. A strange ship! A strange vessel surging through scented blue seas! The last pinnace left on the unknown oceans, steering to the last discoveries! Quiet and content, like the captain at the immortal wheel, Clifford sat in an old black hat and slowly, cautiously steered. And Constance, one of the mere boats, came slowly in his wake in a gray knitted dress, down the gentle slope. And the chair softy [*sic*] curved out of sight as the riding swung round in the dip below. (FLC, 126)
>
> In the last version of this scene Lawrence's presence has become much more insistent:
>
> > And the chair began to advance slowly, joltingly down the beautiful broad riding washed over with blue encroaching hyacinths. O last of all ships, through the hyacinthian shallows! O pinnace on the last wild waters, sailing in the last voyage of our civilisation! Whither, O weird wheeled whip, your slow course steering? Quiet and complacent, Clifford sat at the wheel of adventure: in his old black hat and tweed jacket, motionless and cautious. O Captain, my Captain, our splendid trip is done! Not yet though! Downhill in the wake, came Constance in her grey dress, watching the chair jolt downwards. (LCL, 192)
>
> There is no need to labour the comparison. It is clear enough that in the first version Lawrence is rather deftly picking up Cliffords's own earlier words and counterpointing the rhetoric with the man. In the second, the discrepancy between the

> crippled man and the bold words has become a source of jeering fun, for a writer determined to wring every last drop of satire from a situation, which should rather demand compassion and sensitivity.[6]

Gill asks the reader to have "compassion" for the mechanical men that enslave us. What Lawrence tells the reader in the second passage is that those who enslave us must be jeered at.

As do earlier essays and novels, Lady Chatterley's Lover treats numerous aspects of life, including: sexual purpose and the language of sex; social justice and injustice; and Apocalypse, both sexual (awakening of the body) and social. It has been noted that as Lawrence becomes less constrained by the metaphysical concerns of his youth, he becomes less restrained in his use of street language. Publicly he had stated that society was in a "state of dissolution," but later, privately, he stated that it was the "shits." Similar shifts can be observed in the language and purpose of love and sex as Lady Chatterley's Lover is rewritten.

In The First Version of Lady Chatterley's Lover, the Holy Ghost enters into a conversation between Connie and Clifford as Connie, after a visit to Mrs. Bently for tea, informs Clifford of her desire to bear a child:

> 'Would you mind if I had a child, Clifford?'
> He looked up at her suddenly.
> 'If you had *whose* child?' he said.
> 'I don't know. Would you mind if I had a child by a man?'
> 'Couldn't you promise it would be by the Holy Ghost?' he said satirically.
> 'Perhaps!' she murmured. 'The Holy Ghost!'
> There was a pause.
> 'Why?' he said. 'Do you think you're *going* to

have a child?'
'No!' she murmured. 'Not yet.'
'Not yet! Now not yet?'
'Would you mind if I did have a child?' she repeated.
'Whose child, I ask.'
'But need you ask? Isn't it the Holy Ghost, if one looks at it that way?'[7]

By refusing to acknowledge Parkins as the father, Connie is equating him to the Holy Ghost. She is also denying the carnal universe and the body. That is, she denies that Parkins is a living being capable of having sex with her. She becomes a symbolic Mary in a Christianized fairy tale and Lawrence effectively does as the Christians did, he negates the flesh. When he writes John Thomas and Lady Jane, the Holy Ghost is absent although virgin birth is alluded to. The conversation takes place between Connie and Clifford before the Bently tea episode while Connie is arranging tulips:

> 'I say, Connie, have you heard a rumour that you are going to provide Wragby with a son and heir?'
> She did not start, she made no movement. Only in perfect unconscious silence she waited for some moments with the tulips in her hands . . . .[8] 'But if I *did* have a child, after all?' she said, annoyed.
> 'Whose?'
> 'Oh - ' she brushed the question aside like a vexing fly. 'It would be my child, wouldn't it?' She looked him in the eyes.
> 'Quite! But you hardly expect a virgin birth.'
> 'There are men in the world. Does it matter?'
> 'Is there *a* man in the world, may I ask?'
> 'Why should you ask, Clifford? There might be,' she said . . . .[9]

Clifford is not as persistent in his pursuit to obtain the name of the

father but he does insist here and elsewhere on the quality of the father. In the final version, all Christian allusions are gone and the issue of the child's father is dismissed pertly:

> Next day Connie was arranging tall yellow tulips in a glass vase.
> 'Connie,' said Clifford, 'did you know there was a rumour that you are going to supply Wragby with a son and heir?'
> Connie felt dim with terror, yet she stood quite still, touching the flowers.
> 'No!' she said. 'Is it a joke? Or malice?'
> He paused before he answered:
> 'Neither, I hope. I hope it may be a prophecy.'
> Connie went on with her flowers.[10]

The discussion of immaculate Conception is missing. There is no doubt in the reader's mind that the father will be a man and that the baby will be conceived by bodily contact. Connie is terrified that she will "supply" - not "provide" - a baby. The tone is more matter-of-fact as "supply" implies a price will be paid for the baby. The entire incident is reduced from one of metaphysical rhetoric to one of stark realism as the Holy Ghost is supplanted by something more substantial than Ghost.

In "Study of Thomas Hardy" Lawrence writes: "the goal of the female impulse is the announcement of infinite oneness." The male seeks infinite change (see above p. 12) and the combination of these two movements produces a satisfying stability. In Lady Chatterley's Lover this is not true. *Both* Connie and Mellors strive toward an "infinite oneness" and the movement is totally unconscious and spontaneous.

Connie has sex with Michaelis who rouses in her "a wild sort of compassion" (not passion) but he fails to achieve a "blood-correspondence"

with her. They are unable to achieve a mutual orgasm because he always finishes "so quickly." Oneness is not achieved.

In "The Crown" Lawrence writes "the flower is the burning of God in the bush: the flame of the Holy Ghost: the actual Presence of accomplished oneness, accomplished out of twoness "[11] (see above p. 20). The accomplishment of Oneness out of twoness does not occur immediately in Lady Chatterley's Lover with the first sexual contact between Connie and Mellors. In the first encounter, "the orgasm was his, all his; she could strive for herself no more," and even in the second encounter the "thrust of his buttocks" is a "little ridiculous." The third time Connie is caught "unawares." She and Mellors have two orgasms:

> Then as he began to move, in the sudden helpless orgasm, there awoke in her new strange thrills rippling inside her. Rippling, rippling, rippling, like a flapping overlapping of soft flames, soft as feathers, running to points of brillance, exquisite, exquisite and melting her all molten inside . . . . But it was over too soon, too soon, and she could no longer force her own conclusion with her own activity. This was different, different. She could do nothing. She could no longer harden and grip for her own satisfaction upon him . . . . She clung to him unconscious in passion, and he never quite slipped from her, and she felt the soft bud of him within her stirring, and strange rhythms flushing up into her with a strange rhythmic growing motion, swelling and swelling till it filled all her cleaving consciousness, and then began again the unspeakable motion that was not really motion, but pure deepening whirlpools of sensation swirling deeper and deeper through all her tissue and consciousness, till she was one perfect concentric fluid of feeling, and she lay there crying in unconscious inarticulate cries.[12]

Described far more intensely here than in the first two versions, this mutual orgasm brings Connie into a Oneness she has never known. She is consumed by the pure elements - fire and water - as she is at first conscious, then unconscious of the entire episode. The flame of the Holy Ghost is now the flame of orgasm, uniting both Connie and Mellors into a Oneness and a "blood-consciousness," and creating a "true and vivid relationship" between them. Immediately after this encounter, the couple verbalize their experience in far more intense language than in the first two versions.

This is the most visible change to occur between the first and third versions, the increased use of sexually explicit language in dialogue and in description. In "A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover" written two years after the final version, Lawrence writes: "and this is the real point of this book. I want men and women to be able to think sex, fully, completely, honestly and cleanly."[13]:

> The mind has to catch up, in sex: indeed, in all the physical acts. Mentally, we lag behind in our sexual thought, in a dimness, a lurking, grovelling fear which belongs to our raw, somewhat bestial ancestors. In this one respect, sexual and physical, we have left the mind unevolved. Now we have to catch up, and make a balance between the consciousness of the body's sensations and experiences, and these sensations and experiences themselves. Balance up the consciousness of the act, and the act itself. Get the two in harmony. It means having a proper reverence for sex, and a proper awe of the body's strange experience. It means being able to use the so-called obscene words, because these are a natural part of the mind's consciousness

> of the body. Obscenity only comes in when the mind despises and fears the body, and the body hates and resists the mind.[14]

Whereas in the first version discussion between Parkin and Connie is almost void of lively sexual language, dialogues in the second and third versions are progressively more saturated with "so-called obscene words." As the dialogues become more permeated with sexual language, the sexual encounters become more explicit. Not only do Connie and her lover experience more sexual freedom but Lawrence does too. As he re-writes, he is able to include more food for the mind to digest. The use of colloquial speech and"obscene" words induces the reader to read at an emotional level or not read at all. If we read at the emotional level and continue reading, then we have accepted Lawrence's intention at the level he proposes in "A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover." If the reader disagrees with the intention, then he disagrees with the artistic purpose and needs to read no further. This rather simplistic view of the reader - novel relationship is one to which Lawrence subscribed.

By the third version, Connie and Mellors indulge liberally in sexual talk:

> 'Th'art good cunt though, aren't ter? Best bit o'cunt left on earth. When ter likes! When tha'rt willin'!'
>
> 'What is cunt?' she said.
>
> 'An' doesn't ter know? Cunt! It's thee down theer; an' what I get when I'm i'side thee, and what tha gets when I'm i'side thee; it's a'as it is, all on't.'
>
> 'All on't', she teased. 'Cunt! It's like fuck then.'

> 'Nay nay! Fuck's only what you do. Animals fuck. But cunt's a lot more than that. It's thee, dost see: an tha'rt a lot besides an animal, aren't ter? - even ter fuck? Cunt! Eh, that's the beauty o' thee, lass !'[15]

In order to overcome their fear of sex, Mellors and Connie must think it cleanly as well as do it. They must balance their thought and action. It is noted above that although in his metaphysic Lawrence sees a need for man to climb down Pisgah (see above p. 48), he does not tell how to accomplish this. Now, in passages such as this, he illustrates the language which could be used by men and women to more fully enjoy sexual encounters. Sexual intercourse does not have to involve only the body but can also involve the mind, and hence the whole person. Lawrence does not intend his novel to be a sex manual. It is rather, in Nin's words, "our only complete modern love story."[16]

It is, of course, more than a love novel in that Lady Chatterley's Lover deals not only with the relationship between two lovers but also with their relationship with the rest of society, or, as Lawrence calls it, "the mob." The actions of Connie and Mellors reflect Lawrence's contempt for "mob" values. Lawrence allows his characters to solve their problems with each other and the world by methods more practical (yet perhaps just as dangerous to them) than by eliminating the "mob" with "poison gas." The relationship which the couple establishes *is* socially subversive. Connie and Mellors use language which has been ruled obscene by British courts and they engage in immoral and illegal sexual activity.

In 'Hardy,' Lawrence explains "there is no reconciliation [between light and dark] save in negation," and the sex act is negative in the sense that it produces a child - a movement back in time from adulthood. The sex act is not a negative movement in the sense of dissolution *unless* it is masturbatory and hence unproductive, (as with Connie and Michaels). Lawrence always despises onanism as does Mellors when he tells Connie of his fear of lesbians and homosexuals. Lawrence uses buggery in Woman in Love and it has social implications, as Frank Kermode writes:

> This sell-out to dissolution strongly appealed to Lawrence as a way of cracking the rind, smashing up the whole show, producing the death which must precede rebirth in people but also in races (this is why he was capable of finding some good in war). If we can get to the point of reduction where nothing is left of our mistaken civilization, the Holy Ghost will take over and lead us on again. Now, as I suggest, the analogy, for Lawrence, between the corruption of the individual in his sex and that of the race or the nation was very firmly established; and each was to be immersed in the deathflow as a means to life. The Holy Ghost is the third force that presides over Lawrencean opposites, whether they are expressed as the Law and Love, Man and Woman, or Sex and Excrement. *Thus the anal act can be a symptom of corruption within the unbroken rind, or an attempt to break out of that rind for the purpose of rebirth. This is why "healthy human beings" can commit it.* [17] (italics mine)

This Kermode says of Gudrun and Loerke. But they cannot be called "healthy" when compared to Connie and Mellors, just as England and Germany were not healthy when they dissolved into war - the results were not socially Apocalyptic because the rind of society remained intact, while thousands of lives were smashed to a pulp. Of Connie and Mellors, Kermode writes:

> [Connie] is a woman reborn, also a nation reborn. She has sex which is as far from sex in the head as it can get, "and necessary, forever necessary, to burn out false shames." The psychopomp is the phallus, and Connie now knows: "That was how it was! That was life!" No need ever to do it again; they can perhaps go back to "tenderness." They find chastity good in itself. Anyway, afterwards there is no need of more symbolic sex, except that we are told of Mellors' earlier and bad experiences with Bertha, and Chatterley's solar-plexus surrender (nothing to be hoped from *his* lumbar ganglia) to Mrs. Bolton. To Clifford, Mellors' history was but one more episode in the History of man's "strange avidity for unusual sexual postures", and no doubt Lawrence meant this attitude to be disgusting; he might even have preferred the severity of the English law whereby buggery, even with one's wife, was punishable by life-imprisonment. At least the law took it seriously. So must we.[18]

By the time Lawrence writes Lady Chatterley's Lover, he can imagine two "healthy human beings," and buggery along with "normal sex" becomes socially subversive. The Holy Ghost to which Kermode originally referred is no longer present.

The Holy Ghost is replaced by the flame of intense mutual orgasm. Even mutual orgasm achieved in a masturbatory manner, between a man and woman who have experienced full productive orgasm, can generate such a flame, can carry the couple and "lead [them] on again":

> Burning out the shames, the deepest, oldest shames, in the most secret places. It cost her an effort to let him have his way and his will of her. She had to be a passive, consenting thing, like a slave, a physical slave. Yet the passion licked round her, consuming, and when the sensual flame of it pressed through her bowels and breast, she really thought she was dying: yet a poignant, marvellous death.[19]

This sensual and sensitive encounter leads Connie to the realization that

there is a man who exists beyond the Christian world, who is not ashamed of his animal instincts yet who, unlike Clifford and Michaelis, is above being "merely messy and doggy." Lawrence does not explore Mellors' reaction to the encounter and omits the physical response of the male orgasm. Instead, Lawrence emphasizes that if his characters desire a life beyond what is socially acceptable, they must break the laws of England. The transition of Lawrence's pure metaphysic into a philosophy for the novel can again be seen here. Lawrence had at one time condemned all onanism, yet here he accepts buggery between sexually "healthy people." Connie is not merely a follower of Mellors' nor does she "serve him more completely by allowing buggery." Instead both are guides. The subversive nature of onanistic sex has been explored before by Lawrence in homosexual relationships and he found it unsatisfactory as a weapon against social injustice.

In Kangaroo, the obviously homosexual Kangaroo attempts to subvert the system by armed revolution but he fails to solicit the help of Somers who shuns his homosexual advances - Somers' "heart melted in horror lest the Thing Kangaroo should suddenly lurch forward and clutch him."[20] Ironically (because Lawrence had sought the perfect male-male relationship), the pure male attempt at subversion fails whereas the male-female attempt succeeds. The "leader-cum-follower" idea of social regeneration is dead, as Lawrence explains in a letter to Witter Byner in 1928:

> The hero is obsolete, and the leader of men is back number. After all, at the back of the hero is the militant ideal: and the militant ideal, or the ideal militant, seems to me also a cold egg . .

> . . On the whole I agree with you, the leader-cum-follower relationship is a bore. And the new relationship will be some sort of tenderness, sensitive, between men and men and women and not the one up one down, lead on I follow, *ich dien* sort of business . . . .
>
> But still, in a way, one has to fight. But not in the O Glory! sort of way. I feel one still has to fight for the phallic reality, as against the non-phallic celebration unrealities. I suppose the phallic consciousness is part of the whole consciousness which is your aim. To me it's a vital part.
>
> So I wrote my novel, which I want to call John Thomas and Lady Jane. But that I have to submerge into a subtitle, and call it Lady Chatterley's Lover.[21]

Lawrence implies that real social change does not occur through wars or revolution. Real social change comes only through a heightened awareness of one's own self and one's own place in the cosmos and this can be gleaned through a tender "blood-correspondence" with another human being with similar beliefs. He emphasizes not only phallic consciousness in this heightened awareness but also "cunt awareness." This is why language must not be dirty.

Women too must be able to use and share what has traditionally been "street" talk with men in order to develop not only the long lost phallic awareness but also to regain "cunt awareness" so deceptively discovered and destroyed in Genesis. Mellors suggest: "I wouldn't preach to the men: only strip 'em an' say: Look at yourselves! That's workin' for money!"[22] By seeing himself naked, a man can regain at least the feeling of innocence. Such rebirth into the world can only be achieved

by an individual or personal Apocalypse.

The sexual act is Apocalyptic in Lady Chatterley's Lover but not in the Biblical sense. Kermode states: "the real descent into hell and rebirth Lawrence can signify only by sex. The purest expression of it is in 'The Man Who Died,' but in some ways the love-death undergone by Ursula and Connie is a fuller image because it amalgamates heaven and hell, life-flow and death-flow, in one act. The act is anal."[23] The Apocalyptic experience does not happen exclusively in the anal act. The reawakening actually begins with the third encounter. Connie and Mellors experience together, in an act of tenderness, the real meaning of mutual orgasm which is "like a flapping overlapping of soft flame." Unconsciously and consciously, Connie and Mellors have been exploring each other and are reborn through love into the animistic universe which does not acknowledge bodily shame. Mellors has to be awakened before the anal act to the tenderness of a woman who, unlike Bertha, does not have a beak between her legs. Connie is guided by Mellors who rekindles her appreciation of her asshole and cunt - "Here tha shits an' here tha' pisses" an' I like thee for it. Tha's got a proper woman's arse, proud of itself"[24] - and without this corporeal rebirth, the "refinements of passion" would not have been possible. Personal Apocalypse is a process in Lady Chatterley's Lover, not an event. It is important to Lawrence's philosophy because phallic consciousness, although a "vital part," is not the only part in the "fight for phallic reality."

Lawrence does not propose poison gas attacks and social revolutions as part of his envisioned Apocalypse. From bitter experience he has learned that society - "the mob" - cannot be battled on its own terms. Instead, he proposes in Apocalypse:

> What we want is to destroy our false, inorganic connections, especially those related to money, and re-establish the living organic connections, with the cosmos, the sun and earth, with mankind and nation and family. Start with the sun, and the rest will slowly, slowly happen.[25]

Connexions must be destroyed and to do so, we must recognize the great sun again. Mellors, in his final letter to Connie, writes:

> My soul softly flaps in the little Pentecost flame with you, like the peace of fucking. We fucked a flame into being. Even the flowers are fucked into being between the sun and the earth. But it's a delicate thing, and takes patience and the long pause.
>
> . . . And when the real spring comes, when the drawing together comes, then we can fuck the little flame brilliant and yellow, brilliant.[26]

The "little Pentecost" is a new Pentecost because "the old Pentecost isn't quite right." The old Pentecost is the Holy Ghost, the new one, the one of experience, is the baby. But there are two flames, the Pentecost flame and the little flame that can be fucked more brilliant - the orgasm. Both are "concrete" abstractions yet can be totally experienced. The sun too is flame, no longer symbolic but rather an image that points to a more concrete flame than the Holy Ghost.

Lady Chatterley's Lover is more than an attempt to expurgate the English language of "dirty" words. Lawrence has achieved what he sought

to achieve throughout his essays. He has found a language which expresses not only his philosophy but which expresses it in terms of an experience which is the common denominator of everyone's existence. There is but one challenge remaining for him, to write about Jesus using this philosophy developed for the novel and hence to reawaken the man who had been put to death by a deadened Christianity.

IV

THE ESCAPED COCK

During a walking trip through the Tirolese Alps in 1912, Lawrence carefully observed the portrayal of Christ's crucifixion. In "Christs in the Tirol," he expresses how the Christian Christ is worshipped as a pain ridden and dying Christ: "And so the monuments to physical pain are found everywhere in the mountain gloom."[1] He cares little for the symbolic Christ crucified but he respects the Risen Lord. In 1929, he writes in "The Risen Lord":

> And the Churches, instead of preaching the Risen Lord, go on preaching the Christ-child and Christ Crucified. Now man cannot live without some vision of himself. But still less can he live with a vision that is not true to his inner experience and inner feeling. And the vision of Christ-child and Christ Crucified are both untrue to the inner experience and feeling of the young.[2]

The Christ-child and Christ Crucified are dead in a sense that no person can hope to experience them, but the Risen Lord can be envisioned and becomes an inner experience of hope and life. The Risen Lord is an image which points to the inner experience of Lawrence. It is not symbolic because the human ego (and the idealism Lawrence associates with ego) is not imposed on it.

In "Introduction to These Paintings," Lawrence contemns critics of

art for trying to attach the rhetoric of Christian symbolism to modern French art which is finally removing the human ego from the object it expresses:

> And then the great symbols of this salvation. What the evangelical says: Behold the lamb of God! - what on earth does he want one to behold? Are we invited to look at a lamb, with woolly, muttony appearance, frisking and making its little pills? Awfully nice, but what *has* it got to *do* with God or my soul? Or the cross? What *do* they expect us to see in the cross? A sort of gallows? Or the mark we use to cancel a mistake? - cross it out! That the cross by itself was supposed to *mean* something always mystified me.[3]

Do not attempt to attach bogus words to experience unless these words describe the experience as such and not as accumulated human ego:

> The man of flesh has been slowly destroyed through centuries, to give place to the man of spirit, the mental man, the ego, the self-conscious I. And in his artistic soul Cézanne knew it, and wanted to rise in the flesh. He couldn't do it, and it embittered him. Yet, with his apple, he did shove the stone from the door of the tomb.[4]

Cézanne resists the temptation to "mentalize" the apple and so is able to make a "first tiny step back to real substance, to objective earth." Lawrence takes this "step back" in 1925 when he writes "Sun."

By 1930, Lawrence steps far enough back to write the story of the Risen Lord of his own experience. According to G. M. Lacy in his commentary on The Escaped Cock:

> It should come as no surprise, therefore, to find that the real beginning of Lawrence's work on the theme [of resurrection] of what was to be his last

> major novel has its roots years before, that is, arose directly out of the author's near fatal illness in Mexico in early February 1925. The theme of The Escaped Cock was evident in Lawrence's work *at least* from 1925-1930, and during this final period, the symbolism and myth of resurrection appeared again and again.[5]

Lawrence's philosophy is given an impetus by his illness in 1925 as he climbs down the heights of Pisgah. He now writes not only implicitly about life but he also states explicitly how his philosophy can be realized. The Escaped Cock returns to the language of the Bible but a language which no longer embodies the Judaeo-Christian symbolism in the sense that Cézanne's paintings are not symbolic. Lawrence uses imagery which "points to" rather than symbolizes inner experience.[6] It is important that The Escaped Cock be read, not as metaphysic, but as a philosophy and as an expression of experience. To read it as a metaphysical statement would be to impose human ego upon it. Fundamentally, like Lady Chatterley's Lover, it is a story of love and a reawakening of physical touch and tenderness. It is also structurally similar to the novel, contains similar images and deals with sexual and social issues.

The Escaped Cock begins with the man who died escaping the confines of a dead world and seeking to break old connexions:

> There was nothing he could touch, for all, in a mad assertion of the ego, wanted to put a compulsion on him, and violate his intrinsic solitude. It was a mania of the individuals, it was the mania of cities and societies and hosts, to lay a compulsion upon a man, upon all men. For men and women alike were mad with the egoistic fear of their own nothingness.[7]

Just as Lady Chatterley seeks to resurrect her body - "Give me the democracy of touch, the resurrection of the body"[8] - so the man, now resurrected, seeks to break old connexions by reviving his dead body: "How could I have been blind to the healing and the ~~bl~~iss in the crocus-like body of a tender woman!"[9] Both Connie and the man who died meet another person who is in self-imposed exile from society and who quickly senses the need of the other person. In The Escaped Cock, this person embodies the image of the sun which is far stronger as an image of physical renewal.

The man physically exposes himself to the sun in the peasant's garden and later the sun is embodied - alive - in the priestess:

> He was absorbed and enmeshed in new sensations. The body of Isis was lovely to him not so much in form, as in the wonderful womanly glow of her. Suns beyond suns had dipped her in mysterious fire, the mysterious fire of a potent woman, and to touch her was like touching the sun. Best of all was her tender desire for him, like sunshine, so soft and still. She is like sunshine upon me, he said to himself, stretching his limbs. I have never before stretched my limbs in such sunshine, as her desire for me. The greatest of all gods granted me this.[10]

The sun is now truly alive and glowing inside a woman. It is reminiscent of the sun in "Sun," and is an object of which to be terrified, but its power and flame are manifested for the man in the priestess of Isis. And the tender touch, as in Lady Chatterley's Lover, is reciprocal as the priestess too, is aroused:

> For the first time, she was touched on the quick at the sight of a man, as if the tip of a fine

> flame of living had touched her. It was the first time. Men had roused all kinds of feelings in her, but never had touched her on the yearning quick of her womb, with the flametip of life.[11]

The woman comes to know the full meaning of "blood-consciousness." As is Connie, the man who died is "taken unawares" when the relationship is consummated. The moment is not smothered with words. The woman and the man join in spontaneous love. The priestess finds her Osiris.

The man, however, does not for a moment believe he is anything more than man:

> "You are Osiris, aren't you?" she said naively.
> "If you will," he said.[12]

He is only a god if she wishes and he exists as such only in her fantasy. Lawrence suggests possibilities of gods but he is careful to show that nature is its own god and has its separate meaning beyond gods:

> . . . Only she thought: I am full of Osiris. I am full of the risen Osiris!
>
> But the man looked at the vivid stars before dawn, as they rained down to the sea, and the dog-star green towards the sea's rim. And he thought: How plastic it is, how full of curves and folds like an invisible rose of dark-petalled openness, that shows where dew touches its darkness! How full it is, and great beyond all gods. How it leans around me, and I am part of it, the great rose in space.[13]

Lawrence had once written that it is the Holy Ghost who "tracks""the Great God across the Cosmos of Creation" (see above p.45).Now the cosmos is "Great beyond all gods." Lawrence has gone beyond "old pagan systems" in his newly consolidated philosophy because he says that nature - the Cosmos - is itself an expression of the Greatest.

By using the simile of the finite and curved rose to describe the universe, Lawrence gives further approval to Mr. Einstein's universe. In Fantasia of the Unconscious Lawrence writes:

> The Jewish intelligence for centuries has been picking holes in our ideal system - scientific and sociological. Very good thing for us. Now Mr. Einstein, we are glad to say, has pulled out the very axle pin. At least that is how the vulgar mind understands it. The equation formula doesn't count. So now, the universe, according to the popular mind, can wobble about without being pinned down. Really, an anarchical conclusion. But the Jewish mind insidiously drives us to anarchical conclusions. We are glad to be driven from false, automatic fixities, anyhow. And once we are driven right on to nihilism we may find a way through.
>
> I feel inclined to Relativity myself. I think there is no one absolute principle in the universe. I think everything is relative. But I also feel, most strongly, that in itself each individual living creature is absolute: in its own being.[14]

The Escaped Cock confirms Lawrence's approval of relativity and curved space. He acknowledges that the cosmos is closer than ever to man and that every event effects every other event in this cosmos. It differs from his earlier metaphysical cosmos in that he does not try to use pseudo scientific terms to describe it. This new cosmos is not systemized. The rose is a living image of space. It is an expression of ultimate reality. As in Lady Chatterley's Lover, part of the ultimate reality is "the mob" which also has an effect on other things in the cosmos.

Lawrence's harsh statements in The Escaped Cock about victims of society have drawn some harsh reactions from critics, particularly for

his portrayal of the slaves. Kingsley Widmer writes:

> In Lawrence's final testament, The Man Who Died - his erotic redoing of the Christ myth - he again draws upon the rose in an attempt to embody a perversely sacramental sexuality. For, contrary to some of his polemics, Lawrence sought less "natural" sexuality than an absolutistic and transforming passion. Though his Christ rejects the unphysical love of Christianity, he also rejects the simple physical appeal of a peasant woman and contemptuously turns from the spontaneous copulation of the young in his longing for a mythically heightened orgasm.[15]

The priestess first notices the man who died as both are witnessing a bizarre scene in which two slaves are killing and cleaning pigeons. One bird escapes the girl and the boy beats her, then rapes her. Lawrence is not condoning rape, as spontaneous as it might be - "murder, suicide, rape . . . . It makes me feel ill . . . ."[16] - but sees it as a sickness of society. The slave boy, deprived of mind, spirit, will, freedom, soul and love, is left with one thing, his corrupt phallus energized not by love but by perverse lust. He is the male counterpart of Bertha Coutts. The priestess "found slaves invariably repellent, a little repulsive. They were so imbedded in the lesser life, and their appetites and their small consciousness were a little disgusting."[17] The man who died realizes slaves are part of the real cosmos, not alien to it:

> It was the life of the little day, the life of little people. And the man who had died said to himself: Unless we encompass it in the greater day, and set the little life in the circle of the greater life, all is disaster.[18]

A strong statement about the need to change society is not made. The man

who died recognizes greed and mistrust as the root of social ills but instead of trying to change old ways, he merely acknowledges them as part of the real world.

The parallel between this story and Lady Chatterley's Lover continues to the end. The priestess is impregnated by the man - "I have sowed the seed of my life and my resurrection, and put my touch forever upon the choice woman of this day, and I carry her perfume in my flesh like essence of roses"[19] - and there is a final note of optimism: "Tomorrow is another day."

In The Escaped Cock Lawrence goes beyond simply writing a traditional story or combination of stories about Resurrection as G. M. Lacy claims:

> Lawrence finally creates a completely "mystic new man" in the person of "the man who had died," and the curtain can only come down, the narrative tension be relaxed, and the denouement of a total literary career occur as Lawrence confronts and adapts the symbolic potential found in the Gospel account of the resurrection of Christ. Lawrence as a deeply religious man and writer is in an ancient tradition here, for most "religious" writers - particularly the moderns from Blake on - have found it necessary to work out their religious impulses in relation to the symbol or the story of Christ, to define their "religion" against not only the Christian version of resurrection, but with most of the world's known accounts of the sacred mysteries of spiritual and physical rebirth.[20]

Lawrence does far more than adapt "the symbolic potential found in the Gospel." He recreates the resurrection of Christ, discarding the traditional symbolic Christ and replacing him with a man who could have lived. He does not define his religion against the myth of Isis and Osiris but against a

backdrop far greater than any gods, the backdrop of the cosmos. He makes it clear that Osiris is the inner experience of the priestess as the Risen Christ should be for youth but the real experience is the peasants, the slaves, the soldiers, the flight and ultimately the cosmos. Lawrence does not belittle the reality of inner experience but he firmly asserts that it is not the only experience. Lawrence's "didactic purpose" *is* "large enough," and certainly "not at odds with passional inspiration."

V

CONCLUSION

This study has shown the development of what was essentially the metaphysic of a youthful D. H. Lawrence into a philosophy for the novel which he calls the "book of life." Much impetus for developing a philosophy for the novel arises because he regards the novel not only as a work of art but also as an expression of relationships between people and between people and the cosmos.

Lawrence's philosophy for this "book of life" is consolidated throughout his art but particularly in his essays wherein he experiments with dichotomous systems and language; wherein he searches for an idiom to express a synthesis of aesthetic intent and didactic purpose. Such experimentation and searching leads to the conclusion that the Judaeo-Christian idiom, with its deadening symbols and *kerygma*, is far too fragile to withstand the rigors of reality and hence the novel. He proposes the "pagan many gods," expresses an interest in animism and eventually absolves his art of the Holy Ghost, which had long served as the Great Reconciler. Eventually he turns to a new cosmology. Even Einstein's theory of relativity fits well into Lawrence's cosmology. He adapts the curved, finite and relativistic universe to his cosmos, perhaps best expressing his emotional attachment to the theory in two poems:

Relativity

I like relativity and quantum theories
because I don't understand them
and they make me feel as if space shifted
about like a swan that can't settle,
refusing to sit still and be measured;
and as if the atom were an impulsive thing
always changing its mind.[1]

Space

Space, of course, is alive
that's why it moves about;
and that's what makes it eternally spacious and unstuffy.

And somewhere it has a wild heart
that sends pulses even through me;
and I call it the sun;
and I feel artistocratic, noble, when I feel a pulse go through me
from the wild heart of space that I call the sun of suns.[2]

Recognizing science in his cosmology, Lawrence continues to synthesize a philosophy for the novel.

Driven strongly by his Mexican experiences in 1925 to a realization of his own vulnerability within the cosmos, Lawrence renews his interest in resurrection, Apocalypse and conventionally real issues like survival in a society in which he is different. This experience allows him to see objects not as symbols but as images of experience. The sun becomes connotative, not denotative, because he has broken emotionally from his Christian heritage. He is at last able to use language which clearly expresses the sun as "manifold and spontaneous reality," just as the primitives had. Lawrence, in "Sun," goes beyond Cézanne. The Holy Ghost gone, the sexual act, in particular orgasm, becomes the "non-Platonic" abstraction which he uses to express a "true and vivid relationship" between couples.

Lady Chatterley's Lover does not spring spontaneously from his pen but still is a hotly constructed "book of life." Orgasms experienced by Connie and Mellors bring them into a Oneness out of twoness and the "flame" that is fucked into being is real and substantial. The new Pentecost is "the little fucked flame" between Connie and Mellors and is anything but a Ghost. A "true and vivid relationship" is created and Lawrence "honours" this relationship in itself. He is far more didactic in Lady Chatterley's Lover but he is equally as carnal in "our only complete modern love story."

The Escaped Cock is Lawrence's last novel but it is not a summary of all his beliefs. How could he know it would be his last? It too is a "love story" but it is also like a Cézanne painting. Lawrence takes an inanimate Christ and returns to him a life of his own within a universe which is both alive as a rose and as dead as a slave. Lawrence realistically portrays greed and lust, love and hate as part of the circumambient universe. His characters, as in Lady Chatterley's Lover, undergo a resurrection through sex which, although it drastically changes their "blood-consciousness," does not drastically change society. But Relativity will take care of that. Lawrence subcribes to a philosophy of changing experience and that which is static in the changing world is, for him, dead.

The novel must live and be a book about life, an expression of new and ever changing relationships. Such are Lawrence's last two novels, where his aesthetic intent and didactic purpose coincide in a manner which is both intellectually and emotionally acceptable for the reader and for Lawrence.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Introduction

[1]Emile Delavenay, D. H. Lawrence: The Man and His Work, trans. Katharine M. Delavenay (Heinemann: London, 1972), p. 292.

[2]D. H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover (1928; rpt. Great Britain: C. Nicholls and Co. Ltd., 1969). (henceforth denoted L.C.L.)

[3]D. H. Lawrence, The Escaped Cock (1928; rpt. Los Angeles: Black Sparrow Press, 1973). (henceforth denoted E.C.)

[4]D. H. Lawrence, Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious (1921, 1922; rpt. New York: The Viking Press, 1972), p. viii.

[5]D. H. Lawrence, "Why the Novel Matters," Phoenix (1936; rpt. New York: The Viking Press, 1968), p. 535.

[6]D. H. Lawrence, "Surgery for the Novel - Or A Bomb," Phoenix, p. 520.

[7]D. H. Lawrence, "The Novel," Phoenix II, ed. W. Roberts and H. T. Moore (New York: The Viking Press, 1971), p. 416.

[8]"The Novel," p. 417.

[9]G. H. Ford, Frank Kermode, and Colin Clarke, "Critical Exchange on 'Lawrence Up-Tight'" Four Tail Pieces," Novel, 5 (Fall 1971), p. 55.

[10]Ford, Kermode and Clarke, p. 56.

[11]Ford, Kermode and Clarke, p. 58.

[12]Wayne Burns, "Lady Chatterley's Lover: A Pilgrim's Progress for our Time," from a revised version of a lecture delivered in a seminar at Lake Wilderness, Washington, August 1964, unpublished, p. 16.

[13]Burns, p. 17.

[14]Anais Nin, D. H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study (Chicago: The Swallow Press Inc., 1964), p. 13.

[15]Burns, p. 19.

[16]Nin, p. 14.

[17]F. R. Leavis, D. H. Lawrence: Novelist (1955; rpt. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969), p. 70.

[18]see H. M. Daleski, "The Quality of Lawrence," Modern Fiction Studies, 5 (Sp. 1969), 3-18; also see Graham Hough, The Dark Sun: A Study of D. H. Lawrence (London: G. Duckworth and Co. Ltd., 1956).

[19]In a recent conversation, Dr. J. Zaslove said in reference to this thesis: "Lawrence ultimately discovers that his intellectual purpose and aesthetic purpose coincide only when he writes a novel or short story that illustrates sexuality in action; i.e. the language of sexuality appears to unlock his ideals from their religious form and thereby makes unconscious intent believable for the reader, and further gives the fiction a naturalistic quality, rather than a symbolic aura."

I. The Essays

[1]D. H. Lawrence, "Study of Thomas Hardy," Phoenix (1936; rpt. New York: The Viking Press, 1968), p. 451.

[2]"Hardy," p. 452.

[3]"Hardy," p. 453.

[4]Delavenay, p. 316.

[5]"Hardy," p. 457.

[6]"Hardy," p. 459.

[7]D. H. Lawrence, Sons and Lovers (1913: rpt. Great Britain: Penguin Books, 1970).

[8]Harry T. Moore, ed., The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence (New York: The Viking Press, 1962), I, p. 302. (henceforth denoted C.L.I or C.L.II).

[9]"Hardy," p. 470.

[10]J. E. Cirlot, A Dictionary of Symbols, trans. Jack Sage (New York: Philosophical Library, 1962), p. 303.

[11]"Hardy," p. 479.

[12]J. M. Murry, "The Living Dead: D. H. Lawrence," London Magazine, 3 (May 1956), p. 62.

[13]D. H. Lawrence, 'The Crown," Phoenix II, p. 370.

[14]"Crown," p. 388.

[15]"Hardy," p. 502.

[16]"Hardy," p. 502.

[17]"Crown," p. 392.

[18]"Crown," p. 398.

[19]D. H. Lawrence, "A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover," Phoenix II, ed. W. Roberts and H. T. Moore (New York: The Viking Press, 1971), p. 492.

[20]"Crown," p. 412.

[21]"Crown," p. 378.

[22]Kermode, "Apocalyptic Types," pp. 211-212.

[23]D. H. Lawrence, 'The Reality of Peace," Phoenix, p. 669.

[24]"Peace," pp. 674-675.

[25]"Peace," p. 679.

[26]see Kermode, Ford, Clarke, "Critical Exchange"; also see Mark Spilka, "Lawrence Up-Tight, or the Anal Phase Once over," Novel, 4 (1970/71), pp. 252-267; and Colin Clarke, River of Dissolution (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1969).

[27]Kermode, Ford, Clarke, "Critical Exchange," pp. 60-61.

[28]David J. Gordon, D. H. Lawrence as a Literary Critic, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966) pp. 9-10.

[29]Lawrence, " A Propos of L.C.L.," p. 491.

[30]C.L.I, p. 319, Lawrence's views on sodomy also change; in a letter to Russell in 1915, he states his view on sodomy as: "man goes to the man to repeat masturbation on himself." In L.C.L. sodomy between male and female is acceptable as a refinement of passion although sodomy is not as explicit as some critics have argued.

[31]Harry T. Moore, The Priest of Love: A Life of D. H. Lawrence (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1974), p. 27.

[32]Moore, p. 381.

[33]C.L.I, p. 312. Lawrence tells Ottoline Morrell in 1915, "We will be aristocrats, as wise as the serpent in dealing with the mob . . . . We will found an order, and we will all be Princes, as the angels are."

[34]"Peace," p. 687.

[35]"Peace," p. 692.

[36]"Peace," p. 693.

[37]"Peace," p. 693.

[38]D. H. Lawrence, "Life," Phoenix, ed. E. D. McDonald (1936; rpt. New York: The Viking Press, 1968) p. 698.

[39]D. H. Lawrence, The Complete Poems of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Vivian de Sola Pinto and F. Warren Roberts (New York: The Viking Press, 1971), p. 182.

[40]D. H. Lawrence, "Education of the People," Phoenix, p. 630.

[41]"Education," p. 631.

[42]"Education," p. 634.

[43]"Education," p. 636.

[44]D. H. Lawrence, "Sun," The Complete Short Stories (New York: Viking Press, 1972), II, pp. 528-545.

[45]Delavenay, p. 488.

[46]"Education," p. 641.

[47]"Sun," p. 534.

[48]Moore, Priest of Love, p. 296.

[49]C.L.I, p. 566.

[50]Paul Delany, D. H. Lawrence's Nightmare (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1978) p. 367. Lawrence "even asked Mrs. Eder for an anatomical map of the human nervous system, so that he could give a scientifically correct account of the upper, spiritual consciousness; but he held that this was only a partial truth that needed the truth of blood knowledge to be made complete. This "double truth" was a tacit abandonment of his earlier ambition to construct a complete and rigorous philosophical system. From now on he would simply assert against the "facts" of science a separate and higher reality based on his immediate sense of the way things were."

[51]D. H. Lawrence, "The Two Principles," Phoenix II, p. 227.

[52]"Principles," p. 229.

[53]"Principles," p. 230.

[54]"Principles," p. 234.

[55]"Principles," pp. 234-235.

[56]"Principles," p. 235.

[57]"Principles," p. 237.

[58]D. H. Lawrence, Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious (1921, 1922; rpt. New York: The Viking Press, 1972), p. vii.

[59]Fantasia, p. 119.

[60]Fantasia, pp. 123-24.

[61]D. H. Lawrence, Kangaroo (1923; rpt. England: Penguin Books, 1971). Kangaroo is totally rejected as a leader.

[62]Fantasia, p. 213.

[63]Fantasia, pp. 211-12.

[64]D. H. Lawrence, Women in Love (1920; rpt. New York: The Viking Press, 1928), p. 337.

[65]L.C.L., pp. 118-19.

[66]Kangaroo, p. 294. Somers battles humanity much the same as Lawrence confronts humanity in the war. In so soing, Somers questions the God of

humanity: ". . . To cut himself finally clear from the lost encircling arm of the octopus humanity. To turn to the old dark gods, who had waited so long in the outer dark. Humanity could do as it liked: he did not care so long as he could get his own soul clear. For he believed in the universal soul in the profound unconsciousness of man. Not an ideal God."

[67]Moore, Priest of Love, pp. 376-377.

[68]Heinrich A. Stammler, "Apocalypse: V. V. Rozanov and D. H. Lawrence," Canadian Slavonic Papers, 16 (1974), pp. 236-237.

[69]"Hardy," p. 453.

[70]D. H. Lawrence, "On Being Religious," Phoenix, p. 728.

[71]C.L.II, p. 796.

[72]James George Frazer, The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion (1922; rpt. New York: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1974), pp. 154-155.

[73]Fantasia, p. 165.

[74]Kangaroo, p. 328.

[75]D. H. Lawrence, "Climbing Down Pisgah," Phoenix, p. 741.

[76]Delany, p. 263.

[77]"Pisgah," p. 740.

[78]Hough, Dark Sun, p. 261.

[79]"Pisgah," p. 742.

[80]"Pisgah," p. 743.

[81]L.C.L., p. 229.

[82]D. H. Lawrence, "Red Trousers," Phoenix II, pp. 562-564.

II. "Sun"

[1]Moore, Priest of Love, pp. 400-401.

[2]C.L.II, p. 865.

[3]Kingsley Widmer, The Art of Perversity: D. H. Lawrence's Shorter Fictions (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1962), p. 193.

[4]D. H. Lawrence, "Aristocracy," Phoenix II, p. 482.

[5]Stanley Diamond, In Search of the Primitive: A Critique of Civilization (New York: Transaction Books, 1974), p. 196.

[6]Diamond, p. 196.

[7]After completing this thesis, I read David Gordon's D. H. Lawrence as a Literary Critic. He essentially corroborates what I have found:

> Among [Lawrence's] many normative terms were blood. . . . initiative . . . the quick, the soul, the Holy Ghost, and Life. One of his favourites was 'Holy Ghost," which recommended itself because of its very elusiveness . . . . It reigns supreme in *Studies* of 1923. By 1925 its elevation has become precarious . . . . A few years later it has fallen. . . . Trying to write about the deep life of the spirit in a language used forother purposes and in an age in which mass communication rapidly causes fresh phraseology to become stale, Lawrence was struggling with language itself. p. 10.

[8]D. H. Lawrence, "Introduction to these Paintings," Phoenix, p. 567.

[9]"Introduction," p. 567.

[10]"Introduction," p. 571.

[11]D. H. Lawrence, "Morality and the Novel," Phoenix, p. 530.

[12]"Morality," p. 531.

[13]"Sun," p. 530.

[14]"Sun," p. 532-533.

[15]"Sun," p. 535.

[16]D. H. Lawrence, Apocalypse (1931; rpt. New York: Viking Press, 1966), p. 47.

> What we lack is cosmic life, the sun in us and the moon in us. We can't get the sun in us by lying naked like pigs on a beach. The very sun that is bronzing us is inwardly disintegrating us - as we know later. Process of katabolism. *We can only get the sun by a sort of worship: and the same with the moon. By going forth to worship the sun, worship that is felt in the blood.* (Italics mine)

III. Lady Chatterley's Lover

[1]Scott Saunders, D. H. Lawrence: The World of Five Major Novels (New York: The Viking Press, 1973), p. 181.

[2]Leavis, D. H. Lawrence: Novelist, p. 70.

[3]John Doheny, "Lady Chatterley and Her Lover," West Coast Review, 3 (Jan., 1974), p, 53.

[4]D. H. Lawrence, The First Lady Chatterley (1944; rpt. London: Heinemann, 1972), p. x.

[5]see Kingsley Widmer, "The Pertinence of Modern Pastoral: The Three Versions of Lady Chatterley's Lover," Studies in the Novel: North Texas State University, 5 (1974), pp. 298-313; also see Stepen Gill, "The Composite World: Two Versions of Lady Chatterley's Lover," Essays in Criticism, 2 (October 1971), pp. 347-364.

[6]Gill, pp. 356-357.

[7]The First Lady Chatterley, pp. 49-50.

[8]D. H. Lawrence, John Thomas and Lady Jane (1972; rpt. England: Penguin Books, 1973), p. 152.

[9]John Thomas and Lady Jane, pp. 153-154.

[10]L.C.L., p. 156.

[11]"Crown," p. 412.

[12]L.C.L., pp. 138-139.

[13]"A Propos of L.C.L.," p. 489.

[14]"A Propos of L.C.L.," p. 490.

[15]L.C.L., p. 185.

[16]Nin, An Unprofessional Study, p. 107.

[17]Kermode, "Critical Exchange," p. 57.

[18]Kermode, p. 58.

[19]L.C.L., p. 258.

[20]Kangaroo, p. 234.

[21]C.L.II, pp. 1045-1046.

[22]L.C.L., p. 229.

[23]Frank Kermode, "Lawrence on the Apocalyptic Types (1968)," D. H. Lawrence: The Rainbow and Women in Love, ed. Colin Clarke (Great Britain: MacMillan and Co. Ltd., 1969) p. 215.

[24]L.C.L., p. 232.

[25]Lawrence, Apocalypse, p. 200.

[26]L.C.L., pp. 316-317.

IV. The Escaped Cock

[1]D. H. Lawrence, "Christs in the Tirol," Phoenix, p. 54.

[2]"Risen Lord," Phoenix II, p. 573.

[3]D. H. Lawrence, "Introduction to these Paintings," Phoenix, p. 567.

[4]"Paintings," p. 568.

[5]The Escaped Cock, p. 123.

[6]I wish to thank Dr. J. Zaslove for pointing this out in a conversation.

[7]E.C., p. 34.

[8]L.C.L., p. 78.

[9]E.C., p. 46.

[10]E.C., p. 52.

[11]E.C., p. 43.

[12]E.C., p. 53.

[13]E.C., p. 58.

[14]Fantasia of the Unconscious, p. 209.

[15]Kingsley Widmer, "The Prophecies of Passion," The Centennial Review, 11 (Winter 1967), p. 88.

[16]C.L.II, p. 1096.

[17]E.C., p. 43.

[18]E.C., p. 50.

[19]E.C., p. 61.

[20]E.C., p. 124.

V. Conclusion

[1]Collected Poems, p. 524.

[2]Collected Poems, p. 525.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. WORKS BY D. H. LAWRENCE

Lawrence, D. H. Apocalypse. New York: The Viking Press, 1966.

_____. The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence. Edited and with an introduction by Harry T. Moore. 2 vols. New York: The Viking Press, 1962.

_____. The Complete Poems of D. H. Lawrence. Edited and with an introduction by Vivian de Solo Pinto and F. Warren Roberts. New York: The Viking Press, 1971.

_____. The Complete Short Stories. 3 vols. New York: The Viking Press, 1962.

_____. The Escaped Cock. Edited and with a commentary by Gerald M. Lacy. Los Angeles: Black Sparrow Press, 1973.

_____. The First Lady Chatterley. London: Heinmann, 1972.

_____. John Thomas and Lady Jane. England: Penguin Books, 1973.

_____. Kangaroo. England: Penguin Books, 1971.

_____. Lady Chatterley's Lover. England: Penguin Books, 1969.

_____. Letters to Thomas and Adele Seltzer. Edited by Gerald M. Lacy. Santa Barbara: Black Sparrow Press, 1976.

_____. Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence. Edited and with an introduction by E. D. McDonald. New York: The Viking Press, 1968.

_____. Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious. Introduction by Philip Rieff. New York: The Viking Press, 1960.

_____. The Rainbow. England: Penguin Books, 1971.

_____. Sons and Lovers. England: Penguin Books, 1970.

_____. Studies in Classic American Literature. New York: The Viking Press, 1969.

_____. Women in Love. New York: The Viking Press, 1968.

B. OTHER WORKS

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

Burns, Wayne. "Lady Chatterley's Lover: A Pilgrim's Progress for our Time." From a revised version of a lecture delivered in a seminar at Lake Wilderness, Washington, August 1964, unpublished.

Cirlot, J. E. A Dictionary of Symbols. Translated by Jack Sage. New York: Philosophical Library, 1962.

Clarke, Colin. River of Dissolution. New York: Barnes and Noble Inc., 1969.

Daleski, H. M. "The Quality of D. H. Lawrence." Modern Fiction Studies, 5 (1969), pp. 3-18.

Delany, Paul. D. H. Lawrence's Nightmare: The Writer and His Circle in the Years of the Great War. New York: Basic Book Inc., 1978.

Delavenay, Emile. D. H. Lawrence: The Man and His Work. Translated by K. M. Delavenay. Heinemann: London, 1972.

Diamond, Stanley. In Search of the Primitive: A Critique of Civilization. New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1974.

Doheny, John. "Lady Chatterley and Her Lover." West Coast Review, 3 (Jan. 1974), pp. 51-56.

Ford, G. H., Kermode, F., and Clarke, C. "Critical Exchange on 'Lawrence Up-Tight': Four Tail Pieces." Novel, 5 (Fall, 1971), p. 54.

Frazer, James George. The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion. New York: The MacMillan Press Ltd., 1974.

Gill, Stephen. "The Composite World: Two Versions of Lady Chatterley's Lover". Essays in Criticism. 2 (Oct., 1971), pp. 347-364.

Gordon, David J. D. H. Lawrence as a Literary Critic. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.

Green, Martin. The Von Richthofen Sisters: The Triumphant and Tragic Modes of Love. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1974.

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

Hough, Graham. The Dark Sun: A Study of D. H. Lawrence. London: G. Duckworth and Co. Ltd., 1956.

Hoyt, C. A. "D. H. Lawrence: The Courage of Human Contact." English Record, 14, (April, 1964), pp. 8-15.

Kermode, Frank. "Lawrence and the Apocalyptic Types (1968)." D. H. Lawrence: The Rainbow and Women in Love. Edited by Colin Clarke. Great Britain: MacMillan and Co. Ltd., 1969. pp. 203-218.

_____. The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Lawrence, Frieda. "Not I, But The Wind . . . " . 1934: rpt. Michigan: Scholarly Press Inc., 1972.

Leavis, F. R. D. H. Lawrence: Novelist. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969.

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

Murry, John Middleton. D. H. Lawrence: Son of Woman. 1931; rpt. New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1972.

_____. "The Living Dead: D. H. Lawrence." London Magazine, 3 (May 1956), pp. 57-63.

The New English Bible. Oxford University Press, 1970.

Nin, Anais. D. H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study. Chicago: The Swallow Press Inc., 1964.

Oates, Joyce Carol. The Hostile Sun: the poetry of d. h. lawrence. Los Angeles: Black Sparrow Press, 1973.

Plato. The Republic. Translated by H. D. P. Lee. England: Penguin Books, 1955.

Saunders, Scott. D. H. Lawrence: The World of Five Major Novels. New York: The Viking Press, 1973.

Schorer, Mark. D. H. Lawrence. New York: Dell Publishing Co. Inc., 1968.

_____. "On Lady Chatterley's Lover." Evergreen Review, 1 (1957), pp. 149-178.

Spilka, Mark. "Lawrence's Quarrel with Tenderness." Critical Quarterly, 9 (Winter, 1967), pp. 363-377.

_____. "Lawrence Up-Tight, or the Anal Phase Once Over." Novel. 4 (1970/71),pp. 252-267.

Stammler, Heinrich A. "Apocalypse: V.V. Rozanov and D. H. Lawrence." Canadian Slavonic Papers, 16 (1974), pp. 221-244.

Terry, C. J. "Aspects of Lawrence's Struggle with Christianity." Dalhousie Review, 54 (Spring, 1974), pp. 112-129.

West, Rebecca. D. H. Lawrence. London: Martin Secker, 1930.

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

_____. "The Pertinence of Modern Pastoral: The Three Versions of Lady Chatterley's Lover." Studies in the Novel: North Texas State University, 5 (1974), pp. 298-313.

_____. "The Prophecies of Passion." The Centennial Review, 11 (Winter, 1967),pp. 82-101.

Zaslove, Jerald. "Fiction Extended: The Genre of Apocalypse and Dead Ends." Genre, 3 (1 March, 1970), pp. 17-34.