



室蘭工業大学

学術資源アーカイブ

Muroran Institute of Technology Academic Resources Archive



## WOMEN IN LOVE : A Study of Three Relationship

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 室蘭工業大学 公開日: 2014-06-10 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: 豊国, 孝 メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/10258/3336">http://hdl.handle.net/10258/3336</a>

## WOMEN IN LOVE

— A Study of Three Relationships —

Takashi Toyokuni

The novel is a perfect medium for revealing to us the changing rainbow of our living relationships.<sup>1)</sup>

D. H. Lawrence had always been seeking for living and dynamic relationships both in his actual life and in his works. What he tried to search for was not an acute self-conscious relationship fixed, mechanized, and dehumanized by modern civilization, but a flowing, living relationship felt in the blood and the flesh. We can, therefore, say that the main theme of almost all works of Lawrence is a search for the latter. In his well-known letter to Edward Garnett, Lawrence declares that he is going to say farewell to such a type of realistic novels as *Sons and Lovers* in which the author lays stress on characters and the plot. What he is after both in *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* is, therefore, not “the old fashioned human element,” but “something new, that which is physio—non-human, in humanity”—not the character or psychology of man, but the existence of man itself. He rejects “diamond—the old stable ego of the character,” and looks for “carbon, another ego.” Giving up tracing “the history of the diamond” as the authors of ordinary novels did, he devotes himself to looking for “carbon,” and the relationship between “carbon” and “carbon.” The new theme of *Women in Love* is the relationship between “carbon” and “carbon.”

This paper is an attempt to analyze *Women in Love* from the viewpoint of the study of relationships, and throw light on Lawrence's relationships. I have divided these into three relationships, the man-woman relationship, the man-man relationship, the man-cosmos relationship.

### I. Man to Woman\*

---

\* Chapter I “Man to Woman” is to be published as “*Women in Love—A Study of the Man-Woman Relationship*” in *The English Literature in Hokkaido* XVI, however, it was rewritten for this article.

I am the poet of the Body and I am the poet of the Soul,  
 The pleasures of heaven are with me and the pains of hell  
 with me,  
 The first I graft and increase upon myself,  
 The latter I translate into a new tongue.

— Walt Whitman, *Leaves of Grass* —

The man-woman relationship is the most important of all the relationships in *Women in Love*. Four complicated relationships, Gerald-Gudrun, Loerke-Gudrun, Birkin-Hermione, Birkin-Ursula, will be treated, and Lawrence's ideal view of the man-woman relationship will be induced from them.

#### 1. The Gerald-Gudrun relationship

In "Sisters" (Chapter I), Gudrun, a woman artist, is first magnetized to something northern about Gerald. He has "clear northern flesh," "fair hair glistening like sunshine refracted through crystals of ice," and looks "pure as an arctic thing." Such words as "northern," "ice," and "arctic," used to describe Gerald's features, are worth noticing. They are not only closely connected with Gerald's death by snow, but also symbolize the barrenness of his existence, and, moreover, the dissolution of modern man dehumanized by machine civilization. Gerald, a son of the rich coal-miner, is about thirty years old, handsome, of stout built, and full of activity. Although he looks like the "Superman," he is, at the same time, "Cain" who accidentally shot his brother. Gudrun is twenty-five years old. She has "the remote virgin look of modern girls" like her sister Ursula. She is very beautiful, passive, soft-skinned, soft limbed. Her look of confidence and diffidence contrasts with Ursula's sensitive expectancy.

The famous mare episode in "Coal-dust" (IX), exposes the cruelty and sadism of Gerald who bullies a mare frightened of the locomotive at the railway crossing.

A sharpened look came on Gerald's face. He bit himself down on the mare like a keen edge biting home, and *forced* her round. She roared as she breathed, her nostrils were two wide, hot holes, her mouth was apart, her eyes frenzied. It was a repulsive sight. But he held on her unrelaxed, with an almost mechanical relentless-

ness, keen as a sword pressing into her. Both man and horse were sweating with violence. Yet he seemed calm as a ray of cold sunshine. (p. 104)

The words such as "sharpened," "keen," "sword," "mechanical," "cold," reveal the mechanization of Gerald who belongs to the same kind as the locomotive; while the mare is the symbol of primitive and innocent life. The horse is often used as the symbol of life both in *The Rainbow* and *St. Mawr*. Gudrun feels repugnance to the sadism and perversity of Gerald, on the one hand, but, on the other, she is attracted to them.

In "Water-party" (XIV), the Gerald-Gudrun relationship developing further, Gudrun feels "an unconquerable desire for deep violence against him." This feeling also shows Gudrun's sadism, perversity, and possessiveness. In this chapter, Ursula and Gudrun come across a group of cattle, and Gudrun fanatically dances in front of them. This episode is also an *exposé* of the sadistic voluptuousness in Gudrun, and is put in parallel with the mare episode. Gudrun's strident crying like a seagull suggests her lust and obscenity. Birkin, Lawrence's mouth-piece, explains their relationship to Ursula:

"Aphrodite is born in the first spasm of universal dissolution—then the snakes and swans and lotus—marsh-flowers—and Gudrun and Gerald—born in the process of destructive creation." (p. 164)

Both Gerald and Gudrun are "*fleurs du mal*," and their mutual affections take place, as it were, in the slimy mud of the death-process.

Then he clambered into the boat. Oh, and the beauty of the subjection of his loins, white and dimly luminous as he climbed over the side of the boat, made her want to die, to die. The beauty of his dim and luminous loins as he climbed into the boat, his back rounded and soft—ah, this was too much for her, too final a vision. She knew it, and it was fatal. The terrible hopelessness of fate, and of beauty. Such beauty! (p. 173)

The above sentences show Gudrun's sensuous feeling for Gerald, who has jumped into the water to save his sister Diana from drowning. The rhythmical refrains of the phrases and words reveal the inner

agitation of Gudrun, and, moreover, the words "die," "final," "fatal," "terrible," "hopelessness," and "fate" foretell not only the death of Diana, but the collapse of the Gerald-Gudrun relationship. Towards dawn, the bodies of both Diana and the young man who jumped into the water to save her, are discovered. Ending with death by water, this episode has a close connection with the plot of the novel: the Gerald-Gudrun relationship is fatal; Gerald is a modern Cain possessed by the image of death; finally he has to die in the cul-de-sac of snow.

Gerald, lost both his brother and sister in accidents, starts to run the coal-mines in place of his father, a sentimental idealist, and has an interest in it. He, cut off from the dynamic relationship with life, is obsessed by the mechanism of the great industry. It alone is real to him and he is just a part of the industrial system. In "The Industrial Magnate" (XVII), such a process of Gerald's mechanization and dehumanization is described. Individuals are mere conditions like the weather, he thinks. What matters is the pure instrumentality of the individual. He only needs the will of man in order to perform his business, and man's will is the only absolute. His will, at the present, is to take coal profitably out of the earth. It is, therefore, necessary for him to submit to Mammon. "It was the first great step in undoing, the first great phase of chaos, the substitution of the mechanical principle for the organic, the destruction of the organic purpose..." (p. 223).

Gerald, cutting off the false but almost human relationships under the reign of his father who wanted his industry to be run on love, sets up a pure inhuman relationship to serve the system. When he is alone in the evening, doing nothing, he is struck by a sudden fear, feeling the nullity of his own being. He finds his relief in women temporarily forgetting such a fear. His sex relations with Minnette, "an ice-flower," are means to fill the terrible void in him.

The rabbit episode (XVIII) is parallel with the mare episode. When Gudrun tries to catch the rabbit, "Bismark," Gerald comes around. With subtle recognition, he feels her passion of cruelty. He bullies the rabbit before Gudrun and his sister Winifred. The rabbit is the symbol of the primitive life-force, as known from the adjectives used to describe it, such as "lusty," "wild," "demonical," "powerful." Gud-

run's high voice like a seagull's crying shows that the voluptuous and obscene relationship is finally established between Gerald and Gudrun.

Gudrun looked at Gerald with strange, darkened eyes, strained with underworld knowledge, almost supplicating, like those of a creature which is at his mercy, yet which is his ultimate victor. (p. 234)

In this chapter, the word "obscene" is frequently used to describe Gerald and Gudrun, and exposes their destructive and perverse relationship against life and spontaneity.

In "Moony" (XIX), Birkin asserts that modern man, detached from the connection with life and hope, is advancing on the way to destruction: one is "the long, long African process of purely sensual understanding, knowledge in the mystery of dissolution," symbolized by a West African statuette, a female figure, at Halliday's; the other is the process shown by Gerald, a northerner:

The white races, having the Arctic north behind them, the vast abstraction of ice and snow, would fulfil a mystery of ice-destructive knowledge, snow-abstract annihilation. (p. 246)

Though Gudrun is of an African type, different from Gerald, both trace the path of disintegration. Birkin thinks of Gerald as follows:

He was one of these strange white wonderful demons from the north, fulfilled in the destructive frost mystery. And was he fated to pass away in this knowledge, this one process of frost-knowledge, death by perfect cold? (pp. 246-247)

Here, Gerald's death by snow in the *dénouement* is persistently suggested. Gerald has to accept the living man-man relationship, which Birkin proposes, in order to escape his death, but he rejects it.

In "Death and Love" (XXIV), the long death-process of Gerald's father and Gerald's lust for Gudrun are described. Outwardly, Gerald goes on more or less mechanically with his business. However, the real activity is his terrible interior wrestling with death. To forget the fear of death, he only finds his peace in sexual relations with Gudrun. Just as he is perfected in them, so she is filled by touching his body

and having relations with him. Both of them are deficient as a separate being, and always feeling uneasy and uncertain. Their relationship is not a direct, dynamic, and living one, but a mental, perverse, and fixed one. After all, their love is purely mental, and, moreover, the self-conscious love in which one thinks the other is one's own instrument.

He felt his limbs growing fuller and flexible with life, his body gained an unknown strength. He was a man again, strong and rounded. And he was a child, so soothed and restored and full of gratitude.

And she, she was the great bath of life, he worshipped her. Mother and substance of all life she was. And he, child and man, received of her and was made whole. His pure body was almost killed. (p. 337)

Their relationship is the variation of the Anton-Ursula relationship in *The Rainbow*, and has some mother-child elements in it.

But hard and fierce she had fastened upon him, cold as the moon and burning as a fierce salt. Till gradually his warm, soft iron yielded, yielded, and she was there fierce, corrosive, seething with his destruction, seething like some cruel, corrosive salt around the last substance of his being, destroying him, destroying him in the kiss. And her soul crystallised with triumph, and his soul was dissolved with agony and annihilation. So she held him there, the victim, consumed, annihilated. She has triumphed: he was not any more.<sup>2)</sup>

The above sentences are quoted from the famous scene of *The Rainbow* in which Ursula has a destructive physical relation with Anton. Ursula and Gudrun are the "Magna Mater" as the collective unconsciousness of man asserted by Jung, and both Anton and Gerald are their victims. Gudrun as well as Ursula is the "Great Mother" that has the dualism of life and death. Such mother-child elements in the Gerald-Gudrun relationship are later distorted and caricatured in the relationship between Clifford and Mrs. Bolton without sex relations in *Lady Chatterley's Lovers*.

In "Continental" (XXIX), Gerald and Gudrun come to the Tyrolese

mountains, and meet Birkin and Ursula together. The snow functions as the symbol of abstract, mental knowledge, as is the same with the last scene of *The Man Who Loved Islands*. Lawrence seemed to feel repugnance against snow and ice in his actual life. His letter to Mary Cannan dated (?) 12 February 1922, says, "It is so cold. The almond blossom is out, and looks and *feels* like snow. I don't even like the look of it: it gives me that sick feeling of snow."<sup>3</sup>) He was disgusted at even almond blossoms which brought up the image of snow. Perhaps his repugnance against snow was related to his lifelong enemy, his physical illness. In his letter to Hon. Dorothy Brett under the date of February 12 1928, Lawrence says, "We've been here three weeks in deep snow. For two days it has snowed all day—today it seems to be raining: thaw. I must say I rather hate it: and my cough is as bad as ever; in fact I believe snow is bad for bronchials."<sup>4</sup>) He hated snow, frost, ice, and winter, that is everything he thought was bad for his health. Moreover, the north is the country of death for him.

He saw the blind valley, the great cul-de-sac of snow and mountain peaks under the heaven. And there was no way out. The terrible silence and cold and the glamorous whiteness of the dusk wrapped him round... (p. 391)

The Gerald-Gudrun relationship is on the brink of ruin in the scene of the great cul-de-sac of barren snow. To her, Gerald is only a "perfect instrument," a "pure, inhuman almost superhuman instrument," and she wishes to be a god to make use of him as an instrument.

In "Snowed Up" (XXX), a vital and final conflict sets in their relationship. It is a fierce battle for them to become either a ruler or a slave.

His passion was awful to her, tense and ghastly, and impersonal, like a destruction, ultimate. She felt it would kill her. She was being killed. (p. 435)

Gerald on his part, feels a sadistic and distorted desire to kill her:

His mind was absent all the evening, estranged by the snow and his passion. But he kept the idea constant within him, what

a perfect voluptuous consummation it would be to strangle her, to strangle every spark of life out of her, till she lay completely inert, soft, relaxed for ever, a soft heap lying dead between his hands, utterly dead. (p. 452)

It is the same with Gudrun's case :

Ooh, but how she hated the infant crying in the night. She would murder it gladly. She would stifle it and bury it, as Hetty Sorrel did. (p. 457)

Seeing Gudrun with Loerke, a German sculptor, Gerald realizes that their relationship comes to an end, knocks Loerke down, and nearly strangles her to fulfil his voluptuous desire. He goes on drifting in the snow, obsessed with an idea that he actually killed her. And when he sees a half-buried crucifix in the snow, he has a great dread of being murdered :

Yet why be afraid? It was bound to happen. To be murdered! He looked round in terror at the snow, the rocking, pale, shadowy slopes of the upper world. He was bound to be murdered, he could see it. This was the moment when the death was uplifted, and there was no escape. (p. 465)

The above-mentioned sentences reveal the consciousness of sin, the consciousness of a murderer, in the inner soul of Gerald who accidentally shot his brother. The above quotation also exposes the deep fear of the man who cannot face his death unflinchingly, because he has not fully lived his life. Finally he is frozen to death in a hollow basin of snow. It is as if he were freezing from the inside as well as from the outside. It is the death-process of mechanization and dehumanization of modern man, and an inevitable consequence for Gerald, a denier of life. He should not ask for the limited man-woman relationship possessed by death and lust, but search for the free, living relationship. He could also have accepted Birkin's offer, the dynamic man-man relationship, if he had had a courage to do so. It is, however, first necessary for him to establish his perfect separate being.

And Gerald! The denier! He left the heart cold, frozen,

hardly able to beat. Gerald's father had looked wistful, to break the heart: but not this last terrible look of cold, mute Matter. Birkin watched and watched. (p. 472)

Thus, the Gerald-Gudrun relationship, symbolized by the snow and ice, comes to a barren end.

## 2. The Loerke-Gudrun relationship

Gudrun, despaired and disgusted at her relations with Gerald, is magnetized to Loerke at the hotel in Innsbruck. He has the figure of a boy, almost as a street arab. His legs are thin, but he never makes an attempt to disguise the fact. It is both his old man's look and "his uncanny singleness, a quality of being by himself, not in contact with anybody else" that magnetizes her.

His eyes were arresting—brown, full, like a rabbit's, or like a troll's, or like the eyes of a lost being, having a strange, dumb, depraved look of knowledge and quick spark of uncanny fire. (p. 413)

The words such as "troll," "dumb," "depraved," "uncanny," are fit for depicting Loerke who rejects life and is the symbol of the last stage of the dissolution of modern man. To him, art must serve industry, and man only exists to serve the machine, and enjoy the mechanical motion in his body. The machine is the very god for him, and man cannot serve the machine until human elements are deprived of him. F. R. Leavis says, "We have here the clear presence of Niðhǫgg, the evil power who gnaws at the roots of Yggdrasil, the tree of life. 'Loerke' blends the suggestion of 'Loki' with that of the evil 'lurker.'"<sup>5</sup> Loerke is a "gnawing little negation, gnawing at the root of life," and the very image of anti-life. To describe him who goes through the process of death in life, such adjectives as "uncanny" and "sinister" are repeatedly used.

To Gudrun there was in Loerke the rock bottom of all life. Everybody else had their illusion, must have their illusion, their before and after. But he, with a perfect stoicism, did without any before and after, dispensed with all illusion. He did not deceive himself in the last issue. In the last issue he cared about nothing,

he was troubled about nothing, he made not the slightest attempt to be at one with anything. He existed a pure, unconnected will, stoical and momentaneous. There was only his work. (p. 417)

The stage of dissolution Loerke is in is that of the rock bottom of depravation where man can no longer sink down. Though there are no sex relations between them, Gudrun feels she is connected with him at the core of their beings. Compared with the Loerke-Gudrun relationship which is only ruled by abstract knowledge, the Gerald-Gudrun relationship is thought to be somewhat more human, because the latter has some physical contact in it.

They were almost of the same ideas. He hated Mestrovic, was not satisfied with the Futurists, he liked the West African wooden figures, the Aztec art, Mexican and Central American. He saw the grotesque, and a curious sort of mechanical motion intoxicated him, a confusion in nature. (p. 439)

Both Loerke and Gudrun go towards the dissolution through the West African process, and their contact is a kind of game which corresponds with each other only in their heads. Both have a taste for the West African figures and the achieved perfections of the past, and never talk of the future save the destruction of the world.

Repelled by the world of usurping 'idea' and will with its triumphs of automatism and mechanical order, they can only react to the other extreme, or cultivate the finished perfections of the past in a subtler denial of creative life in the present.<sup>6)</sup>

To them art is the only reality, and life, the unreality. Their connection exists merely in the stage of abstract mentality. Later he invites her to become his mistress. It is only because he needs a little companionship in intelligence. Their relationship is just a kind of intellectual game, so there is no future development any longer.

### 3. The Birkin-Hermione relationship

We will analyze the third man-woman relationship that of Birkin and Hermione. Birkin, a school inspector, is thin, pale, and ill-looking, though he is full of life. "His figure is narrow but nicely made." He

goes with a slight trail of one foot. Although he is dressed neat and tidy, there is "an innate incongruity, which causes a faint ridiculousness in his appearance." While Hermione, the daughter of the rich baronet, has a long, pale face, which she carries lifted up, in the Rossetti fashion. There is something repulsive about her. Birkin and Hermione have been lovers for years.

She always felt vulnerable, vulnerable, there was always a secret chink in her armour. She did not know herself what it was. It was a lack of robust self, she had no natural sufficiency, there was a terrible void, a lack, a deficiency of being within her. (p. 11)

Wanting someone to close up this deficiency, she craves for Birkin. Their relationship is the same as the Gerald-Gudrun, and the Loerke-Gudrun relationships in its barrenness and deficiency. Hermione is a woman possessed by abstract knowledge, so accordingly, she has no dynamic life-power. Birkin hates her in his innermost soul.

"You are merely making words," he said; "knowledge means everything to you. Even your animalism, you want it in your head. You don't want to *be* an animal, you want to observe your own animal functions, to get a mental thrill out of them. It is all purely secondary—and more decadent than the most hide-bound intellectualism. (p. 35)

To her, her love for Birkin is just a perverse mental relation.

And it was this failure which broke the love between them. He hated her, for her incapacity in love, for her lack of desire for him, her complete and almost perfect lack of any physical desire towards him. Her desire was all spiritual, all in the consciousness. She wanted him all, all through the consciousness, never through the senses.<sup>7)</sup>

The above sentences from "Prologue to *Women in Love*" explains their relationship well. Hermione is a variation of Miriam in *Sons and Lovers*. Besides, the Paul-Miriam relationship is the archetype of the Birkin-Hermione relationship. To Hermione, "I must know" is the main purpose of her life, and, consequently, it is an obsession for her

to know everything Birkin knows. Namely, "to 'know' is to possess, and to possess is to destroy; it is a self-defeating process."<sup>8</sup>)

Birkin, on the other hand, severely rebukes, hates, and rejects what is in Hermione. In other words, he also realizes that there is the same dangerous potentiality in his own self. It is better to say that he could also be aware of it through the negative, barren relationship between them. To speak paradoxically, the Birkin-Hermione relationship is essential to starting the only positive relationship between Birkin and Ursula. The latter cannot be formed until the former is denied. Hence, to Hermione, Birkin is the fatal enemy to frighten and destroy her very existence.

And then she realised that his presence was the *wall*, his presence was destroying her. Unless she could break out, she must die most fearfully, *walled up* in horror. And he was the *wall*. She must break down the *wall*—she must break him down before her, the awful obstruction of him who obstructed her life to the last. It must be done, or she must perish most horribly. (*italics mine*) (pp. 97-98)

"Wall" repeatedly used here, has a double meaning: first, it means the obstruction to threaten her presence; secondly, abstract knowledge, because "wall" reminds us of coldness or whiteness, and, accordingly, the image of snow. Therefore, the image of "wall" also reveals the barrenness and blankness of her own existence. Moreover, the phrase "walled up" is closely related to "Snowed Up" (XXX), in which Gerald dies by cold. Hermione tries to strike Birkin to death with the beautiful blue ball of lapis lazuli, while Gerald nearly strangles Gudrun in "Snowed Up." In both scenes, Gerald and Hermione feel the "final voluptuous consummation." At any rate, the Birkin-Hermione relationship has been shattered, and the Birkin-Ursula relationship starts.

#### 4. The Birkin-Ursula relationship

The Birkin-Ursula relationship, the only positive and dynamic one, progresses in the complicated entanglement of negative relationships such as the Gerald-Gudrun, and the Loerke-Gudrun relationships. To Birkin, human beings in modern civilization are "dry-rotten," and "apples of Sodom," and their insides are "full of bitterness, corrupt

ashes." He is going to ask for a new man-woman relationship through his realization that he is also one of them.

Ursula, a school mistress who later forms her relationship with him, is described as follows:

Ursula having always that strange brightness of an essential flame that is caught, meshed, contravened. She lived a good deal by herself, to herself, working, passing on from day to day, and always thinking, trying to lay hold on life, to grasp it in her own understanding. Her active living was suspended, but underneath, in the darkness, something was coming to pass. If only she could break through the last integuments! She seemed to try and put her hands out, like an infant in the womb, and she could not, yet not. Still she had a strange prescience, an intimation of something yet to come. (p. 3)

Ursula is sympathetically depicted, as is known from the phrases, "essential flame," and "trying to lay hold on life." In the world of the unconscious, she is expecting for something to make her life sufficient and meaningful. The Swan-knight who answers her expectancy is Birkin.

In "An Island" (XI), Birkin denies conventional love. He says to her, "They say that love is the greatest thing; they persist in *saying* this, the foul liars, and just look at what they do!" It is necessary for him to reject such a self-conceived mental love as his love for Hermione—that is, to deny his old self. Ursula, though knowing how depraved the actuality of humanity is, rather feels contempt and hate in his preachy style of speaking, because the "Salvator Mundi touch" of Birkin makes her disgusted. Lawrence could not properly separate the character from the writer in Birkin's sermonizing, so, in consequence, too much of Lawrence is exposed here. His impudence as well as charm exposed without reserve, is calmly described from Ursula's point of view.

And it was this duality in feeling which he created in her, that made a fine hate of him quicken in her bowels. There was his wonderful, desirable life-rapidity, the rare quality of an utterly

desirable man: and there was at the same time this ridiculous, mean effacement into a Salvator Mundi and a Sunday-school teacher, a prig of the stiffest type. (p. 122)

Richard Aldington writes of the duality of Lawrence:

According to Aldous Huxley, all Lawrence's decisions in life were determined by his instinctive will always to preserve the artist in him. Whether this is true or not, no one can deny that the conflict or series of inner conflicts dating from childhood gave him almost a Jekyll and Hyde personality—lover and hater, charmer and scandal-monger, artist and preacher, a Siamese twin psychology of *frères ennemis*.<sup>9)</sup>

The duality Ursula felt in Birkin, is, therefore, the duality in Lawrence himself—the artist full of “living creative impulse,” and the preacher who is impudent and priggish.

In “Mino” (XIII), he preaches to Ursula about the new man-woman relationship:

“At the very last, one is alone, beyond the influence of love. There is a real impersonal me, that is beyond love, beyond any emotional relationship. So it is with you. But we want to delude ourselves that love is the root. It isn't. It is only the branches. The root is beyond love, a naked kind of isolation, an isolated me, that does *not* meet and mingle, and never can.” (p. 137)

What is essential to Birkin's new man-woman relationship is a “separate being” as man and woman, beyond a mental or over-conscious self. Arriving at the above-mentioned stage, one can, for the first time, form the new relationship. However, she retorts him, “If there is no love, what is there?” In this chapter, Birkin is not quite confident in his theory. And when Ursula asserts that his theory of the man-woman relationship is selfish, he only says, “But it isn't selfish at all. Because I don't *know* what I want of you. I deliver *myself* over to the unknown, in coming to you. I am without reserves or defences, stripped entirely, into the unknown” (p. 138). She forces him to make her a conventional profession of love. To her, he is “so absurd in his words.” It seems the writer himself describes Birkin, his spokesman, with a

comical and ironical touch. Even Lawrence is not quite sure of his theory, so it is natural that Birkin's theory of the man-woman relationship should be wanting in persuasive power.

"What I want is a strange conjunction with you—" he said quietly; "—not meeting and mingling; —you are quite right: —but an equilibrium, a pure balance of two single beings: —as the stars balance each other." (p. 139)

Ursula thinks such eagerness of Birkin is rather ridiculous and commonplace. The sentence, "But why drag in the stars," is her interior comment on his saying, but at the same time we can feel something self-scorned and self-conscious of the writer. At the end of this chapter, Birkin cannot but say, "I love you. I am bored by the rest."

In "Water-party" (XIV), the Birkin-Ursula relationship is depicted in contrast with the Gerald-Gudrun relationship. To Birkin, both Gerald and Gudrun are "*fleurs du mal*" born in the process of destructive creation. Not only Birkin but Ursula is a "*fleur du mal*" in part. In the Birkin-Ursula relationship, they must develop into self-reformation through the process of self-abnegation. She can first form her real man-woman relationship with him after going through such a process. And she finds that she is deeply and passionately in love with him, and is capable of nothing, waiting for him to come to her. Thus, realizing her passionate love for Birkin, she stands at the cross-road of life, whether accepting the idea of conventional love or agreeing with him by denying the former—whether choosing death in life or life and hope. She has been almost dead in essence as a modern woman in machine civilization. If she can form a living relationship with him, it is her initiation into the resurrection, the rebirth from the world of mechanical death. To her, another shameful, barren school week is unbearable. She must say farewell to her old world and her old self so as to form the new relationship with him.

"Unless I set my will, unless I absolve myself from the rhythm of life, fix myself and remain static, cut off from living, absolved within my own will. But better die than live mechanically a life that is a repetition of repetitions. To die is to move on with the

invisible. To die is also a joy, a joy of submitting to that which is greater than the known; namely, the pure unknown. (p. 184)

Ursula, having been aware of her mechanized life, realizes that she is also tracing the way to dissolution detached from life, as Gerald and Gudrun are doing. Namely, her realization is not only an agreement to Birkin's theory of "singleness" or "polarity," but also the process of her establishing a "separate being." When Birkin comes to see her, she suddenly feels a "pure dart of hate." It is because she has an antipathy against his ill-health—in other words, it is her naive sympathy with life—and also her femininity resists his masculinity:

It was so completely incomprehensible and irrational. She did not know *why* she hated him, her hate was quite abstract. She had only realised with a shock that stunned her, that she was overcome by this pure transportation. He was the enemy, fine as a diamond, and as hard and jewel-like, the quintessence of all that was inimical. (p. 190)

Simultaneously, Birkin confined to his bed considers the man-woman relationship:

He believed in sex marriage. But beyond this, he wanted a further conjunction, where man had being and woman had being, two pure beings, and each constituting the freedom of the other, *balancing each other like two poles of one force*; like two angels, or two demons. (*italics mine*) (p. 191)

His theory of the relationship is something like the resultant of a set of parallel forces in physics, which is also applied to Gestalt psychology. "The resultant of two forces is defined as the single force which, if acting alone, will produce the same effect as the simultaneous action of its components." In Birkin's theory of the relationship, the resultant force is "one force," namely, the living man-woman relationship, which is frequently called "Holy Ghost," or "the rainbow," by Lawrence. And "two poles" are components of force, man's being and woman's being. The resultant force, the living man-woman relationship, is therefore a kind of equilibrium between man and woman.

The relationship which Birkin wants is the free, dynamic one that is neither self-conscious nor bound as conventional love or sex. "Hot narrow intimacy between man and wife is repulsive to him." However, woman has always "a lust for possession," "a greed of self-importance in love," which is unbearable to him. Such a detestable womanhood, the "Magna Mater," exists even in Ursula as well as in Gudrun and Hermione. So it is necessary for Birkin not to be subjected to the "Magna Mater" in Ursula, in order to form the real, dynamic, well-balanced relationship.

In "Moony" (XIX), the famous moon episode shows the fierce conflict between man and woman. Birkin again and again throws stones at the image of the moon reflected on the water, shouting, "Cybele—curse her! The accursed Syria Dea!"

Then again there was a burst of sound, and a burst of brilliant light, the moon had exploded on the water, and was flying asunder in *flakes of white* and dangerous fire. Rapidly, like *white birds*, the fires all broken rose across the pond, fleeing in clamorous confusion, battling with the flock of dark waves that were forcing their way in....But at the centre, the heart of all, was still a vivid, incandescent quivering of a *white* moon not quite destroyed, a *white* body of fire writhing and striving and not even now broken open, not yet violated. (italics mine) (p. 239)

The moon-image he tries to shatter is "the white goddess, the primal woman image, *das ewig weibliche*," as Graham Hough says, and "possessiveness in Ursula" as Leavis explains. Eliseo Vivas, identifying this with the Greek Aphrodite, says, "I take it therefore that Birkin is expressing the ancient and deep-rooted fear some men have felt towards women."<sup>10</sup> In short, the moon-image symbolizes Jung's "Magna Mater" that is the terrible goddess of both life and death. It is "the assertive female will" which persistently asserts female ego, more or less common in woman. Probably it also symbolizes abstract knowledge and the mental-consciousness in Birkin and Ursula because such phrases as "flakes of white" and "white birds," and the adjective "white" so often used, remind us of the image of snow.

Birkin asks Ursula to abandon "the assertive female will," adding,

"I want you to trust yourself so implicitly that you can let yourself go." She, on her part, retorts, "It is you who can't let yourself go," and she laughs at him because he looks like a "Sunday school teacher" or a "preacher." Later they become reconciled to each other through their physical contact. The remarkable thing is, however, Birkin's diffidence in his own theory of the relationship as mentioned before:

He thought he had been wrong, perhaps. Perhaps he had been wrong to go to her with an idea of what he wanted. Was it really only an idea, or was it the interpretation of a profound yearning?  
(p. 245)

Why he is diffident in his theory is because the writer's theory of the man-woman relationship is likewise imperfect, so it is natural that Birkin should not be able to persuade Ursula.

Birkin considers the dissolution which modern civilization has fallen into, and the long process to it. He becomes aware of himself going towards the purely sensual dissolution of the West African type, different from Gerald, so he must take a positive action to extricate himself from the danger of disintegration.

There was another way, the way of freedom. There was the paradisaical entry into pure, single being, the individual soul taking precedence over love and desire for union, stronger than any pangs of emotion, a lovely state of free proud singleness, which accepted the obligation of the permanent connection with others, and with the other, submits to the yoke and leash of love, but never forfeits its own proud individual singleness, even while it loves and yields.  
(p. 247)

In order to make his idea concrete, he decides to propose marriage to Ursula, make "a definite pledge," and enter into "a definite communion." Accordingly, he asks her to marry him. She, under the influence of Gudrun, wants him to be "her man," and at the same time she wants to be his "humble slave."

In "Excuse" (XXIII), a quarrel about Hermione starts between them.

"You!" she cried. "You! You truth-lover! You purity-monger! It *stinks*, your truth and your purity. It stinks of the offal you feed on, you scavenger dog, you eater of corpses. You are foul, *foul*—and you must know it. Your purity, your candour, your goodness—yes, thank you, we've had some. What you are is a foul, deathly thing, obscene, that's what you are, obscene and perverse." (p. 299)

Birkin knows there is some truth in her saying, and he is also aware that his spirituality is concomitant of a process of depravity, a kind of pleasure in self-destruction. They must form a positive man-woman relationship through this conflict. Ursula, getting angry at him, throws the wedding rings which he has bought for her at him, and goes away. After a while she returns and they are reconciled. Through her physical contact with him, she feels "a strange reality of his being, the very stuff of being, there in the straight downflow of the thighs." That is, the female in her feels the male in him, or the presence of "otherness" as Huxley says. Persuasive power is, however, lacking in their sudden reconciliation.

This was release at last. She had had lovers, she had known passion. But this was neither love nor passion. It was the daughters of men coming back to the sons of God, the strange inhuman sons of God who are in the beginning. (p. 305)

Why is this "neither love nor passion" to her who has persistently asserted love to him? It seems that Lawrence, the author, has persuaded Ursula to Birkin's theory by force.

It was all achieved for her. She had found one of the sons of God from the Beginning, and he had found one of the first most luminous daughters of men. (p. 305)

Although there are refrains of jargon in this scene, Ursula has established "a rich new circuit, a new current of passional electric energy, between the two of them." They have formed the new, dynamic man-woman relationship by "physical touch," not in the mental consciousness, but in the "blood-consciousness." They make up their mind to

write their resignations from the world of work there and then. They must say farewell to both their old self and the old world. They have, for the first time, had their sexual relation in Sherwood Forest.

Quenched, inhuman, his fingers upon her unrevealed nudity were the fingers of silence upon silence, the body of mysterious night upon the body of mysterious night, the night masculine and feminine, never to be seen with the eye, or known with the mind, only known as a palpable revelation of living otherness. (p. 312)

"Night" repeated in the above sentence is "unconsciousness" or "blood-consciousness," which is frequently called the "Dark God" in his later works. Birkin marries Ursula and establishes the eternal man-woman relationship.

Thus far we have analyzed the man-woman relationship in *Women in Love*. To Lawrence this relationship is the most primary and basic of all relationships. He first asserts that man and woman should both have a "separate being," true individuality—"the isolate self in proud singleness of being."<sup>11</sup> Conventional love, on the other hand, insists on mingling and fusing, and falls in the fixed, limited, mechanized relationship, losing the true masculine and feminine. Such a relationship only exists in the mental stage. The true man-woman relationship exists alone in the "pure blood-consciousness," or the unconscious.

The second stage is "the polarity, the equipoise of an achieved sexual harmony,"<sup>12</sup> as it were, "two in one," "polarity," or "star equilibrium." It is the resultant force between two components, the equilibrium between two stars—that is, the separate being of man and that of woman. The man-woman relationship is, in short, an emphasis on physical love in contrast to spiritual love of an acutely self-conscious civilized man. However, we must take notice of the fact that Lawrence never asserted physical love without spirit, but claimed that the man-woman relationship should be well balanced.

And this tragedy is the result of over-development of one principle of human life at the expense of the other; an overbalancing; a laying of all the stress on the Male, the Love, the Spirit, the Mind, the Consciousness; a denying, a blaspheming against the

Female, the Law, the Soul, the Senses, the Feelings.<sup>13)</sup>

It can be said that the male principle is "Spirit," while the female principle is "Flesh" or "Body."<sup>14)</sup> Lawrence laid stress on "Body" against the man-woman relationship of modern man who makes too much of "Spirit," because Lawrence thought both the body and the spirit should be well-balanced in the man-woman relationship. In other words, he appealed to the top-heavy modern men whose body is split from the spirit, that they should return to the original image of man, the whole man.

His man-woman relationship was, on the other hand, a means to escape from the bondage of his mother's love for him, who was a mother-child, and also from his acute self-consciousness of it. His letter to Rachel Annand Taylor dated December 3 1910, says:

This has been a kind of bond between me and my mother. We have loved each other, almost with a husband and wife love, as well as filial and maternal. We knew each other by instinct. She said to my aunt--about me:

'But it has been different with him. He has seemed to be part of me.'—And there is the real case. We have been like one, so sensitive to each other that we never needed words. It has been rather terrible and has made me, in some respects, abnormal.<sup>15)</sup>

Such a mother-child relationship was completely analyzed and exposed in *Sons and Lovers*: Mrs. Morrel, Paul's mother, has to die to cut off the fixed relationship between mother and son. Lawrence says in his poem:

.....  
 I kiss you good-bye, my dearest,  
 It is finished between us here.  
 Oh, if I were calm as you are,  
 Sweet and still on your bier!  
 Oh God, if I had not leave you  
 Alone, my dear!

Is the last word now uttered?

Is the farewell said?  
 Spare me the strength to leave you  
 Now you are dead.  
 I must go, but my soul lies helpless  
 Beside your bed.

—“The Virgin Mother,” *The Complete Poems*—

Besides, Lawrence had to cut off his relations with Jessie Chambers, the model of Miriam in *Sons and Lovers*, because he found Jessie was also a woman of his mother's type, asking for only spiritual love. Accordingly, one of the reasons why he persistently denied “spirituality” or the “mental-consciousness” in the man-woman relationship was his inevitable assertion to establish the separate being of Lawrence who had suffered from a mother-complex.

His theory about the man-woman relationship is also a kind of resistance against woman's assertive will and possessiveness. It is his deep-rooted fear for the “Magna Mater” that rules both life and death. In his real life, he had to maintain the dynamic yet fierce man-woman relationship with his wife Frieda who was of a hot temper and full of vitality. He said in his letter, “In a way Frieda is the devouring mother. It is awfully hard, once the sex relation has gone this way, to recover. If we don't recover, we die.”<sup>16)</sup> That is the reason why Lawrence laid stress on the separate being of both man and woman. And he, often overcome by her vitality and her female will, would have to form the theory of man's dominance over woman in his later works—that is, the assertion that man must lead woman.

Lawrence wrote to Katherine Mansfield in the same letter :

I do think men must go ahead absolutely in front of their women, without turning round to ask for permission or approval from their women. Consequently the woman must follow as it were unquestioningly. I can't help it, I believe this. Frieda doesn't. Hence our fight.

Thus, Lawrence asserts man's superiority over woman in the man-woman relationship, and therefore the man-man relationship is emphasized in his later novels, such as in *Aaron's Rod*, *Kangaroo*, and

*The Plumed Serpent*. Especially in *The Plumed Serpent*, Kate, the heroine, swears complete submission to Cipriano. Here, the "two in one" relationship has changed to a "one up and one down" relationship, and consequently, woman must submit to the positive "power-soul" or the "power-urge" in man. However, in his last novel, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, he again lays stress on "tenderness" or "harmony" in love, the man-woman relationship. Not only is it a sort of his reconciliation with women, but is it also a resignation of Lawrence who, being aware of his own death, could no longer maintain a "hard gem-like flame" of the man-woman relationship?

## II. Man to Man

Secondly, I do believe in friendship. I believe tremendously in friendship between man and man, a pledging of men to each other inviolably. But I have not ever met or formed such friendship. Also I believe the same way in friendship between men and women, and between women and women, sworn, pledged, eternal, as eternal as the marriage bond, and as deep. But I have not met or formed such friendship.<sup>17)</sup>

The man-man relationship is as important a theme as the man-woman relationship in his works. Such a relationship is seen between Cyril and George in *The White Peacock*, Birkin and Gerald in *Women in Love*, Aaron and Lilly in *Aaron's Rod*, Richard and Kangaroo in *Kangaroo*, and Ramon and Cipriano in *The Plumed Serpent*.

The Birkin-Gerald relationship is depicted in "Prologue to *Women in Love*" as follows:

They shook hands and took leave casually, as mere acquaintances going their separate ways. Yet there remained always, for Birkin and for Gerald Crich, the absolute recognition that had passed between them then, the knowledge that was in their eyes as they met at the moment of parting. They knew they loved each other, that each would die for the other.<sup>18)</sup>

Birkin is attracted to Gerald who is fair, with "eyes like blue flashing ice." Outwardly, they behave distant and formal, however, an interplay

takes place in "the other world of the subconsciousness." Birkin's love for Gerald is something like his love for a woman.

All the time, he recognized that, although he was always drawn to women, feeling more at home with a woman than a man, yet it was for men that he felt the hot, flushing, roused attraction which a man is supposed to feel the other sex. Although nearly all his living interchange went on with one woman or another, although he was always terribly intimate with at least one woman, and practically never intimate with a man, yet the male physique had a fascination for him, and for the female physique he felt only a fondness, a sort of sacred love as for a sister.<sup>19)</sup>

There is something homosexual in the Birkin-Gerald relationship, and there also seems to be such tendency more or less in man-man relationships in his other novels.

In "Shortland" (II), Birkin and Gerald both want a dynamic man-man relationship, but they rather shrink from it:

They parted with apparent unconcern, as if their going apart were a *trivial occurrence*. And they really kept it to the level of *trivial occurrence*. Yet *the heart of each burned from the other. They burned with each other, inwardly*. This they would never admit. They intended to keep their relationship a casual free-and-easy friendship, they were not going to be so unmanly and unnatural as to allow any *heart burning* between them. They had not the faintest belief in deep relationship between men and men, and their disbelief prevented any development of their powerful but suppressed friendliness. (italics mine.) (p. 28)

There are too many refrains without meaning in the above sentences. Lawrence sometimes uses meaningless refrains and jargon, which is one of his defects.

The famous chapter "Water-party" exposes Gerald obsessed by death, because he is a modern Cain who shot his brother by accident, and, moreover, could not save Diana from drowning before his eyes. When Birkin tries to make Gerald forget "a millstone of beastly memories round his neck," Gerald does not respond to him. Gerald,

however, puts his hand on Birkin's shoulder, which is a "physical touch" to make their relation more intimate :

There was a pause, intense and real. Birkin wondered why his own heart beat so heavily. Then Gerald's fingers gripped hard and communicative into Birkin's shoulder, as he said :

"No, I'll see this job through, Rupert. Thank you—I know what you mean. We're all right, you know, you and me." (p. 181)

Such physical contact in the man-man relationship is frequently seen in his works. For example, in his short story, *The Blind Man*, Maurice feels "the passion of friendship" for Bertie through his physical touch ; Bertie, a successful barrister, cannot bear it, because he feels himself neuter and nothing at the center :

Bertie could not answer. He gazed mute and terror-struck, overcome by his own weakness. He knew he could not answer. He had an unreasonable fear, lest the other man should suddenly destroy him. Whereas Maurice was actually filled with hot, poignant love, the passion of friendship. Perhaps it was this very passion of friendship which Bertie shrank from most.<sup>20)</sup>

The man-man relationship in modern civilization only exists in the mental stage. A man who has lost living connections with other men must be destroyed in the terrible abstraction of the white snow as Cathcart of *The Man Who Loved Islands*.

Only he still derived his single satisfaction from being alone, absolutely alone, with the space soaking into him. The grey sea alone, and the footing of his sea-washed island. No other contact. Nothing human to bring its horror into contact with him. Only space, damp, twilight, sea-washed space! This was the bread of his soul.<sup>21)</sup>

Lawrence, becoming aware of the isolation and barrenness of modern man, severely accuses them. It is also his belief that man cannot live without human contact.

In "Man to Man" (XVI), the Birkin-Gerald relationship develops further.

Quite other things were going through Birkin's mind. Suddenly he saw himself confronted with another problem—the problem of love and eternal conjunction between men. Of course this was necessary—it had been a necessity inside himself all his life—to love a man purely and fully. Of course he had been loving Gerald all along, and all along denying it. (p. 198)

Birkin offers Gerald, "As both you and I are exceptional people, we want to be free and extraordinary, in an extraordinary world of liberty." His offer is the reflection of the wish of Lawrence who wanted to establish his Utopia, "Ranim." Moreover, he asks Gerald to swear a *Blutbruderschaft*, a blood-brotherhood sworn by the old German knights, as Lawrence proposed to Middleton Murry in his actual life. Gerald hesitates to accept the relationship of the blood-brotherhood which Birkin insists on. It is, however, no wonder that Gerald should not have accepted it because Birkin has denied and repressed his love for Gerald, though he loves him all the time. Why must Birkin deny or repress his love, if such a man-man relationship is so positive and essential for both of them? This is a kind of contradiction in Birkin's theory of the man-man relationship, though the writer intended to make this blood-brotherhood an initiation into the living relationship between man and man.

Birkin and Gerald do *jiu-jitsu*, Japanese wrestling in "Gladitorial" (XX). It is again "physical contact" that Lawrence emphasizes. The real connection starts when they give up the mental-consciousness as is the same with the man-woman relationship. This *judo*-practicing is also supposed to be their initiation into the man-man relationship.

Often, in the white interlaced knot of violent living being that swayed silently, there was no head to be seen, only the swift, tight limbs, the solid white backs, the physical junction of two bodies clinched into oneness. Then would appear the gleaming ruffled head of Gerald, as the struggle changed, then for a moment the dun-coloured, shadow-like head of the other man would lift up from the conflict, the eyes wide and dreadful and sightless. (p. 263)

Both Birkin and Gerald become unconscious, exhausted by wrestling. The importance of this wrestling lies in the fact of throwing away the

over-conscious ego of modern man. Such physical contact between man and man is again and again used in his other works. Especially in *The Plumed Serpent*, it is used as a ritual when Ramon and Cipriano become divine.

It is this "additional perfect relationship between man and man" that Gerald, who becomes only an instrument in both his business and his man-woman relationship, needs:

The other way was to accept Rupert's offer of alliance, to enter into the bond of pure trust and love with the other man, and then subsequently with the woman. If he pledged himself with the man he would later be able to pledge himself with the woman: not merely in legal marriage, but in absolute mystic marriage. (p. 345)

Gerald, cut off from both his man-man and man-woman relationships has to be destroyed in the isolated snow.

Birkin went home again to Gerald. He went into the room and sat down on the bed. Dead, dead and cold!

"Imperial Caesar dead and turned to clay  
would stop a hole to keep the wind away."

There was no response from that which had been Gerald. Strange, congealed, icy substance—no more. No more! (p. 470)

Gerald can not form human relationships, free, living, and dynamic, because he is the denier of life.

The last scene in this novel ends with the dialogue between Birkin and Ursula:

"Did you need Gerald?" she asked one evening.

"Yes," he said.

"Aren't I enough for you?" she asked.

"No," he said. "You are enough for me, as far as a woman is concerned. You are all women to me. But I wanted a man friend, as eternal as you and I are eternal." (p. 472)

This eternal friendship, the man-man relationship, later becomes a "master-servant" relationship in *Aaron's Rod*, *Kangaroo*, and *The Plumed Serpent*—Lawrence asserts that the inferior must submit to

the superior.

Master and servant—or master and man relationship is, essentially, a polarized flow, like love. It is a circuit of vitalism which flows between master and man and forms a very precious nourishment to each, and keeps both in a state of subtle, quivering, vital equilibrium.<sup>22)</sup>

However, such a master-man relationship was denied by Lawrence in his later days, and “tenderness” or “harmony” in the man-woman relationship is especially laid stress on.

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 men and women, and not the one up-one down, lead on I follow, *ich dien* sort of business.<sup>23)</sup>

In any event, the man-man relationship is a “power urge” in contrast with a “love urge,” the man-woman relationship. It seems that the former functions as the “compensation” for Lawrence’s imperfect man-woman relationships. It is also the wish-fulfilment of Lawrence who was not in good terms with society. He says in “Autobiographical Sketch.”

By which I mean that I don’t feel there is any very cordial or fundamental contact between me and society, or me and other people. There is a breach. And my contact is with something that is non-human, non-vocal.

.....

It is since coming back from America that I ask myself seriously: Why is there so little contact between myself and the people whom I know?...

The answer, as far as I can see, has something to do with class. Class makes a gulf, across which all the best human flow is lost. It is not exactly the triumph of the middle classes that has made the deadness, but the triumph of the middle class *thing*.<sup>24)</sup>

Lawrence’s human relationships, relationships with both his wife

and friends, did not go on so smoothly as he had expected, so he was sometimes driven to despair.

I begin to despair altogether about human relationships—feel one may just as well turn into a sort of lone wolf, and have done with it. Really I need a little reassuring of some sort.<sup>25)</sup>

Why Lawrence could not form the man-man relationship is partly because he was hypersensitive and, besides, he wanted the absolute and eternal friendship. The strict class system of English society is also responsible for his failure. He asserts that materialism of the middle class has done much harm to the natural human contact between men. His antipathy against the class system, especially his hatred for “the middle class *thing*” is very sharp. However, he was a *parvenue* from a miner’s family, so he had more or less an inferiority complex for it, either consciously or unconsciously. He was a man who lost his own class though he proudly declared he was a free man, belonging to no class.

I cannot make the transfer from my own class into the middle class. I cannot, not for anything in the world, forfeit my passional consciousness and my old blood-affinity with my fellow-men and the animals and the lands for that other thin, spurious mental conceit which is all that is left of the mental consciousness once it has made itself exclusive.<sup>26)</sup>

Lawrence’s lifelong search for the man-man relationship is, in some sense, a nostalgia for the world of miners who had “warm physical contact.”

They [miners] are the only people who move me strongly, and with whom I feel connected in deeper destiny. It is they who are, in some peculiar way, “home” to me. I shrink away from them, and I have an acute nostalgia for them.<sup>27)</sup>

It seems there also exist some feeling of compensation and longing for his father, a miner, whom Lawrence wrongly delineated in *Sons and Lovers*.

The man-man relationship includes not only his nostalgia for both

miners with "warm physical contact" and his father, but also his wish-fulfilment to be in good terms with society. The latter seems to be of much more importance in the relationship between man and man.

His need of a group is always present; he was never self-sufficient. He seems to have been one of those man who cannot add to a tradition without first wrecking it—who cannot co-operate.<sup>28)</sup>

After all, this man-man relationship is the wish-fulfilment of Lawrence who has longed for some reconciliation between himself, an isolated modern man, and society.

### III. Man to Cosmos

Come heart, where hill is heaped upon hill:  
For there the mystical brotherhood  
Of sun and moon and hollow and wood  
And rivers and stream work out their will;

And God stands winding His lonely horn.  
And time and the world are ever in flight;  
And love is less kind than a gray twilight,  
And hope is less dear than the dew of the morn.

— W. B. Yeats, "Into the Twilight" —

To Lawrence, human life exists in the relationship with everything—namely, human relationships and the relationship between man and the cosmos. He thinks modern man has done harm to the dynamic relation with the cosmos because he has conquered the universe by the development of modern science.

But civilized man, having conquered the universe, may as well leave off bossing it. Because, when all is said and done, life itself consists in a live relatedness between man and his universe: sun, moon, stars, earth, trees, flowers, birds, animals, men, everything—and not in a "conquest" of anything by anything.<sup>29)</sup>

It is essential for man to establish a direct contact with the elemental life in the cosmos with a view to revivifying human relationships fixed

and mechanized by civilization.

In "Breadably" (VIII), there is the well-known scene where Birkin, after having his head struck with a paperweight by Hermione, wanders on to the wild valley, takes off his clothes, and has a physical contact with vegetation, naked in the rain. This scene has the symbolic meaning of positively regaining the lost relationship with the cosmos. It is therefore not only a purifying ritual to shatter his fixed relationship with Hermione and his self-consciousness, but also a sort of baptism to respond to the elemental life of the universe:

To lie down and roll in the sticky, cool young hyacinths, to lie on one's belly and cover one's back with handfuls of fine wet grass, soft as a breath, soft and more delicate and more beautiful than the touch of any woman; and then to sting one's thigh against the living dark bristles of the fir-boughs; and then to feel the light whip of the hazel on one's shoulders, stinging, and then to clasp the silvery birch-trunk against one's breast, its smoothness, its hardness, its vital knots and ridges—this was good, this was very good, very satisfying.... How fortunate he was, that there was this lovely, subtle, responsive vegetation, waiting for him, as he waited for it; how fulfilled he was, how happy! (p. 100)

However, it is also the "compensation" of Lawrence who could not establish living human relationships.

He could feel a pain on the side of his head. But after all, what did it matter? What did Hermione matter, what did people matter altogether? There was this perfect cool loneliness, so lovely and so fresh and unexplored. Really, what a mistake he had made, thinking he wanted people, thinking he wanted a woman. He did not want a woman—not in the least. (p. 100)

This dichotomy, his despair and longing for human relationships, was always in Lawrence. When the breach between him and society became greater, he found both peace and rest in something non-human. After recovering from his despair, he again energetically searched for a new human relationship.

Gerald, the very image of modern man to move towards destruction, feels a deep rest for the first time when he, who is in a boat with

Gudrun, is impressed by the existence of the universe around him :

His mind was almost submerged, he was almost transfused, lapsed out for the first time in his life, into the things about him. For he always kept such a keen attentiveness, concentrated and unyielding in himself. Now he had let go, imperceptibly he was melting into oneness with the whole. It was like pure, perfect sleep, his first great sleep of life. He had been so insistent, so guarded, all his life. But here was sleep, and peace, and perfect lapsing out. (p. 170)

This “*correspondance*” with the cosmos is not accomplished by man’s reason, but by his intuition.

But by intuition alone can man *really* be aware of man, or of the living, substantial world. By intuition alone can man live and know either woman or world, and by intuition alone can he bring forth again image of magic awareness which we call art.<sup>30)</sup>

In some respects, we can say Lawrence agrees with Henri Bergson who regards intuition with much importance. In *The Sun*, his short story, it is by this intuition that Juliet responds to the sun, the center of the universe, throwing away the ostentation of her town-life.

She could feel the sun penetrating even into her bones; nay, farther, even into her emotions and her thoughts. The dark tensions of her emotion began to give way, the cold dark clots of her thoughts began to dissolve. She was beginning to feel warm right through.<sup>31)</sup>

Juliet, who was always acutely self-conscious, feels in her “quite another sort of power, something greater than herself, flowing by itself.” Such *correspondance* with the cosmos, in a certain sense, needs self-renunciation. It is also necessary for man to perceive the presence of “otherness.” Lawrence writes *Birds, Beasts, and Flowers* in such a mental state :

Unhooked his gorging, water-honey mouth,  
And seen his horror-tilted eye,

His red-gold, water-precious, mirror-flat bright eye;  
 And felt him beat in my hand, with his mucous, leaping life-  
 throbb.

And my heart accused itself  
 Thinking: *I am not the measure of creation.*  
*This is beyond me, this fish.*  
*His God stands outside my God.*

—“Fish”—

Graham Hough says Lawrence maintained pantheism, or animism:

We can, if we wish, collect labels to describe this faith. It is pantheism—every part of the universe is a manifestation of God. It is animism, in more than one sense—everything is endowed with its particular soul, its own principle of life.<sup>32)</sup>

The god Lawrence believed in is the “profound unconsciousness,” the “inward soul,” the “living darkness” in man,

Man is travail with his own soul, while ever his soul lives. Into his unconscious surges a new blood of the God-darkness, the living unutterable. And this unutterable is like a germ, a foetus with which he must travail, bringing it at last into utterance, into action, into *being*.<sup>33)</sup>

It is true that Lawrence had a kind of pantheism or animism, but not such a simple “primitive religion” as Hough writes of. I think Lawrence’s pantheism or animism is rather the re-constructed one steeped in his modern self, because at the core of it, there is always Lawrence’s respect for individuality, and, moreover, his respect for the unconscious against the acute self-conscious.

Here is my creed, against Benjamin’s. This is what I believe:  
 “*That I am I.*”

“*That my soul is a dark forest.*”

“*That my known self will never be more than a little clearing  
 in the forest.*”

.....

“*That I will never let mankind put anything over me, but I  
 will try always to recognize and submit to the gods in me and the*

*gods in other men and women.*"<sup>34)</sup>

This idea is essentially individualism, and Lawrence's "Dark God" is *the unconscious* or *the dark impulse* which exists in individuals. He thought the world of unconsciousness as "crude Source, the mystic Sun, the well-head of all things." Here is clearly some similarity to Freud's theory on the "unconsciousness," though Lawrence always denied it. To him, "the unconscious" is the "essential unique nature of every individual creature." Therefore, the relationship between man and the cosmos will change according to man's own being.

The world is to us what we take from it. The sun is to us what we take from it. And if we are puny, it is because we take punily from the superb sun.

Man is greater according as his relation to the living universe is vast and vital.<sup>35)</sup>

Lawrence thinks the relation between man and the sun, the center of the cosmos, is formed through the correspondence between the sun and the solar plexus in mankind. And the tragedy of civilized man is the loss of the eternal sun, or the loss of the cosmos—as it were, the loss of inner self of modern man, the loss of individuality. The last mental state he arrived at in *Apocalypse* is that we should restore the primitive sun, or the lost sun, for the purpose of regaining our lost being:

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.

— *Apocalypse* —

The man-cosmos relationship is the last hope of Lawrence who could not establish satisfying, pure, eternal, and living human relationships in his real life.

I have so far analyzed three relationships—the man-woman, man-man, man-cosmos relationships in *Women in Love*. However, from the viewpoint of the structure of the novel, there are some weak points in

this novel—the underplot connected with Gerald's death by snow is too consciously and frequently used; too much use of jargon and meaningless refrains of both sentences and phrases. Considered from the substance of the novel, Birkin, Lawrence's spokesman, is uncertain and diffident in his theory due to the author's own lack of persuasive power; there is a kind of contradiction in Birkin's theory; there is too much of Lawrence as a preacher. Although there are such defects in it, *Women in Love* has a dynamic appeal as a whole—some of its merits are: the proper use of symbols, such as "snow," "ice," "water," "horse," "rabbit," "cat," "West African figures"; the lyricism and fascinating rhythm of sentences; the dynamically constructed structure of the novel.

As for the meaning of the three relationships in this novel—first, the man-woman relationship is: his emphasis on Body against Spirit, the resurrection of Body, but at the same time the relationship well-balanced between them; an equilibrium between two components, man's separate being and woman's separate being; a kind of means to escape from his "mother complex"; a resistance against the "Magna Mater" or "woman's possessiveness" and "her assertive will."

Secondly, the man-man relationship has various elements in it: a trace of homosexuality; a power urge; a "compensation" for his imperfect man-woman relationship; his longing and nostalgia for the world of miners and his father with a warm physical contact; his wish-fulfilment to be in good terms with society.

The man-cosmos relationship is, in short, a kind of "compensation" for imperfect human relationships. It is also a re-constructed pantheism or animism steeped in his modern self. Moreover, it is a means to throw away the acute self-consciousness of modern man, and respond to the universe in the "blood-consciousness."

These three relationships of Lawrence are all dynamic, free, living, and flowing, unable to be fixed, and mechanized. However, no one can absolutely or eternally form these free, flowing, unfixed relationships. The very fact that he used the rainbow, which temporarily appears and disappears soon, as the symbol of the consummation of such relationships has a symbolic meaning to him. Nevertheless, his theory of relationships might be his deep-rooted longing and trust in both Hu-

manity and Nature. And at the core of them, there always exist his somewhat aristocratic, modern individualism, a kind of Nietzscheanism,<sup>36)</sup> his sharp critical spirit, and the sense of crisis in face of the mechanization and dehumanization of modern civilization.

So that everything, even individuality itself, depends on relationship. "God cannot do without me," said an eighteenth-century Frenchman. What he meant was, that if there were no human beings, if Man did not exist, then God, the God of Man, would have no meaning.<sup>37)</sup>

It is, in other words, the modern humanism of Nietzsche who declared the fall of rational man, and established the "philosophy of life" to liberate man from his fixed life. Lawrence, a modern humanist, declared a new birth of the whole Man, just as the artists in the Renaissance cried the revival of Man. He strove to set modern man free from his fixed, mechanized life, to release intuition from reason, and to protect humanity from the tyranny of modern science. *Women in Love*, searching for absolute and eternal relationships, is a great myth of the present age, especially of "the Age of Discontinuity."

Ohne Mythos aber geht jede Kultur ihrer gesunden schöpferischen Naturkraft verlustig: erst ein mit Mythen umstellter Horizont schliesst eine ganze Kulturbewegung zur Einheit ab. Alle Kräfte der Phantasie und des apollinischen Traumes werden erst durch den Mythos aus ihrem wahllosen Herumschweifen gerettet.<sup>38)</sup>

(Received May 18, 1971)

#### Notes

- 1) "Morality and the Novel," *Phoenix, The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence*, ed. Edward D. McDonald (London, 1967), p. 532.
- 2) *The Rainbow* (London, 1963), p. 320.
- 3) *The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence*, ed. Harry T. Moore (London, 1965), Vol. II, p. 692.
- 4) *Ibid.*, p. 1038.
- 5) F. R. Leavis, *D. H. Lawrence, Novelist* (Harmondsworth, 1964), p. 176.
- 6) *Ibid.*, p. 180.

- 7) *Phoenix II, Uncollected, Unpublished and Other Prose Works by D. H. Lawrence*, ed. Warren Roberts and Harry T. Moore (London, 1968), p. 100.
- 8) F. R. Leavis, p. 196.
- 9) Richard Aldington, *D. H. Lawrence, Portrait of a Genius But...* (New York, 1967), p. 23.
- 10) Eliseo Vivas, *D. H. Lawrence, the failure and triumph of art* (Evanston, 1960), p. 260.
- 11) Keith Sagar, *The Art of D. H. Lawrence* (Cambridge, 1966), p. 96.
- 12) *loc. cit.*
- 13) "Study of Thomas Hardy," *D. H. Lawrence, Selected Literary Criticism*, ed. Anthony Beal (London, 1961), p. 221.
- 14) *Ibid.*, p. 185, "Most fascinating in all artists is this antinomy between Law and Love, between the Flesh and the Spirit, between Father and Son."
- 15) *The Collected Letters*, Vol. I, p. 69.
- 16) *Ibid.*, Letter to Katherine Mansfield dated (?) 21, Nov. 1918, p. 565.
- 17) *loc. cit.*
- 18) *Phoenix II*, p. 93.
- 19) *Ibid.*, pp. 103-104.
- 20) *The Complete Short Stories*, Vol. II (London, 1965), p. 364.
- 21) *Ibid.*, Vol. III (London, 1966), pp. 742-743.
- 22) "Dana's *Two years Before the Mast*," *Studies in Classic American Literature* (London, 1964), p. 110.
- 23) *The Collected Letters*, Vol. II, Letter to Witter Bynner dated 13 March 1928, p. 1045.
- 24) *Phoenix II*, pp. 594-595.
- 25) *The Collected Letters*, Vol. I, p. 566.
- 26) "Autobiographical Sketch," *Phoenix II*, p. 596.
- 27) "Return to Bestwood," *Phoenix II*, p. 264.
- 28) D. W. Harding, "A Note on Nostalgia," *Scrutiny*, Vol. I, (May 1932), p. 12.
- 29) "Pan in America," *Phoenix*, p. 31.
- 30) "Puritanism and Arts," *Selected Literary Criticism*, pp. 58-59.
- 31) *The Complete Short Stories*, Vol. II, p. 530.
- 32) Graham Hough, *The Dark Sun* (London, 1956), pp. 223-224.
- 33) *Kangaroo* (London, 1964), p. 271.
- 34) "Benjamin Franklin," *Studies in Classic American Literature*, p. 16.
- 35) "Aristocracy," *Phoenix II*, p. 478.
- 36) *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. James Hastings (Edinburgh, 1937), Vol. 7, p. 221. "In opposition to this extreme anti-individualism there is at present a new form of individualism, viz. Nietzscheanism. Nietzsche exempts the strong man from all rule, despises moral laws as an invention of the

weak in order to triumph over the strong, and sees in the Superman the terminus of human evolution.”

37) “We Need One Another,” *Phoenix*, p. 190.

38) Friedrich Nietzsche, *Die Geburt der Tragödie* (München, 1954), p. 125.