CONCLUSION

Lawrence wrote his first poems "Guelder Roses" and "Campions" on a "slightly self-conscious Sunday afternoon" in 1905, when he was a "very green and unsophisticated" youth at twenty (Foreword to Collected Poems). Since then there was no looking-back for his creative activity till his end came on 2nd March 1930. As Moore records, his final effort to write as an author was made at the Ad Astra sanatorium a few days before "death took hold of him." "Sitting up in bed, he scratched away a review of a book which had come in, Eric Gill's Art Nonsense and Other Essays" (626).

All through his literary career spanning more than two decades, Lawrence's major concern was the human self and its relationships. He believed in the wholeness of the individual, and the wholeness of life men and women can live sustaining a "vivid relatedness" with other men and women and the whole universe. As one of the most philosophical of modern novelists, Lawrence seeks to discover in artistic terms the selfhood of each individual, and explores the whole being of man and woman to find out why one individual achieves fullness of living while another fails to do so and ends up as an automaton. He also enquires into the nature of human relationships with the circumambient universe and attempts to find out how some relationships fulfil the vital needs of the individuals and how some lead to deadness and disintegration.

Lawrence is not alone in this search for self-identity. He has before him nearly two and a half millennia of Western and Eastern thought throwing light on the question of self-identity in all its dimensions. The history of Western philosophical thought from Socrates to Sartre seems to be the history of how human mind has tried to grapple with the rival claims of the three entities, soul, mind and body, to selfhood. Both Socrates
and Plato held the soul as the ‘essence’ of self, and believed in the immortality of the soul. To Plato, the real world was that of Forms, known as the world of Being, and the changing everyday world of the human beings was the shadow of the real and it was known as the world of Becoming. But to the ‘practical philosopher’ Aristotle, this world of ours was the reality. He rejected Plato’s separation of the human soul from the body and saw human beings as ‘rational animals’. In the modern age, with philosophers like Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, Fichte, Schelling, Locke and Hume consciousness has come to occupy prime place in the body-consciousness-soul trio. Descartes’ most famous sentence, “I think, therefore I am”, makes self-identity dependent on mind or consciousness and not on the body. Kant divides the self into ‘transcendental ego’ and ‘empirical ego.’ It is with modern thinkers like Meredith Michaels the connection between the body and consciousness is established. And the existentialists, Sartre, Jaspers and Heidegger, assert the belief that existence comes before essence. They lay emphasis on essential human nature, and place the entire responsibility for existence on the individual himself.

In Eastern thought, the Hindu concept of the self is essentially religious. Brahman, the Godhead, is considered as “the Unity underlying all individual selves and things.” The Mandukya Upanishad says: “Ayam atma brahma” (“This self is Brahman”). And the Katha Upanishad speaks of the need for turning the eye “inward” and seeing “the self.” Buddhism, which had its origin and roots in the Indian soil, believed in the soul and in its reincarnation, but paradoxically, it did not speak of the immortality of the soul. In the Hindu philosophical tradition, in the eighth century, Sankara speaks of the realization of the individual soul and the supreme soul through the major texts of the Vedas, which consider them as one. The old concepts of the individual self and the Supreme Self still find expression in the teachings of
Ramakrishna in the nineteenth century and Ramana Maharshi and Aurobindo in the
twentieth century. However, as Aurobindo points out, the Indian mind in its emphasis
on spirituality never belittled the mind or life or body.

Lawrence was familiar with the concept of self in Western as well as Eastern
philosophy, but he did not identify his thought with any particular school of philosophy.
In the ‘eternal’ opposition between the body and the soul and the conflict between
mental consciousness and spontaneous being, Lawrence’s emphasis is on bodily
consciousness and spontaneous being. But he does not negate the soul or belittle the
power and usefulness of the mind. He warns against the creative spontaneity in the
wholeness of being and the fullness of life being thwarted by the intervention of ‘ideas’
of the mind or the arid claims of the soul.

Lawrence wants integration to take place in the divided self, in which the
divisions polarize into the conscious self and the personal self. He uses expressions like
‘average self’, ‘workaday self’, and ‘temporal, social self’ to refer to the former, and
expressions such as ‘real individual self’, ‘stronger self,’ ‘passional self’ and ‘invisible
self’ to denote the latter. According to him, “the self that is begotten and born from the
idea, this is the ideal self: a spurious, detestable product” (“Democracy” 711). In his
fiction, the will-spontaneity conflict is dramatized in the respective opposition between
characters like Skrebensky and Ursula, Hermione and Birkin, Clifford and Mellors,
Bertha Coutts and Mellors, and Clifford and Connie. In these opposing selves can also
be included two animals, a mare and a stallion, but they are opposed to human beings:
Gerald and the Arab mare, and Rico and St.Mawr. However, there are also Lawrence’s
ideal pairs with spontaneous life in them like, Louisa and Alfred, Yvette and the gipsy
man, Lydia and Tom Brangwen, Ursula and Birkin, and Connie and Mellors.

Lawrence’s conception of the real or passional self is connected with his belief
in the deepest consciousness in blood or the unconscious. Lawrence strongly criticized
the Freudian unconscious, seeking support from the American psychologist Trigant
Burrow, who considered the Freudian unconscious as "merely the representation of
conscious sexual life as it exists in a state of repression." In Lawrence's concept, "the
true unconscious" is not a site of repressions, but "the well-head, the fountain of real
activity." (Psychoanalysis . . . 207). Lawrence believes that self-realization is possible
through spontaneous living. One has to go beyond the conscious self to reach the
deepest whole self. Even as he believes in the wholeness of the individual, he has his
own misgivings about the concept of oneness and wholeness of humanity.

Lawrence distinguishes the real self on grounds of three binary oppositions,
living and non-living, human and non-human, and whole and partial. In his conception,
the self is a whole living human being, a "whole man alive." Applying this notion of self
to art, he considers the communication between the novelist and the reader a
transmission and reception of "tremulations" between whole men alive (288). An aspect
of prime importance concerning the human self in Lawrence's conception is the
individual's isolation in spite of relationships. In Aaron's Rod, Lilly says, "In so far as I
am I, and only I am I, and I am only I, in so far, I am inevitably and eternally alone,"
and he considers this "intrinsic isolation" as the core of his "self-knowledge" (289-90).

Lawrence believes in change as a principle of organic living and it is opposed to
fixity or deadness. In his view, one should not allow fixity or an absolute to be
perpetuated on oneself. However, Lawrence believes in the unchanging core of a being
which he likens to the "the unchanging chemical composition," the carbon beneath the
allotropic variations such as "diamond, coal or soot" (The Letters . . . 114).

Lawrence insists on the individual's deep relationship with the circumambient
universe. In The Rainbow, Ursula felt that "Self was a oneness with the infinite. To be
oneself was a supreme, gleaming triumph of infinity” (441). He expects the individual to open the “doors of receptivity” and allow the living contact with the life outside himself to take place. In *Apocalypse* Lawrence affirms the need for man’s wider but deeper relation with everything outside himself (126).

There was “an extreme kind of criticism,” the chief representative of which was Middleton Murry’s, that Lawrence the novelist could not create characters one could get hold of. And it was Leavis who effectively countered that criticism and showed with examples how “the power of making human individuality livingly present” is evident in the fictional oeuvre of Lawrence (190).

In Lawrence’s fiction, characters like Annable, Walter Morel, Gerald and a few others, easily yield themselves to a study in isolation because of some special characteristics in them, in spite of their being placed in situations of human relationship like the other characters. With his motto, “Be a good animal, true to your animal instinct,” Annable seems to support the author’s belief in blood consciousness and vivid relatedness to life. In Walter Morel of *Sons and Lovers*, Lawrence presents, despite his faults and weaknesses, what he would admire as “the livingness” and “deep spontaneous life.” As Martin observes, in Paul’s mind, Walter is identified with ‘working class’ and ‘warmth’ in their respective binary opposition to ‘middle class’ and ‘ideas’ (38). In contradistinction to the gamekeeper and the coal miner, Gerald, the mine owner, stands for what the author condemns in a human being: the domineering will and mental consciousness.

Lawrence’s concern with love and sex is a part of his concern for life in general and human life in particular, and he considers man-woman relationship as the greatest of all human relationships. There is no novel of his in which he does not explore the love and sexual relations between man and woman. He presents the failure of
Siegmund’s sexual relationship with his protégé Helena in *The Trespasser*, and the deeply satisfying sexual love between the run-away soldier Bachmann and his girl Emilie in “The Thorn in the Flesh.” In *The Rainbow*, Lawrence presents an ideal joyful married life in the first generation, and fruition in motherhood without any real fulfilment in sex in the second, and love failing to give the girl what she needs in sex in the third. In *Women in Love*, while Birkin-Ursula love-relationship, which is based on Lawrencian concept of the stellar polarity of spontaneous beings respecting the “otherness” of each other, succeeds, Gerald-Gudrun relationship, which is dominated by a clash of wills fails and ends in the tragic death of the lover. The novel also expresses, through Birkin, Lawrence’s recurring charge that women assume themselves to be the Magna Mater and the Mater Dolorosa claiming back the man they had borne in suffering. After Tom-Lydia and Birkin-Ursula pairs, it is in Connie-Mellors in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* that Lawrence presents his model of a happy man-woman relationship, which is based on “inward expansion and warmth” (279).

The presentment of anal sexuality in a scene in *Women in Love* and in a similar scene in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, in *The Rainbow* and in “The Thorn in the Flesh,” has raised much critical discussion. Following Middleton Murry’s expression of his critical ire at the “sub-human and bestial” thing, scholars like Wilson Knight, Daleski, Pritchard, Ford and Stevens have commented on the passages, some with sneer, some with condescension, and some with sympathetic understanding. The important question about this kind of sexuality is the possible connection with the human waste, which Murry and Stevens have a dig at. But in “Pornography and Obscenity,” he clearly distinguishes between the “creative flow” of sex from the excrementary flow, and holds that in a “really healthy human being” there is the “profoundest” instinct of opposition between the two flows” (205).
One of the most controversial issues in Lawrence’s fiction is his attitude to women. There has definitely been a paradoxical change in him over the years from the position of a supporter of the cause of women to that of a male supremacist vulnerable to the attack of most feminists. Hilary Simpson situates this change in attitudes in Lawrence in the post-war period. However, the change is clearly visible in *Women in Love*, and it must have begun to take shape even as he was writing the third, penultimate version of *The Rainbow*. For, one could see Lawrence’s proclivity towards male chauvinism even in “The Thorn in the Flesh” published in July 1914. As Simpson points out, the novella *The Fox* and the stories “Tickets, Please” and “Monkey Nuts” deal “explicitly with the overturning of traditional sexual roles and relationships as a result of the war” (93-94). Lawrence expects women to retain their essential femininity; he does not like women to lose their “henny self” and become “cocksure” (“Cocksure . . . 555).

The domination of man over woman, his expectation of honour and obedience from her, and man becoming the saviour of woman in her state of physical insecurity and sexual deprivation are respectively the important aspects of the themes of the novellas, *The Ladybird*, *The Captain’s Doll* and *The Virgin and the Gipsy*. The theme of woman’s submission to man is dominant in *The Lost Girl* as well as in *Kangaroo*. In *Aaron’s Rod* and *The Plumed Serpent*, the Lawrencian men Aaron and Cipriano take sadistic delight in withholding themselves proudly when the woman is about to reach her orgasm. Both Aaron and Lilly, who assure the dual presence of the author in the novel, are male supremacists; both expect the woman to submit to them. And these ‘heroes’ seem to have “no feelings at all” about children. In handling the idea of male dominance and woman’s resistance, the novelist not only adopts extreme anti-feminist attitude but also takes a malevolent and misanthropic position as seen in the paedophilic
Simone de Beauvoir, in *The Second Sex*, brings to light how in society woman has been accorded a mere “secondary” status and is always defined in relation to man. She finds in Lawrence’s writings men incarnating “transcendence” and women dedicated to “immanence.” The truth of her statement is seen in the fact that Cicio in *The Lost Girl* and Lawrence’s mouth-pieces Aaron and Lilly in *Aaron’s Rod* and Somers in *Kangaroo*, none of them believes in any wider role for women; they cannot not think of women’s participation in “real politics.” Beauvoir strongly disapproves of Lawrence when he speaks for male supremacy and the dominance of the phallus in sexual intercourse.

While Beauvoir remains cool and temperate in her fair and balanced judgement of Lawrence from the feminist point of view, Kate Millett’s criticism of Lawrence’s views on man-woman relationship in *Sexual Politics* is marked by her indignation at Lawrence’s male chauvinism, her mocking tone and her failure to see his greatness as an artist, which transcends his later anti-feminist stand. According to her, Lawrence, in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, by making “the transformation of masculine ascendancy into a mystical religion,” plays sexual politics,” and he does it in the most subtle manner, “for it is through a feminine consciousness that his masculine message is conveyed” (71). In her view, the Mexican story “The Woman Who Rode Away” is the most impassioned statement of the doctrine of male supremacy and the penis as deity” (80-81). The woman is to be sacrificed to the sun, which is part of the phallic cult. But Kinkead-Weekes sees the woman as a Gringo in Mexico rather than an emancipated woman and reads the story as the “psychic backlash” of the native people against the colonisers, the Gringos. However, even as a symbolic act, the ritual killing of a woman for no crime or ‘sin’ of hers is horrifying, inhuman and anti-human, and one wonders whether the
author himself had psychological compulsions like "the primitive desire for killing" Ursula finds in Gerald's "playing at killing" (52-53).

One of the most disturbing issues in Lawrence's leadership novels is his obsession with male leadership and male domination over women. Judith Ruderman, with the help of the psychoanalyst Margaret Mahler's theory, traces the origin of this to the "disruption" Lawrence must have had in his psyche caused possibly by the possessive or narcissistic mother in his infancy and early childhood in the process of individuation. In Ruderman's view, it is his "repulsion from the female web" that is developed into "the domination of the male as symbolic father" in the leadership novels (109-10).

Another controversial issue is the question of homosexuality between Cyril and George in *The White Peacock* and between Birkin and Gerald in *Women in Love*, and the question of lesbian relationship between Ursula and Winifred. While Murry indulges in biographical criticism and speaks of Lawrence's passion for 'man,' Moore refutes it strongly. However matters of close body contact between men in Lawrence's stories and novels are no more big issues in the post-Lawrencean world.

As Lawrence presents them the relationships within the family count much not only in the individual's awareness of selfhood but also in his or her growth into a whole being. While focusing his vision on relations within families, Lawrence is also conscious of the wider, spatio-temporal relationships between generations. He shows in *The Rainbow* men and women of three generations standing at the crossroads of contemporaneity and historicity, having their social and historical connections. Historically the novel can be seen as an "inter-play between the different histories" (Kinkead-Weekes qtd. in Burden 92), the "archetypal history with its Biblical and mythic reference," the "real history recording the changes in English life from the rural
to the urban, the agricultural to the industrial in the process of modernization," and "the personal history of the three Brangwen generations."

Lawrence's concern with men and women begins with his interest in the child. Most writers in the British literary tradition, who have felt and thought about the child have specially benefited from their interest in Rousseau in the Romantic period and in Freud in the twentieth century. Peter Coveney, in *The Image of Childhood*, discovers three distinct attitudes underlying the attitude of the writers towards the child: the Christian belief in the child's inheritance of Original Sin, the romantic assertion of the child's Original Innocence, and the acceptance of Freud's concept of Infantile Sexuality. While the doctrine of Original Sin considered the 'original nature' of the child sinful, the Romantic tradition, represented by Blake and Wordsworth, saw the child as "the symbol of Imagination and Sensibility, a symbol of Nature set against the forces abroad in society actively de-naturing humanity." Their concept of the Original Innocence of the child comes from Rousseau's emphasis on the child being in "a state of nature." Rousseau's relevance to Lawrence could be seen in Rousseau's assertion that the child is important in himself, and not as a diminutive adult. However, Freud's scientific approach rejected both the religious affirmation of Original Sin and the romantic concept of Original Innocence through the theory of infantile sexuality. Though Lawrence attacked Freud's concept of the unconscious, he had a serious interest in the psychic realities. In *The Rainbow* Lawrence presents in each generation the childhood of a major character. However, the childhood of Anna and Ursula assume greater importance and attract more elaborate treatment than that of Tom.

With the movement from childhood into 'boyhood' and 'girlhood' the children begin to have relations with the parents as 'sons' and 'daughters'. The autobiographical novel *Sons and Lovers* handles the Oedipal theme in Paul Morel's intensive, passionate
relationship with his mother. As Kuttner observes, the novel corroborates the Freudian theory of "the child's attachment to the parent of the opposite sex" becoming "the prototype of all later love relations." (Review 65). In *The Rainbow* it is the father-daughter relationship that happens to be a major theme.

Perhaps the most important and complex relationship in the family is that which exists between the husband and wife. In Lawrence's conception, in an ideal marriage, the man and woman sustain between them a living relationship in which there is sexual fulfilment and respect for each other's individuality as in a stellar equilibrium. A serious blot on a conception based on mutual respect is Lawrence's later belief in male supremacy. Lawrence's ideal union of man and woman in marriage without any intervention of mental consciousness is that of Tom and Lydia. An example of marriage becoming sheer bondage keeping together two persons of opposing nature can be found in the relationship between Thomas Crich and his wife in *Women in Love*.

Wider than the individual's familial relationship is his relationship with the society, the country and the whole world. The Aristotelian dictum that man as a social animal is now a truism. Contrary to the modernists' view of man as a solitary being, the realistic novelists like Tolstoy believe in man's position and nature as a historical and social being, and Lawrence, with a fine combination of his intense psychological insight and his social grasp, has kinship with them.

Lawrence's criticism of the disastrous effects brought on the industrial civilization by Jeremy Bentham's utilitarian principle, which drew its sustenance from Adam Smith's theory of economic liberalism or laissez faire, finds dramatic expression in a scene in *The Rainbow*, in which, through a dialogue he has with young Ursula, the materialistic vulgarity of Skrebensky's idea of 'the greatest good of the greatest number' is exposed. With the second phase of the Industrial Revolution, which lasted
from about 1850 until about 1940, the new sources of power, the internal combustion
engine and electricity, ushered in a new, dehumanising process of mechanization, and
the old industrial England became a new industrial England, with its new collieries and
new railroads defacing the beautiful countryside, and its industrial capitalism dividing
the society into the moneyed class of entrepreneurs and the working class.

Lawrence's major concern was about the triumph of the machine which turned
the industrial worker into an ignorant, complacent wage-slave and the owner of the
industries like Gerald in *Women in Love* into the God of the machine. The whole system
"subjected life to pure mathematical principles." It deprived the poor workers of their
self-identity as men; they were reduced to "less than humanness." As shown in the short
stories and novels, the worker's homes are alike in their poor financial condition, their
hopelessness, their suffering, their helplessness in calamities like death and their poor
use of their leisure. But, despite their shortcomings, Lawrence identifies among these
people men like Albert Durant, Walter Morel, Aaron and Mellors, who are known for
their deep spontaneous life.

Class is an important phenomenon in British society. By birth, upbringing and
emotional identity Lawrence is a man of the working class, but he does not belong
"absolutely" to any class. As Leavis puts it, people interest him first and last as human
beings. As a novelist he recognizes that in class dynamics, the physical work one does
for his living, the habitual association with 'ideas,' and the language one normally
speaks at home are factors that go into the making of one's class-identity. While with
prejudices, conflicts, and attempts at social climbing, the class-issue gets complicated,
as Lawrence shows in "Daughters of the Vicar," *The Lost Girl, The Virgin and the
Gipsy* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover,* there is in normal, healthy sex, which one feels in
the 'blood', a redeeming factor that can bring down the walls of class.
As one interested in all aspects of contemporary civilization, Lawrence critically examines the basic concepts and methods of education that were being adopted in the schools in England. In *The Rainbow*, he shows how the utilitarian principle had made inroads into the portals of educational institutions, which, by rejecting the sense of wonder from the learning process and applying rigid rules and methods of discipline, prepared the school children for the collieries and factories, and turned all liberal education at college into “a flunkey to the god of material success.” As an educationist with a vision, he is concerned about the educational system ignoring the vital fact that “The sheer delight of a child’s apperception is based on wonder.”

Since man is willy-nilly placed in one political system or the other, Lawrence subjected the extant political systems and philosophies to severe scrutiny. Basically he was a democrat, but a democrat who maintained his freedom to criticise some of the inherent defects of the system to which he belonged. He believed in the individual’s “free spontaneous self” and the “otherness” between individuals, and attacked the common notions of equality which reduced the human being to mathematical abstraction and failed to see any possibility beyond the average self. He wanted a new Democracy in which “the whole soul of man” would be free to have the blossoming of his “spontaneous, single, pure being.” He rejected “isms” such as “socialism, conservatism, bolshevism, liberalism, republicanism, communism,” because, as he found them, all of them were governed by the selfsame “principle of the idealized unit, the possessor of property.” He believed that property is only there to be used, not to be possessed.” To him even group or State possession of property was “no more than a fatal betrayal of the spontaneous self.” Looking for an alternative, his mind began to have experiments with the idea of a leader, the greatest of great individuals who would stand “between the dark God and the dark-blooded masses of men.” His idea of the
single great individual with power like that of a dictator drew the charge of fascism against him by many, including Bertrand Russell.

On the question of nationalism he had an open mind, and with his own country, where he was subjected to the greatest humiliation by his own people during the War, he had a love-hate relationship. He was not a pacifist. Like Lilly of Aaron's Rod, he had no inhibition about killing an enemy; what he was averse to was man becoming a bit of "the huge machine" called war. However, there are oscillations in his responses to racial and colonial issues. Though he shares Ursula's strong "anti-Raj sentiments" and speaks against the British imposing themselves upon a nation "older" than theirs, he does not seem to have seen India and its Nationalism in the proper perspective. He also has reservations about allowing immigration of "coloured labour" into Australia.

Like the individual's relationship with others in society, Lawrence perceives his relationship with Nature also as vital to his being. From his everyday material contact with Nature to his intimate kinship with it, there is the possibility for the human being to have a vast range of relationships with Nature. The Marxian concept of "use-value" considers the relationship man has with Nature as a combination of matter and labour. R. G. Collingwood surveys the idea of Nature from the Greeks to the Moderns through the Renaissance. Lawrence, while drawing on all these earlier views and also on the pantheistic tradition, insists on the living relatedness man should have with Nature. He even believes in the presence of what he calls "the spirit of place" in different continents and regions. He finds in Nature a suitable response to the human drama on earth. Besides presenting man's direct contact with Nature as in the "blood intimacy" the Brangwens of the Marsh farm have with Nature, the novelist, in his poetic use of language in fiction, discovers numerous images in the fecund world of Nature. As in his analogy of stellar equilibrium, he finds in Nature, several models to interpret and
illustrate the human self and its varied relationships. His conception of Man-Nature relationship is so intimate that he often describes natural phenomena in human terms, especially in sexual terms. As Lawrence is concerned with Nature primarily for its own sake and not for any ultimate advantage, he condemns all exploitation of Nature; he becomes greatly upset when he sees what a man like Gerald does to Nature by his “fight with Matter.” As Erich Fromm observes, while all animals live in harmony with Nature, man alone with his special endowments seeks to change the environment “alloplastically.”

In his serious concern for the human being, Lawrence also scrutinizes the relationship the self has with art. The literary artist is in a strange relationship with his craft, as its medium, which is language, is already a complex sign system that has been in use for centuries in the linguistic community. Lawrence says, “Art-speech is the only truth,” and considers the novel as the greatest form of art, as it can make the “tremulation” in a “whole man alive” much more than what the other genres can do.

As an artist, Lawrence practises Eliot’s formulation of “depersonalization,” the separation maintained by the artist between “the man who suffers and the mind which creates” (296-97). It is in this context Lawrence says: “Never trust the artist. Trust the tale.” The mastery of his own personal self is an absolute need for Lawrence, as in every major work of his, he presents the experiences of his personal life. His first novel The White Peacock grew out of his own experiences in the Midlands and his third, Sons and Lovers, is out-and-out autobiographical. In The Rainbow, the parallel between the couples Tom and Lydia and Lawrence and Frieda is “clearly not accidental” (Leavis). In the novel, the author also undergoes a ‘transmutation’ of sex; his consciousness becomes identical with that of Ursula. However, the personal element is never obtrusive in the novels; it “belongs as much and as inevitably to the impersonal dramatic whole as
any other in it.” The characters Birkin, Aaron, Lilly and Somers, in varying ways represent Lawrence. In *Women in Love*, Lawrence overcomes the problem of his alter ego Birkin becoming an intolerable dictator of ideas by introducing a kind of ‘dialogics’ in which multiple voices are heard arguing the same issue from different viewpoints. (Burden 163). Another problem, especially in the later fiction, is the overt presence of the author’s voice directly addressing “the gentle reader” as in the eighteenth century novels. Lawrence indulges in it much more in *Mr Noon* than in *Aaron’s Rod* and *The Lost Girl*. Perhaps it is also one of the reasons why these novels failed to reach the heights of *The Rainbow* or *Women in Love*.

In presenting the artist’s relation with the world, Lawrence disapproves of art subserving material interests, as in Loerke’s idea that “art should interpret industry as art once interpreted religion.” Lawrence expects the novel to establish a “quick,” “lively” relatedness to everything in the world. In *Women in Love* the statue from the West Pacific and the West African wooden statuette express “really ultimate physical consciousness, mindless, utterly sensual.” Quite a few of these men with artistic talents in Lawrence’s fiction are protagonists of the novels. Siegmund of *The Trespasser* is a violinist, Aaron Sisson of *Aaron’s Rod* is a flautist and Paul Morel of *Sons and Lovers* is a painter. Many critics, including Salgado, are of the view that *Sons and Lovers* “being centrally concerned with the formative years and growth into full awareness of a single character,” is an outstanding example of *bildungsroman* like Joyce’s *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. However, the artist theme is not fully developed in *Sons and Lovers*; it is submerged by the relationship themes. Of the other artists, Will Brangwen is a failure both as artist and as man, Cameron Gee is a successful writer but fails in marital life, Rico and Sir Clifford are pseudo-artists with no relationship with the ‘quick’ of life, the “Dublin rat” Michaelis is nothing but a successful social-climber,
and the "ultra modern" Duncan Forbes is "stupid" and "sentimental."

About the use of language in fiction, as Burden points out, "for Bakhtin, and for Lawrence, the novel is the only form of writing capable of doing justice to the complex interaction and interanimation of the discourses and voices, the languages of the social world." Novels like *Women in Love* and *Mr Noon* make use of what Bakhtin calls "polyphony," which is "a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses... each with its own world which are combined in a dialogic relation" (Burden 162). Foucault criticises Lawrence's attempt to deal with sex in language saying that "by bringing sexuality into the clear light of language we have succeeded only in controlling and thus repressing it." Lydia Blanchard defends Lawrence arguing that Lawrence overcomes the sex-language tension in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* by "drawing simultaneously on a variety of genres" which makes extraordinary demands on the reader.

Of all relationships of the self, the most difficult to conceptualize is that the self has with what lies beyond consciousness, beyond the pale of thought and beyond death. Toynbee speaks of a frame of six dimensions in an endeavour to comprehend the vision of "God's creative activity on the move." The first five are the three dimensions of Space and the dimensions of Time and Life, and the sixth one is the field of vision to which human beings are raised by "a gift of the Spirit." The artist with his fancy can have a *darshan* ('vision') of the Spirit or God or the realities beyond the self. So the questions asked with regard to Lawrence are: What kind of *darshan* does Lawrence have when his profoundly intelligent creative mind exercises its freedom towards "the beyond"? What kinds of relationships does Lawrence perceive to exist between the self and God or the beyond?

In his fiction, Lawrence uses the word 'beyond' in various senses. But in the
most complex level it signifies the unknown power or force that is commonly referred to by religious philosophers as the Supreme Self or God or the Super Consciousness. Questions about the beyond often result from a conflict between faith and reason. In The Rainbow, the conflict is between Anna’s scepticism and Will’s belief in the story of Jesus’ miracle at the marriage at Cana. Lawrence presents both sides of the case; he neither refutes the reason behind Anna’s argument nor rejects Will’s emotional attachment to the beliefs of his religion.

Lawrence is religious, if by that term one means sincere commitment to Truth and a profound love for humanity. He never identifies himself absolutely with any of the traditional religions including Christianity. He believes in a universal religion, but respects all religions of the world and their respective myths, histories and connections with the land and the people. His dreams of the ideal community Rananim seem to be related to pantheism. All through his works he attaches the greatest importance to “the deepest whole self of man.” Lawrence is audaciously inventive in the use of religious myth and imagery in contexts that would shock and horrify the pious. In The Man Who Died he presents the most ‘heretic’ story of the flowering and fulfilment of sexual love between “the man who died” (the resurrected Jesus) and the priestess of the pagan goddess Isis, who herself was looking for the lost phallus of Osiris who was dead. But the “half-buried crucifix” that appears in the snow in the scene of Gerald’s death does have conventional religious significance as a reminder that Gerald is beyond redemption.

Thoughts of the ‘beyond’ raise questions regarding man’s relationship with the universe and questions regarding birth and death, which connect man with the unknown. In the flux of life, what matters is “a true relationship to the things we move with and amongst and against.” Glimpses of what lies outside the periphery of human
consciousness could be had if people turned inward from the outer world. Lawrence conceives birth and death as part of the great flux and the continuity of life. Just as there are frequent references to the germinating of the fecund seed, the burgeoning of leaves on the stem and the woman bringing forth the child, there are several deaths described, reported and dwelt on in his novels and stories. Lawrence has a peculiar notion of two processes of death and dissolution, the African way of “sun-destruction,” and the Northern way of “ice-destructive knowledge” which belongs to the white races. Gerald’s death in the icy mountains in Austria comes in the Northern manner. Birkin warns, if man “fails creatively to change and develop,” the non-human mystery that has brought forth man and the universe could dispense with man as it has done away with the ichthyosauri and the mastodon, and “replace him with a finer created being” (538).

Probably under the influence of the Indian Yogic conception of the six centres of consciousness in the human body, Lawrence perceives in the body four centres of primal consciousness. There are two kinds of life-circuit, the internal and the external, established between the four poles or centres; they constitute the profound primal consciousness of the human being and establish the primal relationship between two different beings or creatures. As science and philosophy now cohere in their perception of the connection between the body and consciousness, this conception of Lawrence has great relevance.

Lawrence’s rejection of mental consciousness and his great belief in blood-consciousness lead him to his religion of blood. He believes in a ‘dark god’ who is the origin of all sexual, sensual passion and who is felt in the blood consciousness, which is more vital and deeper than Freud’s unconscious. In Kangaroo, Somers wants man to submit to the ithyphallic God of “the first dark religions” (224). In his deification of the phallus, Lawrence draws on the ancient phallic cults, especially the Isis-Osiris myth of
Egypt. His glorification of sex, his phallic worship, his religion of blood, his
reinstallation of the Mexican gods are to be seen as part of his tendency to apotheosize
what he believes to be unshakably true and meaningful. However, Lawrence
overindulges in blood when he owes allegiance to his leader-heroes, Ramon and
Cipriano, who not only believe in human sacrifice like Somers, but also perform it
ritualistically as the Mexican gods Quetzalcoatl and Huitzilopochtli.

Lawrence has no agreement with Whitman's concept of One Identity of all
beings as "emanations from the Supreme Being," because his insistence is always on
the oneness or wholeness of the individual. He argues for the soul in the individual,
comparing it with the rider of a bicycle, but when he extends the analogy and supposes
"a rider of the many-wheeled universe" controlling the sun and the innumerable planets,
his argument seems simplistic. Lawrence says in "Life" that man "cannot create
himself"; he is "not self-contained or self-accomplished"; he can only "submit to the
creator." He views human life as "a flame which burns balanced upon a wick,"
"between fecund darkness of the first unknown and the final darkness of the after life,
wherein is all that is created and finished" (695-96).

Lawrence may sometimes 'bore' the reader as a preacher; he may nauseate him
with his worship of the male; he may also tire him with his imagined religion and
imagined leaders. But, as John Fowles says, "sometimes, one leaps to him or rather he
leaps you with him, like the horse in St Mawr, to an effortlessly and infinitely higher
plane, almost to another planet." Then he really "speaks" to the reader; there is then "a
close human bond," the most serious reader-writer bond" (91). What appeals most in
Lawrence as a writer is his serious and sincere concern with fullness of life and living
relationships, which shuns deadness of all kinds. What Coveney says of Wordsworth's
poetry can also be said of Lawrence's fiction. Lawrence's truly great novels and short
stories, which are great in number, are of great relevance to humanity because they are, like Wordsworth's poetry, "philosophic" in the sense that they are the creative work of "a man involved seriously with his art and the central problems of human existence" (69).