Lawrence, as a novelist, is very much alive to the great possibilities of interrelationships in the family. The wholesome relationships which the individual has with others in the family as son, daughter, father, mother and so on count much, not only in the individual’s awareness of selfhood but also in his or her growth into a whole being. However, Lawrence is also acutely aware of the crippling influence the family relationships may often have in curtailing the freedom and the full organic living of the individual. He comes out in support of those who, young or old, choose to live according to the dictates of their organic being and acquire the power to break the narrow confines which the members of the family have built for themselves or inherited from earlier generations.

Generations

Generations are concatenations of families held together in chronological order. Men and women of each generation stand at the crossroads of contemporaneity and historicity, having their social as well as historical connections. A novel like The Rainbow, which studies the life of three generations of people in the Midlands, is at once a social and a historical document. Originally conceived, along with its sequel Women in Love, as a larger novel, The Sisters, The Rainbow presents Lawrence’s interpretation of English social and cultural history over a fairly long period, from the middle of the nineteenth century to the early decades of the twentieth century. In this family saga, Lawrence presents the personal and social lives of three generations of Brangwens, keeping as background the coming of the Industrial Revolution to the collieries of the Midlands and other historical and social events affecting the lives of the
people of England for more than half a century.

In *The Rainbow*, as Leavis points out, Lawrence remains “unsurpassed” as a social historian among novelists (149). The novel deals with the married life of Tom Brangwen of the Marsh Farm and his Polish wife Lydia and Tom’s relationship with his step daughter Anna in the first generation; the love and marital relationships between Anna and Will Brangwen in the second, and the love-relationship the young Ursula Brangwen has with the Polish baron’s son Anton Skrebensky in the third. “As a recorder of essential English history” Leavis considers Lawrence “a great successor to George Eliot.” But, what this “major” “classic” does is not a mere recording of important historical or social facts; it is a “rendering of the continuity and rhythm of life through individual lives” (110, 150).

Critically examining the theories of history made use of by Leavis and others in their analysis of *The Rainbow*, Robert Burden draws on the theories of Michel Foucault and presents the three distinct senses of history perceived by Mark Kinkead-Weekes in *The Rainbow*. The first is “archetypal history with its Biblical and mythic reference.” The second is “real history recording the changes in English life from the rural to the urban, the agricultural to the industrial in the process of modernization.” The third is “the personal history of the three Brangwen generations.” In *The Rainbow*, Kinkead-Weekes finds an “inter-play between the different histories” (92).

Gamini Salgado, who explicates at length the first sense of history, shows how the novel “aspires to the condition of myth,” how “it attempts to capture the essential rhythm of human experience not only in relation to fact and history, but in a larger relation to a trans-temporal order of being.” He finds in the novel “the framework of a modern Genesis myth” and shows that “the parallels between Lawrence’s novel and the Biblical myth exist at many levels, from the structural to the stylistic.” The recurrent
major symbol of the novel, the rainbow, recalls the rainbow of the Old Testament, which is “a sign of the covenant God makes with Noah, a natural emblem of a supernatural bond.” Tom Brangwen himself, as he grows to maturity, resembles Noah, the Biblical patriarch. The flood in which Tom dies “is presented as a vast cataclysm, an act of God recalling that in the Old Testament.” His death “indicates that the covenant is yet to be fulfilled.” The novel is also filled with Biblical allusions and echoes drawn from Lawrence’s consciousness which had been steeped in Christian myths and dogmas from early childhood (110–11).

As Burden says, the conception of history in the novel is considered apocalyptic as it presents “a vision of spiritual degeneration and the self-destruction of mankind prefigured in the real catastrophe of the Great War, yet supposedly leading to regeneration.” The apocalyptic reading of Lawrence’s novels was done by Kermode in the seventies and it was revived by Peter Fjagesund (Burden 87-88). In Kermode’s view, The Rainbow represents the Old Testament and Women in Love the New Testament. Women in Love is an end, whereas The Rainbow was a beginning: it represents the destruction of the old, and enacts the pause before the new world. It presents a kind of Utopia; but it is subjected, like the rest of the apocalyptic material, to Lawrence’s own brand of scepticism (160-61).

The second sense of history Kinkead-Weekes refers to is actual history including what Leavis speaks of as “essential” history in The Rainbow. Leavis observes that while Women in Love has its “astonishing comprehensiveness” and “profundity of treatment” in the presentment of contemporary England, the England of 1914, “The Rainbow has instead its historical depth” (105, 151). To borrow Saussurean terms from Structural Linguistics, while Women in Love makes a “synchronic” study of British civilization, The Rainbow makes a “diachronic” study. The novel makes “a deep and
sustained study of related individual lives” in Lawrence’s own Midlands, where “the immemorial farm-life (‘We’ve been here above two hundred years’) and the England represented by the canal, the colliery, the colliery-town, and the advancing railway met one another and consorted in a challenging paradigm” (105).

The first reference to history is made as early as the first chapter of the novel with the description of the construction of the canal in about 1840 “across the meadows of the Marsh Farm, connecting the newly-opened collieries of the Erewash Valley” (11). In each generation the individual lives are connected in some way with the general history. However, Kinkead-Weekes finds an increase in the contact with history as the novel progresses from one generation to the other. “In the first generation, Marsh Farm is relatively isolated from the events of history. The second gets progressively more involved. By the third, the novel presents ‘a fully historic world’” (Burden 92). As Burden points out, in the third generation there are references to imperial history (the Siege of Khartoum, 1885; the Boer War, 1899-1902; and the British rule in India), to social history (education reform, the Women’s Movement, and class inequality) and to the history of science (the new materialism, the empirical scientific attitude, but also the vastly improved conditions of life enabled by modern science and technology).

Leavis’s view of the social history presented in the novel draws heavily on his moral and cultural preoccupations as a critic. In Burden’s opinion, Leavis’s sole “emphasis on the loss of the spiritual dimension in modern life” is “a reductive reading” that has smoothed over “the contradictions of represented history” (90). Burden identifies Raymond Williams and Terry Eagleton as critics holding on to Leavis’s view in their own way. However, Burden does not fail to note that in Lawrence there is a confirmation of Leavis’s own critique of modern civilization. He finds in the camp opposite Leavis, Graham Holderness, who holds that Lawrence, in *The Rainbow*,
presents a reductive, ideological view of history, “a reduction of history and social relations to the opposition between an ideal organic past and a mechanistic present” (Burden 90). Observing that the colliers were both organic and mechanical, Holderness argues that Lawrence is only aestheticizing history when he glorifies old rural England and its organic community and considers the “man-made,” modern, industrial world “so vile” (“Nottingham . . . 119). Holderness argues that “Lawrence fails to offer a solution to the problem of the contemporary England he diagnoses” because “he misconceives the problem itself”. He considers Lawrence’s views on the causes of industrialization a “radically alienated perspective,” a perspective that misrepresents history (Burden 91-92). According to Burden, both Leavis and Holderness have “closed readings” of the novel. Despite “their respective merits,” they reduce “the semiotic complexity” of the novel to this or that aspect only. Burden prefers Kinkead-Weekes, who according to him, “is more open to the textual complexities when he proposes three distinct senses of history in The Rainbow” (92).

The third sense of history, as Kinkead-Weekes’ distinguishes it, is the personal history of the three Brangwen generations. No great author is interested in history for its own sake; it is the human interest in the stories of individual human lives that form the community or the society that binds the writer to history. Lawrence, as Lukacs says of Tolstoy, presents the human being always as a social being who establishes “relationships with things or persons outside himself” and has his own “origin and goal of human existence” (476-77). In the words of Leavis, The Rainbow clearly reveals Lawrence’s firm conviction that “it is only by way of the most delicate and complex responsive relations with others that the individual can achieve fulfilment.” Leavis also points out the implicit moral in Lawrence’s further insistence that “lasting and satisfactory” personal relations are possible only between “fulfilled individuals.” And
Leavis describes Lawrence’s fulfilled individuals as those “who are really themselves, recognizing their separateness or otherness, and accepting the responsibility of that” (106-07).

Salgado discerns two basic narrative patterns in *The Rainbow*, the linear and the cyclic. The linear one is “concerned with development in time, with one character giving place to another as a centre of interest against a background of change in milieu and circumstance.” In the cyclic pattern “each character undergoes the same struggle for fulfilment, for an adequate relationship between himself and herself and another and with the circumambient universe” (110). In this cyclic pattern, which happens to be within the linear, each generation looks back and forward through parallel relationships, similar episodes, recurrent symbols and so on, is what Leavis refers to as “the paradox of a continuity that is at the same time discontinuity” (104). Salgado likens the expansion of the story over the generations to “the widening ripples caused by a stone in water”. Both spatially and temporally the narrative moves out progressively from the small circle of the Marsh Farm in the early nineteenth century to the larger world of industry, school and university in the beginning of the twentieth century (112). But one wonders whether the Marsh Farm continues to be the centre throughout the novel.

The novel begins with a reference to generations of Brangwens living “on the Marsh Farm, in the meadows where the Erewash twisted sluggishly through alder trees, separating Derbyshire from Nottinghamshire.” They lived a life that pulsated with the life around them on the farm. With the construction of the canal with an embankment, and the coming of the colliery and the railways, contact with the busy outside world was established. Although by getting into contact with the world of industry and trade the Brangwens got richer and became “almost tradesmen”, the Marsh Farm still remained “remote and original,” not corrupted by the external forces (12).
In each cycle of life in the novel the author presents the chief character as a child and as a parent and “the effort of realization and discovery starts again in each generation.” (Leavis 104). Though not so elaborately as in the other two cycles, in the first cycle also the chief character Tom’s life is traced from his childhood. Allowing a quick glimpse into the family history and the early life of the youngest child at the Marsh Farm, Lawrence presents to the reader the nineteen year old Tom Brangwen entering into a new relationship with Lydia Lensky, the Polish widow. Leavis finds in Tom’s whole response to the foreignness of Lydia “a theme that recurs in The Rainbow as the experience of new love recurs in each new generation. Either lover is for the other a ‘door’; an opening into the ‘unknown’, by which the horizon, the space of life, is immensely expanded, and unaccepted limits that had seemed final are “transgressed”” (119).

Tom and Lydia plunge into their sexual experience which proves to be a “secret” to both of them. But, when she is with child, there comes a “silence and distance” between them that he appeals with all his power to the child and soon “the small Anna” and Tom Brangwen are “like lovers, father and child.” It is now the first hint of the recurring and unifying symbol of the rainbow is given. As the pregnant woman merges into a “heavy obscurity” and the husband is thrown into an unutterable silence and tension, he feels “like a broken arch thrust sickeningly out from support.” It appears as though the arch were a subsidiary of that dominant symbol, the rainbow, which is used quite often by the author, in one form or the other, suggesting the cyclic pattern of the novel (62-65).

The gradual development of intimacy between little Tom and Anna is a remarkable study of human relationships, especially of the possibilities of love and affection between a child and its step father in the context of the child’s jealousy of the
mother (66-67). The scenes that dramatize this are presented so realistically that, when, in the scene of the feeding of the cows on the rainy night, the child clings “soft and warm” to her father, the reader easily accepts the transformation that has come about in the relationship between them. Little Anna now asks him, on her own, “Will the cows go to sleep now?”, “Will they eat all their stuff up first?” Now, holding the child to himself, Tom looks down at “the silky folds of the paisley shawl” covering her body. It reminds him of his mother, who used to go to church in it. It is not only that Tom is back again as a boy, “in the old irresponsibility and security” of his home. It is also that the reader is taken back to the past, the beginning of the novel, by simple objects which do not otherwise have much symbolic function. Even as he is presenting the vital “male to female” relationship between Tom and Lydia, the author is beginning to give equal importance to Anna Lensky, who is the representative of the next cycle (78-81).

Even after the birth of his son Tom’s love flows towards Anna and he is happy when the little girl responds to his love and accepts him as her father. However, with “a part of his stream of life” thus diverted to the child, Tom still has his “main flood to his wife” (83). When they reunite after a brief quarrel over Tom’s slight interest in his brother’s mistress, Lawrence expresses the hope and happiness that married life assures once again through the image of the doorway through which they discover “the new world.” When Lawrence uses the symbol of the arch again, it is not a broken arch, but a full arch across the heavens. It beautifully symbolizes the fulfilled life of the parents, which alone can secure joy and peace for the child. “She was no longer called upon to uphold with her childish might the broken end of the arch. Her father and mother now met to the span of the heavens, and she, the child, was free to play in the space beneath, between” (96).

The beginning of the second cycle synchronizes with the growth of little Anna
into a young woman. Lydia imperceptibly recedes to the background and Tom Brangwen also, after an emotional conflict and upsurge, resigns himself to the background. Young Anna’s life undergoes a change with the arrival of Will Brangwen, in whose company she is getting glimpses of “the beyond,” which the Brangwen women had always longed for. “In him the bounds of her experience were transgressed: he was the hole in the wall, beyond which the sunshine blazed on an outside world” The “hole” unobtrusively takes the place of the doorway symbol (114). The love between Anna and Will causes much pain to the father who realizes that he is going to lose his dear daughter to her man. Will is after all his own nephew. Yet, as far as his love for his daughter is concerned, Will is an outsider who is going to take his daughter away from him. After the fowl loft scene there comes the equally significant scene in which Anna and Will gather sheaves of corn and set them against the shock in the moon light (122). It is at the end of this scene that Will suggests that they get married. After a heart rending conflict with Tom, Anna gets his consent for the marriage and also an unexpected, generous gift of a large part of the Marsh capital from him.

In the novel there are some “most characteristically vivid scenes,” which Salgado, following Julian Moynahan, calls “ritual scenes.” They are, in fact, part of the novelist’s conventions to fathom the unconscious. Included in these are the sheaf-gathering scene between Will and Anna, the parallel moonlight scene between Ursula and Skrebensky, Anna’s naked dance in “Anna Victrix” and Ursula’s encounter with the horses in the last chapter. These scenes contribute to “the cyclic pattern in which narrative time is arrested and we have little sense of before and after.” They help the author explore “the inner existence” of the characters through a special use of language characterized by repetitions, symbols, images, rhythm and a “hallucinatory and incantatory quality” associated with ritual (Salgado 112-17).
The real victory of Anna lay in the bliss of her becoming a mother with all “the fierce, tearing pain.” She too strained her eyes to see something “beyond” and from her Pisgah mount saw “a faint, gleaming horizon, a long way off, and a rainbow like an archway, a shadow-door with faintly coloured coping above it.” But “with satisfaction she relinquished the adventure to the unknown.” She was now bearing her children with “vague” contentment and with her great fecundity discovered the rainbow in her own self. The cosmic symbol of the rainbow is identified with the passage of birth in the woman, at the microcosmic level. She herself is “a door and a threshold,” through which another soul comes “to stand upon the threshold, looking out, shading its eyes for the direction to take.” She watches the sun and the moon travel on and pass her by. But she cannot go; “she must stay at home now” (192-96).

In his married life with Lydia, Tom found “the gateway” to the beyond, but in Anna, Will is not able to find any promise to “the way out.” The arch-doorway-rainbow symbol does not bring any assurance of new life. There is only retrogression. He dreads all flight to the Absolute Beauty represented by the round arch and turns to “the Gothic form, which always asserted the broken desire of mankind in its pointed arches.” He considers this Absolute beauty “immoral and against mankind” and finds his “Absolute Beauty” in his wife, “in the sensual beauties of her body.” But even this only “seems” to have “come to being in the body of woman,” and “all the shameful things of the body reveal themselves to him now with a sort of sinister, tropical beauty”(237-38). As Will and Anna are involved in their day-to-day interests, the focus of the novel shifts to the adventures and conflicts of their first child Ursula, who will carry on the family saga into the third generation. However, as Anna “lapses from the foreground of the drama” and remains “the serene mother in the background,” Will continues to play an important role in the development of the child’s consciousness, at
least till her circle begins to widen (Leavis 132).

As Ursula, the chief personage of the third cycle, assumes importance, the novelist is on his way to bring to an end the roles of those of the first life cycle, who have already receded far into the background. He recalls the lost intimacy and the reserve between the father and the step-daughter, and announces Tom's death in just five words: "Then suddenly the father died." It is then, as though in flashback, he proceeds to describe how the death by water came about. But even here the author has the point of reference of time as Ursula's. He begins: "It happened one spring time when Ursula was about eight years old, he, Tom Brangwen, . . ." (243). As Kettle observes "the full significance of the coming of the canal (serving the new collieries)" may be realized in the fact that it is the bursting of the canal-bank that kills Tom Brangwen (112). The scene does recall Noah and the Flood of the Old Testament. But here Tom, the patriarch, is drowned in the flood, signifying the ending of an old world and its values represented by the Marsh Farm and the beginning of a new world of which Ursula will be the representative. The body being brought to the parlour of Anna's house and the cleaning and dressing she does with the help of her husband and a woman reminds one of the scene in "Odour of Chrysanthemums," in which Elizabeth Bates does the same to her husband's body when it is brought home from the colliery, though the intensity of the death-situation is felt much more in the poor collier's family.

Lydia carries on her life as a widow for a few more years at the Marsh Farm and the author mentions her death just in passing, two years after the event, as part of Ursula's recollections of the past while she is waiting for the tram (368). But in the last years of her life she has her relevance in the novel mainly as one who considers Ursula "her chief friend." The connection between the third and the first of the generations continues almost bypassing the generation in between. To Ursula, her grandmother's
bedroom was “a paradisal land,” away from the “activity and passion” of Cossethay. Her childish questions would set “the musing, fragile woman of sixty,” off on her journey down memory lane, as when she inquired about the two wedding rings on her fingers. The grandmother would tell her about the girl’s two grandfathers. Lawrence here brings in one of the vital themes of the novel, the continuity of life despite changes. “Life must go on, I must marry your grandfather, and I have your Uncle Tom, and your Uncle Fred. We cannot take so much upon ourselves” (254-60). The grandmother’s past stirs thoughts about her own future in the little girl’s mind, which has already begun to see her continuity from “the dark-bearded impressive man” from Poland:

‘Will somebody love me grandmother?’

‘Many people love you, child. We all love you.’

‘But when I am grown up, will somebody love me?’

‘Yes, some man will love you, child, because it’s your nature. And I hope it will be somebody who will love you for what you are, and not for what he wants of you. But we have a right to what we want.’(260)

This conversation between Ursula and her grandmother looks forward to what awaits the girl in her immediate future. But the grandmother’s emphasis on the recognition of and respect for the individual self in a love-relationship has its significance even beyond the world of the present novel. Already the grandmother’s words about her two husbands seem to point to Ursula’s relationship with Skrebensky as a girl in the present novel and with Birkin as a woman in its sequel: “I liked them both. I married the first when I was quite a girl. Then I loved your grandfather when I was a woman. There is a difference.” And there is going to be a big difference in Ursula’s relationship with the two men (259). But, at the moment, the grandmother’s words frighten the girl. She clings to her, and from the “peace and security” of the grandmother’s room, “the door
opens on to the greater space, the past,” which contains “loves and births and deaths, tiny units and features within a vast horizon.” In the novel, along with the theme of the continuity of life with all its changes, there is also the affirmation of the relevance and value of individual life on earth (260).

Roger Sale is partly right when he says that, in the chapter “The Marsh and the Flood,” “for the first time, the novel’s forward flow is checked; the preceding chapter does not lead into it as we have seen was the case in earlier chapters nor does the subsequent chapter lead away from it”. But in its focus on Ursula’s response to the grandmother’s past, which is also hers, the chapter does have its connection with the following chapter. Sale argues that Lawrence “contradicts one of the novel’s central symbols.” He says “the door here, in stead of opening on to the ‘beyond’, the ‘rainbow’, and, always, the future, opens on to the past, the ‘tiny units and features’” (112). But, in the development of the paradoxical theme of continuity in discontinuity (“lives are separate, but life is continuous”), effectively carried through by the cyclic narrative pattern, there does not seem to be anything amiss in looking back at the past through the central symbol of the novel.

Of the three cycles, it is the third that brings a member of the Brangwen family into real contact with the wider world. Quite surprisingly, there are two chapters of identical title, “The Widening Circle”, in this section. The story of young Ursula’s relationships with Anton and other members of the modern world occupies nearly the whole of the second half of the novel. As a true Lawrencean heroine, Ursula, whether at home or in the world outside, always desires to be herself, always holds her individuality very dear. At home, despite the hurts and insults she receives from a father who fails to understand her, and the persistent interruptions from her younger siblings, Ursula often dwells in her own private world of romantic dreams and “multicoloured”
illusions, arising as they do from the tales she reads and the stories of her ancestry she hears from her grandmother.

When she finds herself out of this “intricately woven illusion of life” and goes to the Grammar School in Nottingham, she has a new illusion of school, but soon, like “a free, unabateable animal,” she revolts against all authority and seeks to protect “her undiscovered self” from the attacks of “brutish resentment of the commonplace, the average Self” (268-71). It was while she was wrestling through “the dark days of confusion” that Skrebensky, the young man of twenty one, appeared in the life of the “slim, smouldering girl” of sixteen (288). To Ursula, he was “one such as those Sons of God who saw the daughters of men, that they were fair”(292). She had already come to believe that those Sons were the offspring of God beside Adam and they “had known no expulsion, no ignominy of the fall” like Adam (276). In her initiation into the world of passion Ursula felt as though her “adventure in life” was beginning.

The author in his description of the life of this young pair of lovers recalls quite consciously the events in the lives of the pairs in the previous two generations. Ursula’s father’s reaction to the developing relationship between Ursula and the ‘outsider’ recalls her grandfather’s anger and jealousy towards her father when he courted her mother. Despite her father “gathering in anger against him” and her mother “hardening in anger against her,” Ursula went ahead with her relations with Skrebensky as defiantly as her mother once did in her love-making (303). Ursula taking her young lover to the shed on the pretext of showing him her wood-carving and playing at kisses with him is a near parallel to the scene in the second cycle in which young Anna takes Will to the fowl loft on the pretext of checking whether she put the brick over where the rat came in. However, Ursula soon becomes aware that her love relationship with the young soldier is a failure. Skrebensky leaves for the South African war, and as she finds him annulled
as a lover and a human being, Ursula finds that her hopes and dreams are brought to nought.

The next person in her widening circle with whom Ursula had the experience of intimacy ending in disappointment was Winifred Inger, her class-mistress, "a rather beautiful woman of twenty-eight" (336). It was Ursula who brought together Miss Inger and her uncle, Tom Brangwen, who was then managing a big, new colliery in Yorkshire. With both her uncle and her teacher, Ursula found the same kind of worship of the abstraction as she found with Skrebensky. If the abstraction was the 'nation' with Skrebensky, with Winifred and Tom it was "the monstrous mechanism that held all matter, living or dead, in its service." Like Skrebensky's, their lives were also marked by nothingness. Winifred would "let fate do as it liked with her" and marry Tom, "since there was nothing remaining to be done." As for Tom, all his desires had ended in a disintegration of his soul and "he had come to a stability of nullification" (344). Ursula hated both her Uncle Tom and Miss Inger. She was repelled by their adherence to the world of the machine, in whose service they achieved their "consummation." They soon got married, and the author predicts, Tom "would let the machinery carry him" and Winifred "would make a good companion." But Ursula had already decided to "leave them both for ever, leave for ever their strange, soft, half-corrupt element" (351-52).

For Ursula, the third generation Brangwen, the problem the world poses would logically be "more complex," "as the cultural conditions become more sophisticated." Hers is no longer the old agrarian world of her grandfather Tom Brangwen, which had just seen the coming of the railroad and the opening of the new collieries. Her England is Lawrence's England and her experience in the new world has "a representative quality;" "we watch the movement of civilization in England" (Leavis 142). The first phase of the innocent's initiation into the world of experience being over, Ursula comes
home only to get ready to launch herself into the next phase.

Ursula has further experience of the outside world at St.Philip's School, where she gets a chance to take a critical look at education, becomes a friend of the suffragette Maggie and gets interested in the liberty of women. Maggie's brother, Anthony's proposal of marriage, which she rejects, does not hamper her surging ahead in the new world. The novelist then moves the entire family to Beldover, which is going to be the central place of activity in the next novel, *Women in Love*.

Her England is the new industrial England in which “the great machine has taken us all captives” and, as Leavis concludes, the novelist, as well as his little heroine, is now moving out of the world of *The Rainbow* and entering the world of *Women in Love*. “The distinctive themes and tones of the later book” are introduced in the later part of *The Rainbow*, and there is “the same sense of the plight of human life in an industrial civilization.” According to Leavis, the novelist is now in an urgent need “to get this book somehow finished and done with, in order that he might go on with the one he wanted to write.” In his opinion, there is “something oddly desperate” about the novel’s concluding page and a half and the “confident note of prophetic hope in the final paragraph” is “wholly unprepared and unsupported” (148).

Ursula's disappointing experience with Skrebensky on the coast of Lincolnshire, in which no consummation was possible, was the last blow that made her declare that it was all finished between them; it was a failure. It did not take much time for Skrebensky to take further course of action. He married his Colonel’s daughter and, without notifying Ursula, “sailed with his new wife to India” (482-83). Humbled by the thought that she might be pregnant, Ursula writes a letter of apology to Skrebensky asking him to have her back. But all that she receives is a cablegram from him: “I am married.” “An old pain and anger and contempt” stir in her. She becomes ill for a
fortnight. As she grows better, she looks out through the window and sees there a rainbow forming itself, making a “great architecture of light and colour and the space of heaven,” with its pedestals “luminous in the corruption of new houses on the low hill” and its arch reaching “the top of heaven.” The author brings in the old symbols, the husk and the kernel, again along with the rainbow, and ends the novel with a note of hope. Ursula hopes that the rainbow would be arched in the blood of the people and quiver to life in their spirit, that they would cast off their “horny covering of disintegration” and have “a new germination,” “a new growth.” “In the earth’s new architecture, the old, brittle corruption of houses and factories” would be swept away and the world would be “built up in a living fabric of Truth, fitting to the over-arching heaven” (494-96). There are “signs of too great a tentativeness in the development and organization of the later part” of the novel and “signs of a growing sense in the writer of an absence of any conclusion in view.” But, despite the “imperfection” in the ending, as Leavis concludes, the novel remains “a classic” with “a marvellous invention of form” presenting life lived through “three interlinked generations” (150-51).

Though not so elaborately as in *The Rainbow*, Lawrence also deals with generational differences in *Women in Love*. As early as the chapter “Diver” it is suggested that the Criches have changed much from the earlier generations. Gudrun identifies Shortlands as belonging to the eighteenth century, the time of “Dorothy Wordsworth and Jane Austen,” but Ursula says the Criches do not “fit the period.” Gerald has made “all kinds of latest improvements” including the installation of a private electric plant for lighting the house. Ursula finds in him “several generations of younghess at one go.” The ultimate, disastrous effect of mechanization on the life of the individual, from which Gerald is going to suffer, is already anticipated by Ursula: “He’ll have to die soon, when he’s made every possible improvement, and there will be
nothing more to improve. He’s got go, anyhow.” Gudrun agrees that Gerald has got ‘go’, but “the unfortunate thing is, where does his go go to, what becomes of it?” Ursula replies that his ‘go’ “goes in applying the latest appliances” (52-53).

The sisters learn from Mrs Kirk, from whom they buy honey, that Thomas Crich is “as nice and kind a gentleman as ever you could wish to meet.” But “his children don’t take after him.” Mrs Kirk, who nursed three of the Crich children, says they were “proper little terrors,” “little fiends,” and “Gerald was a demon if ever there was one, a proper demon, ay, at six months old.” And, if the father locked the study door and whipped them when he got really worked up, the mother would pace up and down, outside the room “like a tiger, with very murder in her face.” The “proud haughty” mother would be provoked to great anger “if you wouldn’t let them smash their pots on the table, if you wouldn’t let them drag the kitten about with a string round his neck, if you wouldn’t give them whatever they asked for” (238-39). Winifred had her pet animals. “But if she heard that her beloved kitten Leo had been run over by the motor-car she put her head on one side, and, replied, with a faint contraction like presentment on her face: ‘has he?’ Then she took no more notice” (247). Such callousness was a characteristic of the Crich family.

The generational difference between Thomas Crich and his eldest son Gerald is clearly marked in their attitude towards their fellow human beings and the world of industry in general. Though Lawrence does not present an ideal picture of a man in Thomas Crich, he shows him as a ‘good’ human being with agreeable ‘human’ failings. But, when he presents Gerald, “the industrial magnate,” he gathers all his powers and launches a subtle and scathing attack on the modern industrialist with ‘inhuman’ attitudes towards the world of man and of Nature. In the words of Leavis, we see in Gerald, “the malady of the individual psyche as the essential process of industrial
civilization” (164).

Thomas Crich had always wanted to be an ideal Christian. He was “so constant to charity, and to his love for his neighbour,” and always thought of “the welfare of the people.” “He was a large employer of labour, he was a great mine owner. And he had never lost this from his heart, that in Christ he was one with his workmen.” He believed that the miners, being poor, were nearer to God than he, and wanted to move towards them. His wife would come down “like a wolf” on the poor who came crawling after charity. But he was always kind and even “liked hearing appeals to his charity” (241-43).

But the old man's religious beliefs in charity “seemed to have become obsolete, to be superseded in the world.” When he took over the direction of the mines from his father, Gerald, as part of the reforms of the firm, even stopped the free supply of coal to widows of men who had worked for the firm and said the firm was not a charity institution. He spewed inhuman contempt towards those widows. He would wonder: “Why were they not immolated on the pyre of the husband, like the sati in India?” (259).

In the earlier generation the money from the earth was used to make the mine owners “comfortably rich” and “allow the workmen sufficient wages and good conditions.” For Thomas Crich of the second generation, who had sufficient fortune, the mines “were primarily great fields to produce bread and plenty for all the hundreds of human beings gathered about them” (252). But, in the third generation, with Gerald, the relationship with the earth did not have anything to do with the well-being of people. He did not care about money or social position. “What he wanted was the pure fulfilment of his own will in the struggle with the natural conditions.” It was a “fight with Matter, with the earth and the coal it enclosed” (256).
Though many things are passed down from one generation to the other, each generation has to find its own way into the future; each generation has to have its own adventure, its own seeking. In *The Lost Girl* Lawrence dwells at length on this in the experiences of Alvina Houghton, who “realized that her day was not the day of her parents, their life was not hers.” “After all, it was not for her to reconstruct her parents’ lives [. . .]. Returning up-channel to re-discover their cause was quite another matter from flowing down-stream into the unknown, as they had done thirty years before. [. . .] Wisdom has reference only to the past. The future remains forever an infinite field for mistakes. You can’t know before hand.” On the death of her mother, she was determined that her fate would be different from her mother’s. Her business was with her own fate, not with her mother’s (59).

**Children**

Lawrence’s concern with men and women begins with his interest in the child, not merely as the would-be man or woman, but also as an individual being by itself. The child has been co-existent with the adults ever since the creation of mankind, and no human concern can afford to ignore the place of the child in familial relationships. In a sense, marriage as a social institution becomes relevant only when it stands for the identity, care and protection of children. A fact that can be added to this is that in the world of mammals, the human child alone depends so much and so long on the adult world for its survival and growth.

The way literary authors present the child in their works largely reflects the general attitude of the society to the child. It is only rarely that some exceptionally sensitive writer sees and thinks differently and tells the society at large to look at the child differently. And even such writers owe much to the current developments in social and psychological theories about the child. It is an area in which there has been much
scope for useful exchange of ideas between literature and the social and natural sciences. On the theme of childhood as presented in literature in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, especially in "English literature during the period of the great novel," *The Image of Childhood* by Peter Coveney still remains a classic. The book, as Leavis says, "makes us look, if back to Blake, then forward with clear perception of a direct vital relation, to D. H. Lawrence" (Introd.15).

Tracing the history of the child in English literature, Coveney strongly opines that "until the last decades of the eighteenth century the child did not exist as an important and continuous theme in English literature. Childhood as a major theme came with the generation of Blake and Wordsworth." He holds that "in the Elizabethan drama, in the main body of Augustan verse, in the eighteenth century novel, the child is absent, or the occasion of a passing reference; at the most a subsidiary element in an adult world" (29). Coveney’s study discovers three distinct attitudes underlying the sensibility 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.

Those who believed in the doctrine of Original Sin considered the ‘original nature’ of the child sinful, miserable and corrupt. In the seventeenth century, puritans like Janeway counselled parents to "take some time daily to speak a little to your children one by one about their miserable condition by nature" (qtd. in Coveney 44). Restraints were imposed upon "natural vice" by "rational virtue." And, throughout medieval and Elizabethan times, parents and teachers had so often considered corporal punishment "God’s instrument to cure the evils of their condition" (44).

With "the romantic revival," with "the revolution in sensibility" that came with the end of the eighteenth century, the child became "the focus of an unprecedented
literary interest” and “the modern literary child,” also known as “the romantic child,” was born. “The society created by the industrial developments” was “increasingly unconcerned with and often inimical to art,” and the later nineteenth century artist was not only “alienated and bewildered,” but also “confronted” by the diminishing of the proportion of the literate public to whom he could expect to address himself as a serious artist. In the “disastrous” context of “isolation, alienation, doubt and intellectual conflict,” the artist was attracted towards the child as a literary theme. “Through the child he could express the conflict between human Innocence and the cumulative pressures of social Experience” (30-31).

There were two clearly opposing tendencies in the interest the artists showed in the child, which Coveney considers “the weakness and the strength of all romantic art.” One was the “morbid introversion” of some artists for whom the child was “a symbol of retreat into personal regression and self-pity.” The other was the “objective awareness” artists like Blake, Wordsworth and Dickens had of the child as “a symbol of growth and development.” Commending the authors having the latter tendency, Coveney says “in a world given increasingly to utilitarian values and the Machine,” such authors find in the child “the symbol of Imagination and Sensibility, a symbol of Nature set against the forces abroad in society actively de-naturing humanity.” These authors are able to identify themselves with the child, for, in their “central problem” of adjustment with society, they find kinship with the child, whose difficulty and chief source of pain often lie in adjustment and accommodation to environment.” In authors like Blake and Wordsworth the child becomes “a symbol of the greatest significance for the subjective investigation of the Self, and an expression of their romantic protest against the Experience of society.” The child lies at the heart of “serious adult art” like The Prelude, Hard Times, Dombey and Son and Huckleberry Finn. For Wordsworth the
child becomes “the basis for a whole philosophy of human nature” (30-33).

The concept of the Original Innocence of the romantic child stems most forcefully from Rousseau, whose *Social Contract* begins with the historic words: “Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains.” Rousseau’s relevance to Lawrence could be seen in Rousseau’s “primary demand [. . .] that the child is important in himself, and not as a diminutive adult.” The central emphasis of Rousseau’s classic on education, *Emile*, is on seeing the child as a child. He writes: “Childhood has ways of seeing, thinking, and feeling peculiar to itself; nothing can be more foolish than to substitute our ways for them.” As Coveney points out, “it is Rousseau’s *Emile* that dominates the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries until Freud” (42-44).

Coveney says Freud’s “Essay on Infantile Sexuality” may be said to join hands with Wordsworth’s *Prelude* “across the century” because “a major concern of Freudian analysis was to increase awareness of the child and objective appreciation of the importance of the childhood consciousness to the development of the adult mind” (34). However, Freud’s psycho-analysis of the child’s consciousness marks a clear “emancipation” from both ‘original sin’ and ‘original innocence’, as they had become “impediments to an objective assessment of the nature of the child, and the significance to be attached to his education and experience” (291-92).

Freud shook the very foundations of the medical world in the last decade of the nineteenth century by his “claim that many symptoms of mental illness and disturbed personality could be traced back to suppressed memories of childhood experiences”. “His greatest medical and social heresy was to claim that the sex impulse existed in infants . . . and that its misdirection could be the principal cause of later mental disturbances” (Greene 468). In his psycho-analysis Freud posits “the reality of the unconscious and its relation, first to mental disorder, and thence to the whole field of
human behaviour,” and turns especially to infancy and childhood, “when the conscious
is in its most dynamic and tender relationship with the unconscious” (Coveney 293).

According to Freud, there are three components of human personality, the Id,
the Ego and the Super-Ego. Id, which in Latin means ‘it’, is a term Freud borrowed
from The Book of the Id by Georg Groddeck, an exponent of psychosomatic medicine
(Freud’s Personality . . . ). It represents “our primitive drives and operates largely
according to the pleasure principle, whereby its two main goals are the seeking of
pleasure and the avoidance of pain.” The Id draws its energy from “the energy
storehouse” called ‘Libido’ and comprises two major instincts: Eros, “the life instinct
that motivates people to focus on pleasure-seeking tendencies (e.g., sexual urges)” and
Thanatos, “the death instinct that motivates people to use aggressive urges to destroy”
(Ego . . . ). Ego, which means ‘I’ in Latin, refers to the agency of the mind that
“mediates between the Id, the Superego, and the external world to balance our primitive
drives, our moral ideals and taboos, and the limitations of reality” (Freud’s Personality.
. .). The Super-Ego, which stands in opposition to the desires of the Id, is “that agency
in the unconscious which through parental and social influences assumes the power of
an unconscious moral ‘conscience’” (Coveney 293).

Considering the human personality “basically a battlefield,” Freud describes it
with comical but revealing pugilistic images: “He [the human self] is a dark-cellar in
which a well-bred spinster lady (the superego) and a sex-crazed monkey (the id) are
forever engaged in mortal combat, the struggle being refereed by a rather nervous bank
clerk (the ego)” (qtd. in Ego . . . ). In a stable personality there would be a resolution of
“the conflict between the impulses of the Id seeking satisfaction, and the demands of
external existence, and also the other conflict between the instincts and the
unconsciously inhibiting pressures of the Super-Ego.” When there is a failure to achieve a conscious resolution, particularly in the case of the infantile Ego, the stability of the individual personality is upset. Freud saw in the neurotic symptoms of the adult the repercussions of “the failure of the infantile Ego to control the impulses of the Id,” and, in this way, he formulated the whole concept of ‘infantile sexuality’ (Coveney 294).

In Freud’s view, when the apparatus for adjustment, the Ego, is weakest, the child encounters “enormous problems of accommodation to reality – through birth itself, through weaning, through the necessity to adopt clean bodily habits, and to accept the existence of other brothers and sisters in respect of the affection demanded from the loved parent, through the prohibition on infantile masturbation, and, most important for Freud, through the frustration of the child’s oedipal impulse towards sexual satisfaction with the parent of the opposite sex.” Freud considered it “a serious danger” to lay “too early and strict inhibition” on the natural impulses of the child. “Too crude a transition at any stage of the child’s development, too sudden a prohibition of the gratification of its earliest oral, anal, and oedipal impulses would lead to the repression of such impulses into the unconscious, engendering fear, anxiety, and guilt in the child’s and adult’s conscious behaviour, and thus preventing, through the unconscious obstacle of repression, the continuous development of the psyche towards adult maturity.” So, for Freud, “an essential pre-condition of prophylaxis against neurosis lay in the enlightened treatment of the child” (Coveney 295-96). He states, in his An Outline of Psycho-Analysis, that neurosis could be avoided “if the child’s sexual life were allowed free play, as happens among many primitive races” (qtd. in Coveney 296).

Freud’s scientific approach rejected both the religious affirmation of Original Sin and the romantic concept of Original Innocence. As a scientist he wanted to deal only in ‘facts’, and concepts such as ‘corruption’, ‘sin’ and ‘innocence’ were alien to his
approach. "He had a fundamental distaste for the traditional Christian theory of human consciousness, which treated the child's nature as corrupt." However, "for all his destruction of the idea of childhood's innocence, Freud's ideas were in fact in fundamental sympathy with the original romantic assertion of childhood's importance, and its vulnerability to social victimization" (Coveney 301).

With the beginning of the twentieth century, with Joyce and Lawrence, there came the clear acceptance of the role of psychology in analysing the mind of the child, discarding the concepts of sin and innocence. They would not use the child for a romantic 'message', or as a "vehicle for self-pity, indulgent pathos, or escape." Nor would they conceive him as "the child of the Puritan's sin and the Devil." They would present the child "in his reality." But, seeking to answer the question whether they owed anything to Freud, Coveney suggests that the relation between modern literature and Freudian analysis could be considered as "a cross-fertilization between intellects and sensibilities" that work often in parallel fields but sometimes coincide. On his seventieth birthday, when he was praised as "the discoverer of the unconscious," Freud disclaimed the title and added that "poets and philosophers before me discovered the unconscious. What I discovered was the scientific method by which the unconscious can be studied" (303-04).

In *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* Lawrence is critical of Freud's "adventure into the hinterland of human consciousness." He says: "Suddenly he stepped out of the conscious into the unconscious, out of the everywhere into the nowhere, like some supreme explorer. He walks through the wall of sleep, and we hear him rumbling in the cavern of dreams." He disapproves of the psychoanalyst presenting the complexes not just as "abnormalities" but as "part of the stock-in-trade of the normal unconscious" (203-04).
Though he shares with Joyce a serious interest in the psychic realities, Lawrence does not, like Joyce, overtly experiment with techniques such as the stream of consciousness, and his art reflects “less consciously the psychological preoccupations of his time” than that of Joyce. As Coveney says, his central concern has been the psychic relation between the individual and his society, especially the individual’s integrity in the face of the false emotional values of his society. In works such as *The Rainbow* the two “polarizing interests of his art,” the individual and the society, are very closely related to his concern with childhood and development. (321). However, Scott Sanders considers Lawrence “a true heir of Freud.” He argues, using Freudian terms, that Lawrence “set the ego against the id.” The id is “not an identity,” but “rather a name for the unknown, a territory of obscure forces, the dark and silent basement of the self.” And, “compared with the stark and savage evocations of the unconscious in *The Rainbow*, say, or *Women in Love*, the work of Proust, Mann, Virginia Woolf and even Joyce appears tame and civilized” (16-17).

In *The Rainbow* the novelist presents in each generation the childhood of a major character. However, the childhood of Anna in the second generation and of Ursula in the third that assume greater importance and attract more elaborate treatment than the childhood of Tom in the first generation. The story of Tom’s childhood is told in just three pages. He was sent to school only by the initiative taken by his mother in his education. But this child, “more sensuously developed, more refined in instinct” than the other boys at school, knew his own limitations in what he had to do with the brain. Unlike his grand daughter Ursula, who was a passionate lover of books even as a child, he “hated books as if they were his enemies.” When he took the book and began reading the words of Shelley introduced by his teacher of literature ‘*Oh wild west wind, thou breath of autumn’s being*’, “the very fact of the print caused a prickly sensation of
repulsion to go over his skin” and threw the book down and walked over it and went out to the cricket field (16). The stories of Anna and Ursula as little children are dealt with in detail in the next section because the stories are as much about themselves as children as they are about the relationships they have as daughters with their parents, especially with their fathers.

The very survival and continuity of human kind on earth depend on the care and love the adult world shows the child. Any civilization that ignores the well-being of the child only marches towards extinction. It is true that sexual pleasure is independent of the desire to have children; men and women engage themselves in sex not merely because they need their progeny. But it is children who bring meaning to the institution of marriage. As Lawrence’s one-time friend Bertrand Russell defines it, “marriage is something more serious than the pleasure of two people in each other’s company; it is an institution which, through the fact that it gives rise to children, forms part of the intimate texture of society, and has an importance extending far beyond the personal feelings of the husband and the wife.” In Russell’s view, “but for children, there would be no need of any institution concerned with sex, but as soon as children enter in, the husband and wife, if they have any sense of responsibility or any affection for their offspring, are compelled to realize that their feelings towards each other are no longer what is of most importance” (63-64).

In Women in Love, in both Ursula and Gudrun, who are interested in discussing marriage, there is no sign of any positive interest in child-bearing. Ursula says, “Perhaps one doesn’t really want them, in one’s soul” (9). In the case of Minette and the other Bohemians, neither marriage nor children matter. Minette is ten weeks pregnant, but she does not want to have the baby. The ‘putative’ father of the child, Halliday, is not going to have her with him. Minette tells Gerald, “And now I’m going to have a baby, he
wants to give me a hundred pounds and send me into the country, so that he would never see me nor hear of me again” (75).

Though many things are passed down from one generation to the other, each generation has to find its own way into the future; each generation has to have its own adventure, its own seeking. In The Lost Girl Lawrence dwells at length on this in the experiences of Alvina Houghton, who “realized that her day was not the day of her parents, their life was not hers.” “After all, it was not for her to reconstruct her parents’ lives [. . .] Returning up-channel to re-discover their cause was quite another matter from flowing down-stream into the unknown, as they had done thirty years before. [. . .] Wisdom has reference only to the past. The future remains forever an infinite field for mistakes. You can’t know before hand.” On the death of her mother, she was determined that her fate would be different from her mother’s. Her business was with her own fate, not with her mother’s (59).

Sons and Daughters

Mother-son relationship in the autobiographical novel Sons and Lovers occupies an important place in Lawrencean criticism because of the question of the Oedipus complex in the chief character Paul Morel and in the author himself. Mrs Morel, with all her middle-class expectations, developed a deep hatred towards her collier husband Walter Morel, whom she despised for his drunkenness, his despicable lies, his “bullying indifference” to her expectations, his uncouth behaviour and his harsh and brutal treatment of her and the children. The children, on whom the mother showered all her affections, took sides and hated the father. When he was told of the birth of his third child, Paul, the miner, tired of the day’s work at the pit, only grunted and asked for his drink. When he went up reluctantly, after finishing his meal, he blessed the child “by rote – pretending paternal emotion, which he did not feel just then” (44-45). But, the
mother “felt strangely towards the infant.” “She felt as if the navel string that had connected its frail little body with hers had not been broken.” “Then she put him to her bosom again, ashamed of her impulse to give him back again whence he came” (51). The possessive mother is here the Magna Mater and Magna Dolorosa, whom Birkin derides in *Women in Love* for her desire to take back the man to herself, “soul and body, sex, meaning, and all” (224). Mrs Morel cast off her husband and turned “for love and life to the children” (62).

Paul’s hatred towards the father makes him pray, “Lord let my father die,” which is an unconscious wish to get rid of his rival (79). The mother’s response to the son-lover is also peculiar. When the boy brings home, after hunting far and wide, some blackberries and offers her a little spray, she expresses her joy “in a curious tone of a woman accepting a love-token.” And in their love for the mother, the brothers William and Paul are “unconsciously jealous” of each other (88-89), and with the death of William, Mrs Morel’s life “rooted itself in Paul” (176).

In the second part of the novel in the two love triangles Paul entered into, his mother was the rival to each of his sweethearts. For fear of his mother’s jealous protest, Paul could not admit even to himself that he and Miriam were lovers. He would call his relationship with her “a platonic friendship” (213). And, with all his fondness for Miriam’s company, he held on to his mother most passionately. When the mother and son went out across the fields to the village and sea, “he stuck to her as if her were her man” (219). Mrs Morel allowed her bitter jealousy to come out in the open and objected to Paul’s relationship with Miriam. She cried in her heart: “she’s not an ordinary woman, who can leave me my share in him. She wants to absorb him. […] – she will suck him up” (237). And the young man “felt dreary and hopeless between the two.” But “at the thought of his mother,” he could “feel cruel towards” Miriam and “easily”
hate her (238). How much the love for the mother kept the young man from any fulfiment in love with Miriam is revealed when Paul was forced to tell his mother, who burnt with jealousy: “what nonsense, mother – I know I don’t love her – I – I tell you I don’t love her – she doesn’t even walk with my arm, because I don’t want her to.” For Paul it was a realization by instinct that he is “life” to his mother and “she is the chief thing to him, the only supreme thing.” Hearing his mother’s cry, “and I’ve never – you know, Paul – I’ve never had a husband – not really —,” he comforted her by stroking her hair, “and his mouth was on her throat.” “His mother kissed him a long, fervent kiss” and “without knowing, he gently stroked her face.” On that day the “last fight was fought in that home” by the elderly Morel over a silly pork-pie, Paul told his mother after Walter stumbled off to bed: “Don’t sleep with him, Mother,” and the mother agreed to sleep in her own bed (260-64).

In his “not loving her, physically, bodily,” Miriam “felt upon him the hardness, the foreignness of another influence.” It was true that before his love for his mother “nobody else mattered” (272-73). When he took his mother to Lincoln cathedral, he said, “You forget I’m a fellow taking his girl for an outing” and he bought some blue violets and stuck them in her coat in the middle of High Street (294-95). And a little later he blurted out: “Why can’t a man have a young mother? What is the old for?” and expressed his wish that he should have been her eldest son; then he would have had her young. He was “mad with his impotence” (296). Immediately after Annie’s marriage with Leonard, Paul reassured his mother, “I’ll never marry while I’ve got you – I won’t.” He said they too, in their old age, she at seventy-five and he at forty-four, would live together in “a pretty house” with a servant (300-01).

When Paul broke with Miriam and started going out with Clara, Mrs Morel, who still remained a jealous, possessive mother, warned her son that he would soon tire of
Clara (401). Paul was beginning to realize how in his relationship with his mother and other women he was caught in “a circle where life turned the back on itself, and got no farther.” His mother “bore him, loved him, kept him and his love turned back into her, so that he could not be free to go forward with his own life, really love another woman.” At this period, “he pulled at her bondage” and “his life wanted to free itself of her.” He did not disclose everything to his mother, as he used to when he was making love to Miriam (420). In great despair Paul bewailed his inability to give himself in marriage to either Miriam or Clara, and told his mother, who put in that he was yet to meet the right woman, “And I never shall meet the right woman while you live” (427).

Neither her old age nor her last sickness changes Paul’s deep feelings for his mother, his beloved. Before going back to work he kisses her and strokes the hair from the temples “gently, tenderly, as if he were a lover” (457). When he is away from his dying mother, he feels “as if his life were being destroyed, piece by piece, within him.” As he runs to the station, the tear-drops fall on the pavement. When he begins to work his pen stops writing.

Paul, with the knowledge of his sister Annie, quickens the death of his mother and brings the prolonged maddening agony to a close by giving her an overdose of morphia pills mixed in her night milk. And when she is gone, he whispers, “My love – my love – oh, my love!” (484). Having facilitated Clara’s return to Baxter, Paul is free to accept Miriam’s love and marry her. But, once again, he turns away from her, and his soul is still with his mother. He looks at himself – “one tiny upright speck of flesh, less than an ear of wheat lost in the field.” He wants his mother “to touch him, have him alongside with her.” But quite unexpectedly, there comes a determination not to give in. turning sharply, he walks towards “the faintly humming, glowing town, quickly” (510-11).
The first Freudian reading of *Sons and Lovers* is that of Alfred Booth Kuttner, who sees Lawrence’s novel at once as a great piece of literature which “deals with a son who loved his mother too dearly, and with a mother who lavished all her affection upon her son” and as a literary work yielding and corroborating support to the scientific study of human motives by the psychologists (“A Freudian . . . 69-70). 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.” As Kuttner explains, in the normal development, this first infatuation is gradually obliterated from memory by widening associations and by transference, but the unconscious impress remains, so that every man tends to choose for his mate a woman who has associative connections for him with the early infantile image of his mother, while the woman also makes her choice in relation to her father. As soon as there is any disturbance of the balanced influence of both parents upon the child there follows an abnormal concentration upon the beloved parent (Review 65).

*Sons and Lovers* is “an eloquent example” of distortion leading to “neurotic disturbances.” As Kuttner points out, “where Mr Lawrence particularizes so passionately Freud generalizes.” He clarifies that Lawrence’s novel is not one “written with the express purpose of illustrating a theory”; if it had been so, it would be worthless as a proof of that theory. He is also convinced that the novel “is built up internally [. . .] out of the psychic conflicts of the author” (65, 70). However, Burden is of the view that “Kuttner’s reading is not strictly Freudian enough,” and Lawrence thought Kuttner’s article a “half lie” (50).

It was Frieda who had given Lawrence a clue to the Oedipal situation, “by what she had learned about the theories of Freud from a young German [Otto Gross] who was an enthusiastic analyst” (Aldington, *Portrait . . .* 128). “For Lawrence, working for
two years at a novel which had never found a centre, her ideas came just when he needed them” (Worthen, *D. H. Lawrence* . . . 35). Burden is of the view that Lawrence’s plot, which although not based on a thorough knowledge of Freud, seems all the more remarkably close to Freud’s ideas emerging at the same time, especially in those essays, “Family Romances” (1909), “A Special Type of Choice of Object Made by Men” (1910), and “On the Universal Tendency to Debasement in the Sphere of Love” (1912), which seem at least superficially to be telling the same story about the family, the parent-child relation, and the sexual development of the young adult male, as Lawrence (51).

Lawrence also explores intense mother-son relationship in the long story “Daughters of the Vicar” written during this period. Like Lawrence and Paul Morel, Alfred Durant, the young man from the working class family, was also much attached to his mother. “His feeling for her was deep and unexpressed.” His mother knew that he depended on her. “To her he did not seem the man, the independent man her other boys had been. He was her baby.” Alfred, who had been in the navy for about ten years, is now a collier, enjoying the company of the fellow miners and the variety of labour offered in the pit. But, “it was a great chagrin to his mother,” who, like Lawrence’s mother, “would have liked to have this last of her sons a gentleman” (153). When she was in death bed, like Paul Morel in *Sons and Lovers*, he “was conscious of her, and of what was happening to her. He could not escape from her, she carried him with her into an unformed, unknown chaos” (162).

In *The Rainbow*, when her mother marries Tom Brangwen of the Marsh Farm, Anna Lensky virtually enters a stranger’s home, where, in the beginning, her relationship with her step father is cold and detached. But soon the father and the daughter become close to each other like “lovers.” The dramatization of the growth of
this relationship between the little girl and the adult farmer, from cold aloofness to warm intimacy, in a series of domestic situations, is a brilliant exploration of the psyche of the child.

The first morning after the marriage Tom discovers that it is not going to be easy with the child. Knocking at their room, still in her night dress, the child has its first confrontation with the man who has ‘usurped’ her place near her mother. She says to him, “I want my mother” with a jealous accent on the ‘my.’ He helps her to reach her mother on the high bed, but she, staring at him with her “antagonistic” eyes, darts forward her head “like a viper” and asks him to go away. Still claiming her rights over her mother, the child asks her several times during the day when they would be going home. The mother tells the child helplessly, “We are at home, darling, we live here now. This is our house, we live here with your father.” Seeing Tom coming into the room she asks him fiercely, “Why do you sleep with my mother? My mother sleeps with me.” She sobs, but slowly begins to understand. Knowing the child as a child Tom becomes “easy with her, talking to her, taking her to see the live creatures, bringing her the first chickens in his cap, taking her to gather the eggs, letting her throw crusts to the horse.” Her animosity towards her new father fades away, but she only remains “neutral” (66-68).

“Curiously, incomprehensibly jealous of her mother,” the child’s temper tantrums cause poor Tilly, the servant at the farm, much worry and anxiety when Brangwen drives with his wife to Nottingham leaving the child at home. When she is thus becoming a problem to all at the Marsh, one day, Tom is very much pleased to hear her telling the geese at the farm, in her imperious manner, “My name is Anna, Anna Lensky, and I live here, because Mr Brangwen is my father now. He is, yes he is. And I live here.” Soon they draw nearer, but when her mother, in her later months of her
pregnancy, becomes “strange and detached,” “the old, unhealthy uneasiness” comes on
the child again and she goes in search of her. But finding her tired and unresponsive,
she goes back to Brangwen, and in the cosy cow-sheds, by the light of the hanging
lanterns, she watches, “his hands squeezing rhythmically the teats of the placid beast”
and “the froth and the leaping squirt of milk” and “his hand sometimes rubbing slowly,
understandingly, upon a hanging udder.” They keep each other company, but at a
distance (68-72).

It is on the day the mother’s labour pains begin that the real intimacy between
the child and the father is achieved. Finding the child insisting on her being taken to the
mother, Brangwen undresses her himself and with the help of Tilly puts on the stubborn
child her nightie, folds her round in a big shawl and takes her to the barn in the darkness
and rain to “supper-up” the cows. With the lantern shedding a soft light on the barn, he
feeds the cows, carefully balancing the child on one arm. As she silently watches him
do it, “a new being is created in her for the new conditions.” She, on her own, frees her
arm and puts it round his neck, clinging soft and warm. Then she asks him about the
cows going to sleep and about their finishing their fodder. For the child as well as the
man holding her close to him in the barn listening to the snuffing and breathing of the
feeding cows, it is a great moment of newly achieved intimacy. Gradually the child
sinks to sleep and Brangwen carries her carefully into the house and puts her into bed.

Even when his son is born there is no decline in Tom’s love for little Anna. In
the beginning he wants to give “all his love, all his passion, all his energy” to his wife.
But, as it is not possible in the new situation in which the attention of the mother is only
on the new born, Tom forms “another centre of love” in the child Anna. The child too
now becomes independent and loves Brangwen most, “of her own choice”, “from her
own centre” (83-84). The relationship between a child and an adult becomes possible
only when the grown-up person understands the child with due respect for its individuality and real care for its growth. Brangwen takes the little girl to all places, to the cattle market, to the corn exchange, to the shops and to the public house. And the child too responds to the love of the man. She has come to accept Tom as her own father. When the landladies enquire her her name she haughtily answers, “Anna Brangwen.” She loves driving with Tom in the trap. “Installed high beside him on high”, “her passion for eminence and dominance is satisfied” and “she is like a little savage in her arrogance”. She is “a little heroine” when the farmers gather there at the inn and Brangwen has “a secret desire to make her a lady” (85-89).

When Anna Lensky crosses over her childhood and enters her girlhood as Anna Brangwen, her relationship with her step father is unshakeably established. It is when Anna is eighteen there comes a real impact from outside to change the course of life for her. The coming of William Brangwen, a young man of twenty, son of Tom’s brother Alfred, causes ripples in the settled calm of the father-daughter relationship in the Marsh Farm and brings to Anna experiences and conflicts hitherto unknown. So far, the young men she had known had never become “real” to her. The only real person she knew was her father, and, “as he was something large, looming, a kind of Godhead, he embraced all mankind for her, and other men were just incidental” (107).

As their courtship started, Anna “began to act independently of her parents, to live beyond them”, and Will himself “was acutely angry that her parents looked up scrutinizingly at him and her” (115). In a scene similar to the feeding of the cows that years before brought the father and the daughter together, there is a scene near the fowl loft that brings together the young pair of lovers at night, but throws the father, who watches them, into a feeling of despair and estrangement. After exploring the psyche of a mother who wants to keep her son all to herself in Sons and Lovers, Lawrence now
presents a father whose heart is wrenched by the feeling of jealousy and apprehension of his separation from his daughter. There is a painful recollection of the past, in the presentation of which Lawrence delicately captures the moment when a father helplessly feels the sense of deprivation at the point of losing his daughter to her man, who is, at least in the beginning, considered an intruder.

He thought again of the child he had carried out at night into the barn, whilst his wife was in labour with the young Tom. He remembered the soft, warm weight of the little girl on his arm, round his neck. Now she would say he was finished. She was going away, to deny him, to leave an unendurable emptiness in him, a void that he could not bear. [...] He walked on in the rain, sweating with pain, with the horror of being old, with the agony of having to relinquish what was life to him. (119-20)

Anna accepts Will's suggestion to get married. And it is when Will approaches his uncle with the proposal to marry Anna that the pathos of the emotional drama between Anna and her father reaches its peak. Anna’s parents reject the proposal referring to Will’s lack of money and experience. The young man feels “like a caged hawk” and holds on to his will. It is an interesting irony that later, in Women in Love, when his daughter Ursula declares her decision to marry Birkin, Will, then a father, not only treats Birkin, who comes to propose to Ursula, discourteously, but also expresses his displeasure by delivering a brutal blow to Ursula. Anna takes on her father with the cruellest words in her power. She cries in the shrill, hysterical way of her childhood, “You are not my father – my father is dead – you are not my father.” Lawrence describes the effect of this ‘unkindest cut’ by the daughter in very sharp monosyllables: “The cold blade cut down, deep into Brangwen’s soul. It cut him off from her” (127).

But, with one noble act of forgiveness and generosity, Tom attains the stature of
a great patriarch and makes the impetuous little girl regret what she has done. He hands over to Will the shares he has transferred to Anna, which amount to “a great deal of the Marsh capital.” Anna sobs “as if her heart would break” and offers her contrite apology by crouching on the hearth rug with her arms round him and her face against him. But Tom has the pathetic feeling that she has broken the “beloved image” that he was her father. He sits “in his coldness of age and isolation” feeling that “there is a generation between them”. However, he realizes that it is but “natural” that “the child who clung to him wanted her child-husband” and blames himself for his illusions: “Why should there be love between them, between the stout, middle-aged man and this child? How could there be anything between them, but mere human willingness to help each other?” (127-28).

In the third cycle, in which the centre of attention of the Brangwen saga is Anna’s daughter Ursula, the novel presents “the child’s dawning consciousness, its growing awareness of the world, its development into a person, all the freshness of experience in the beginning life” (Leavis133). With the chapter “The Child” begins the story of the child and its developing consciousness. Even before a strong relationship is established between Anna and the child Ursula, Anna gives birth to her second child, and as she is immersed in the rapture of motherhood in suckling the second child Gudrun, the first child Ursula, the weaned baby, becomes “the child of her father’s heart.” As in the case of Anna’s childhood in the first cycle, here too, the novel’s focus is more on the father-daughter relationship than on that between the mother and the daughter. Lawrence’s presentation of Will Brangwen’s interactions and encounters with his most favourite daughter Ursula is once again a revealing exploration into the child’s psyche. Here too there is a concrete depiction of the gradual development of the complexity of the relationship between an adult and a child placed in continual physical
proximity by their kinship. In the first story, the development is towards intimacy between the father and the daughter, whereas, in the second, it is towards estrangement between the two. Like the scene of the feeding of the cows in the barn that brings into the child’s consciousness a recognition of the step father’s endearing self, Lawrence presents a few scenes in the third generation, which appear simple but nevertheless serve as “objective corollaries” of the emotional trauma the sensitive child undergoes in its relationship with its father. Ursula’s spirit “withers” when Will refers, with contempt and anger, to the “ tiresome little monkey” “pulling the place to bits” when it goes to church with him. “Her vulnerable little soul is flayed and trampled” when her father reacts violently to her trampling of the seed-beds. True it was that “her father was the dawn wherein her consciousness woke up.” But “he came too near to her” and “she was awakened too soon.” “His bigger heart,” desperately in need of love and fulfilment, made premature demands on “her sleep-living heart” (*The Rainbow* 218-23).

In her “self-asserting indifference” and in her “deliberate will,” Ursula is like her mother. She also inherits, as Draper observes, her father’s religious sense, but without its unquestioning boredom and barrenness (70). Leavis considers Will’s “abnormal intensity of relation with his daughter” “an outcome of the failure between him and Anna” (133-34). But the real problem Will faces is that his daughter is no less assertive an individual than his wife Anna. Under insult from her father she strongly asserts herself and recognizes “nothing in the world but her own self.” “And when he bullied her, she became hard, cut herself off from all connexion, lived in the little separate world of her own violent will” (*The Rainbow* 224).

Ursula comes back home after her exposure to the industrial world, as the author says, “to fight with her mother.” Her mother has now “the power to irritate and madden the girl continuously” (353). Anna is again with child, the ninth she had borne. While
Ursula is “suffering all the anguish of youth’s reaching for some unknown ideal,” her mother has no existence beyond “the immediate, physical, common things.” One wonders whether she still remains, as Leavis refers to her earlier, “the serene mother in the background,” leaving the foreground to Will and Ursula (132). Lawrence’s description of her almost smacks of contempt. Her “long trance of complacent child-bearing had kept her young and undeveloped.” “All these years nothing had happened save the coming of children, nothing had mattered but the bodies of her babies.” She cast them off “as her children came into consciousness.” Ursula hated her mother and the “enforced domesticity” (354). Ursula escapes from home by taking up a teaching job at St.Philip’s School at Ilkeston. But she has had to put up a fight against her mother’s contempt and her father’s harshness before they allow “Miss. High-an’-mighty” to go her own way. By now her soul has become “hard and cold with regard to her parents” (365-66).

When the next novel Women in Love opens, Ursula’s estrangement from her home and her parents is almost complete. On an important issue like her marriage Ursula’s father acts as a bully. He calls her “a bitch” and even bashes her on her face. The mother is also angry with her for the secrecy the daughter has maintained. What these parents have failed to understand is that they expect their children, even grown-up ones, to obey them implicitly but never create a free and friendly atmosphere where the children could share their problems with them. Like Mr Lindley in “Daughters of the Vicar,” Brangwen is not able to loosen his will to respond kindly to the individual self of his daughter. Filled with sorrow and indignation she breaks down in the consoling presence of Birkin. “‘And I have loved him, I have,’ she wept. ‘I’ve loved him always, and he’s always done this to me, he has –’.” What she has had is “a mortal conflict, a deep wound” (415).
So late in the novel *Women in Love*, almost towards the close, there is a reference back to *The Rainbow*, which provides the reader coming to *Women in Love* from the former novel, an opportunity for a nostalgic recall of the world of the Brangwens over the relentless passage of time. While Ursula was returning to the hotel “in the night of snow-silence,” she saw a man opening the door of an outhouse where she saw some cows and felt their smell. It reminded “Ursula again of home, of the Marsh, of her childhood, and of the journey to Brussels, and, strangely, of Anton Skrebensky” (460).

In *The Plumed Serpent*, after the death of Dona Carlota, Don Ramon’s wife, the two boys accuse their father that he was the cause of their mother’s death. Ramon’s answer to his sons raises an important question about father-son relationship: Does a father love his son even if he is not lovable? One of the sons tells him that their mother, unlike their father, *always* loved them. Then Ramon replies: “She called thee her own. I do not call thee mine own. Thou art thyself. When thou art lovable, I can love thee. When thou art rash and impudent, nay, I cannot. The mill will not spin when the wind does not blow” (393).

**Husbands and Wives**

What Lawrence expects in marriage is not any sameness between the husband and wife, but a strong and deep connection with mutual respect for individual differences. In *The Rainbow* the progenitors of the novel’s first generation of Brangwens, Alfred and his wife, would have made an ideal model but for the lack of knowledge of each other. “They were two very separate beings, vitally connected, knowing nothing of each other, yet living in their separate ways from one root” (13)

In the two succeeding generations the novel deals with the married life of Tom Brangwen and Lydia and Will Brangwen and Anna. Tom, at nineteen, “a youth fresh
like a plant, rooted in his mother and his sister” is disillusioned of “his first carnal contact” with a prostitute (19-20). Till he sees in his twenty eighth year Lydia Lensky, Tom, the “bout-drinker,” has kept himself aloof from women antagonistically (28). The young man’s marital relationship with the Polish widow brings about a “transfiguration” in him and puts him “on the brink of ecstasy, like a creature evolving to a new birth” (37-39). It is a “trespass” into a “new life” with the thirty four year old stranger, the mother of a jealous little child “with a face like a bud of apple-blossom” (32). It is an “intimacy of embrace,” and “utter foreignness of contact!” (49). In “the foreignness between them,” the author emphasizes the theme of ‘otherness,’ and the mutual otherness and strangeness are for Tom “a condition of depth and wholeness in the response” (Leavis 119).

Lydia’s awareness of herself in relation to Tom Brangwen came to her gradually. Then “her blood stirred to life” and “she began to open towards him, to flow towards him” (56). In their “elemental embrace beyond their superficial foreignness,” there was no past and no future for either of them; everything was reduced to “the moment,” “the hour”. In his conjugal life with her he felt that he was “in contact with the unknown, the unaccountable and incalculable” (57-59). It seems true that Lawrence has conceived Tom and Lydia as an ideal pair in love and marriage.

But Lydia’s married life with her first husband was a sheer failure. The contrast Lawrence brings out between Lydia’s relationships with Lensky and Tom clearly reveals the author’s concept of marriage, which has absolutely no touch of male supremacy in it. In a marriage of real fulfilment, there is no loss or submission of one’s being. Lydia recalls, several years after his death, that her first husband had never realized his real being in the master-slave relationship in which he had held her. As for his sexual relations with her, he had been more dead than alive. “He had lain with her,
but he had never known her. He had never received what she could give him.” “He had never lived,” and had “never really become himself.” Lydia now felt that if it were not for his daughter Anna, “there would be no more left of him than of a broken vessel thrown away.” Lydia, who had merely been “the shadow” to the “substance” that was Lensky, came to “her own self” only in her marital relationship with Tom Brangwen, who became “one with her” (258-59).

Following the most celebrated scene in the barn which binds Tom and his step daughter together in love, there is a little scene which shows the inexpressible bond that exists between the husband and wife. Lydia is in labour pains. After feeding the cows, Tom puts the sleeping child into bed and goes to see his wife, who now appears “other than himself.” As he touches her fingers, she opens her eyes and “looks at him as a woman in childbirth looks at the man who begot the child in her: an impersonal look, in the extreme hour, female to male” (81). And when his son is born, Tom is glad that his fatherhood is confirmed and that Lydia is the mother of his child. Though Tom holds little Anna in great intimacy, his main stay still continues to be his wife. During this time they two have a quarrel over his little, passing, flirtatious interest in Mrs. Forbes, his brother Alfred’s mistress in Derbyshire. He is “flabbergasted,” but this little quarrel cannot shake the strong foundation of their love and marriage. He is united with her in great fulfilment; he knows “the subterranean force of his desire to come to her, to be with her, to mingle with her, losing himself to find her, to find himself in her” (94-95).

The novelist finds an occasion to show the solace and reassurance Tom finds in his relationship with his beloved wife even in their middle age, when he is thrown into a feeling of despair and isolation by Anna’s quarrel with him on the eve of her marriage. The girl had broken “the beloved image” of his being her father and he helplessly blamed himself for “wanting the young to belong to him.” Going to bed with “a hard,
cold heart”, Brangwen looked at his wife, who was now fifty, but “still young and
naïve, with some girl’s freshness” and cursed himself for his “greedy middle-age” still
demanding “to share the rapid life of youth.” He found relief in the feeling that “he had
known satisfaction with his wife” and was proud of the “fulfilment.” But, “there still
remained an unsatisfied Brangwen, who suffered agony because a girl cared nothing for
him” (128-29).

But Anna easily turned to Will and began to enjoy courtship. Now, Will became
the only real man to her; all others were “shadowy” and “unreal”. She found “the very
fountain of life” flowing from his body and he, in turn, was “consumed” by her, who
was “a flame” that “flowed up his limbs, flowed through him.” Though there was
much passion in their love, they were opposed to each other in their attitudes, especially
towards the church and its doctrines. She questioned his pet ideas and beliefs and they
quarrelled over trivial things. An important aspect of the relationship between the two is
what is recognized by Leavis and others as the “dominance in Anna” and its
complement, the “dependence in Will.” Anna “is the Magna Mater, the type-figure
adverted to so much in Women in Love of feminine dominance that must defeat the
growth of any prosperous long-term relation between a man and a woman” (128).

Anna’s naked dance in her bed room is the scene that led to the banning of the
book. Big with child as she was, she danced “before the Unknown,” “lifting her hands
and her body to the Unseen, to the unseen Creator who had chosen her”; she danced
again, on a Saturday afternoon, “before her Creator in exemption from the man”. As she
was surprised by Will in that dance of her pregnancy, her pride became “fiercer” and
“the power of her in her dancing burned him” and he was “consumed” and “obliterated”
(183-84). To Anna becoming a mother was a victory. “To her, her pains were only the
wound-smart of a victor, she was the producer.”
The strong-willed Anna has already had another victory, though she would not consciously approve of it. She has had her conquest over her husband by almost nullifying his passionate faith in what lies outside their own selves, in the absoluteness of the church. At Will’s “beloved Lincoln Cathedral, while it was sheer “ecstasy” for Will, Anna, who was also overcome by the experience of the cathedral, was not “tuned to the place.” She could not accept the altar as “the threshold of eternity”; it was “barren”, “dead matter lying there.” She remembered the open sky “where stars were wheeling in freedom, with freedom above them always higher” (203). When Anna laughs at the gargoyles of the cathedral, Will hears her voice as “the voice of the serpent in his Eden,” but soon he, as Adam before him, succumbs to her “spoiling his passionate intercourse with the cathedral.” He gets disillusioned and the cathedral “which had been his absolute, containing all heaven and earth” becomes to him as to her, “a shapely heap of dead matter.” The altar, which had been “a mystic door” to “the great Unknown”, now appears “false” and he too comes to recognize, like Anna, the life outside the cathedral – the song of “the thrushes in the gardens” and the sight of the fields “all yellow with dandelions” (204-06).

Anna and Will do not achieve “the long, marital embrace” of the older generation (129; Beal 34). Lawrence attributes Anna’s love for her husband only to her maternal instincts and her bodily desires. “She loved him because he was the father of her children. And she always had a physical passion for him.” Will too “lived simply by her physical love for him,” abdicating all claims to “the spiritual superiority and control” (208). After Will’s abortive nocturnal escapade with the girl he met in the Empire, Will and Anna meet each other on an equal footing, as “sensual” male and female seeking nothing more than the voluptuous pleasures of the body. “Throwing everything overboard, love, intimacy, responsibility,” she seeks him as if he were a
stranger with whom she would have extramarital sexual relationship as he had tried to have with “the little creature in Nottingham.” They abandon in one motion their “moral position.” They ignore their responsibility towards the children and “live in the darkness and death of their own sensual activities.” “They have no conscious intimacy, no tenderness of love. It is all the lust and the infinite, maddening intoxication of the senses, a passion of death” (235-37). And in the third life-cycle of the novel, Anna, again with child, remains “dominant” at home and her husband continues “in a kind of rich dowse of physical heat, in connexion with his wife.” They are not “quite personal, quite defined as individuals”; they are only “pervaded by the physical heat of breeding and rearing their young” (353-54).

How strangely the bondage of marriage can keep together two persons of opposing nature could be seen in the relationship between Thomas Crich and his wife in Women in Love. She “like a bird of prey, with the fascinating beauty and abstraction of a hawk” “beat against the bars of his philanthropy.” He “had always loved her with the intensity”; but “by force of circumstance, because all the world combined to make the cage unbreakable, he had been too strong for her, he had kept her prisoner.” But, “within the cage, she was denied nothing, she was given all licence” (242). She bore him many children. And, as time went on, “like a hawk [an image used more than five times in the context] that sullenly submits to everything,” she submitted to him. But theirs was “a relation of utter interdestruction,” and his “vitality was bled from within him, as by some haemorrhage” (244).

While, in her psychological reading of Lawrence’s story “Sun,” Ruderman focalizes mother-son relationship, Leavis draws attention to the husband-wife, which was a failure. “The tale presents a terrible criticism of an aspect of industrial megapolitan civilization” (Leavis 295). When her husband was “all ashore” in
America, she was “out to sea” and it was in the Mediterranean coast, in her communion with the sun, “something deep in her unfolded” (500). But her husband was still “a worm” that the sun had never seen. She found in a local peasant “that air of quiet superiority which belongs to individuals, not to a class.” It was with him she felt the flame of desire flowing over her body “melting her bones” (508). But, her husband, the New York businessman, represented “the loss of the life of the body” (Leavis 296). An old woman of the place said to herself that he was good, “but not a man” (503). Juliet had the urge to meet the peasant “for an hour, as long as the desire lasts and no more.” She wanted to bear the man’s child, but she knew that “the fatal chain of continuity” would cause the next child to be Maurice’s (508).

As shown by Lawrence, in life only some people like Tom Brangwen and Lydia make the best of their marital relationship and see the flowering and fruition of love. They do not foresee, as the woman in “Sun” does, any ‘fatal chain of continuity,’ but children born of spontaneous love-relationship. As they do not submit themselves to any mechanistic existence, they have living relationship between themselves and with others. For such people the circle of relationships is ever widening to include not only the members of their own family, but others in greater units such as society, nation, race and finally the entire humanity and the universe.