CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Catherine Carswell, correspondent of Lawrence also makes extensive use of this prefix in her narrative of Lawrence, where she reflects on future critics of his work:

Lawrence as a whole remains to be read and re-read. He has to create the taste for his work, and this takes time. But it is a taste that grows.
Not only so: it is a taste that delicately transforms the palate and renews it for the re-trial of other tastes, ancient and modern” (xxi).

Like Carswell, the researcher too believes that Lawrence remains to be read and re-read. In modernist studies, D. H. Lawrence has tended to represent one of two incompatible extremes: either critics cast him as an odd man out or they view him as a figure whose works are quintessential artifacts of the period. This dichotomy seems to arise out of the difficulty of determining his definitive philosophy or set of literary practices, though many of his most well known critics – including Millet, de Beauvoir, and even his defender Leavis – have apparently done just that. Yet, what is most arresting about Lawrence – as well as frustrating, maddening, and fascinating – is his refusal to be fixed in one identity or philosophy. In this respect, the researcher contributes to the study of select novels of Lawrence by suggesting a new way of thinking about Lawrence’s portrayal of characters and their relationships in pertinent to ‘familial’ and ‘non-familial’. It is indeed a wide continuum, stretching from Sons and Lovers, The Rainbow, Women in Love, The Lost Girl, Trespassers and Lady Chatterley’s Lover.
In his “A Review of Women in Love,” John Middleton Murry rightly observes that

Mr. Lawrence is what he is: a natural force over which we have no power of command or persuasion. He has no command or persuasion over himself. It was not his deliberate choice that he sacrificed his gifts, his vision, his delicacy and his eloquence. If ever a writer was driven, it is he. (67)

Every critic, irrespective of the age and ability, has not hesitated to point an accusing finger at Lawrence and to set him apart from his contemporaries by the vehemence of his passion. But an unimpassioned study of the works, life and background would reveal that Lawrence before the war could be distinguished by his sensitive and impassioned apprehension of natural beauty or an understanding of the exquisite blood bonds that unite human beings, or the power of natural vision that prompted him with a gorgeous discrimination of language.

Nevertheless all these anticipations of a genius that thrilled readers are all drowned and burned in the acid of vehement passion. What begins as a benign expression of personal repressed feelings, rises gradually but steadily and reaches a crescendo in his Lady Chatterley’s Lover, a character which fails to delight the readers, but on the other hand exasperates readers by its persistence. Even a casual survey of the various criticisms leveled against Lawrence would suffice to make us see the fury of the English literary world against Lawrence.

Clement Shorter, journalist and critic, said of The Rainbow in “Sphere” that

There is no form or viciousness, of suggestiveness, that is not reflected in these pages. … In this novel, The Rainbow, Mr. Lawrence has
ceased to be an artist, and I can find no justification whatever for the
perpetration of such a book. (Draper, 96)

Shorter has gone to the extent of calling Zola’s novels child’s food the same which
sent their publisher Henry Vizetelly to the goals when compared to Mr. Lawrence’s The Rainbow.

An unsigned review in the “Standard” (1 October 1915) says:

Assuredly The Rainbow is not a novel to please all. There are no
draperies in it, no asterisks, no reticence, no prettiness. It reveals the
latent, savage in its characters, through none of the Brangwens is
wholly primitive. … Such a book The Rainbow may cause offence and
be condemned, for it takes more liberties than English novelists for
many years past have claimed, but, whatever its reception, it is an
important piece of work. (Ibid. 89)

And again let one see what Robert Lynd said about The Rainbow in his “Daily News” (5 October 1915):

Mr. Lawrence’s reputation must suffer from the publication of such a
book as this, it is not chiefly that the book will offend the general sense
of decency. Many an indecent book is none the less fine literature by
reason of its humanity, its imaginative intensity, or its humour. The
Rainbow, though it contains intense pages, lacks these marks of good
literature. It is mainly a prolix account of three generations of sexual

The Prosecution Report of The Rainbow, as appeared ‘The Rainbow Destruction of a
Novel Ordered,’ in The Times, is yet another evidence of the displeasure the English
reading public had developed towards the novel.
At Bow Street Police Court on Saturday (13 November 1915) Messrs. Methuen and Co. Ltd. Publishers, Essex-street, Strand, were summoned before Sir John Dickinson to show-cause why 1,011 copies of Mr. D. H. Lawrence’s novel *The Rainbow* should not be destroyed. The defendants expressed regret that the book should have been published and the magistrate ordered that the copies should be destroyed and that the defendants should pay £ 10.10s costs. (op.sit. 102)

And the magistrate in making an order as above said it was greatly to be regretted that a firm of such high repute should have allowed their reputation to be soiled, as it had been, by the publication of this work, and that they did not take steps to suppress it after the criticism had appeared in the press.

*Lady Chatterley’s Lover* was certainly, for the most part, misunderstood. It had always seen a subject for music hall sniggering. The novel was taken as an encouragement to talk more openly about copulation, and by those who have not read it, as a sort of Bible of the new religion of promiscuity. The true essence of the book was willfully ignored.

Lawrence’s work by its very nature and complexity runs the risk of being misread and misinterpreted. So, it comes as no surprise that Lawrence is one of the few writers in English literature whose work generated so much of controversy and, at the same time, scholarly work. However, it is an irony that Lawrence wrote unremittingly for upward of a quarter of a century, his work was largely ignored, except as scandal, during his life time and for many years after his death. Other famous contemporaries of Lawrence who passed judgement on his work include Henry James, Virginia Woolf, Arnold Bennett and E. M. Forster. If it was the clash
of personalities between Eliot and Lawrence certainly it wasn’t the same where these other literary figures were concerned. Arnold Bennett in fact appreciated Lawrence’s intentions and wrote ‘He tries to fish up sexes from the mud into which it has been sunk for several hypocritical and timid English generations past’ (Eliot, 179). As a result he was denied his rightful place among the literary pantheon for a long times, till F. R. Leavis put him in ‘the great tradition’.

Hence readers know now that in spite of the pungent and burning criticism that had been leveled against Lawrence’s morbid preoccupation with sex and the abnormalities, yet there had been many a great critic who had recognized his distinction as a writer at large and a novelist in particular. In *Aspects of the Novel* (1927), Forster groups Lawrence with Dostoevsky, Melville and Emily Bronte. The best criticism to be read on Lawrence is Herbert J. Seligmann’s *D. H. Lawrence, an American Interpretation* (1924). He emphasizes the challenge of Lawrence’s attacks on the leveling of democracy, on the evils of mechanization, and on the rise of independent, managing women. Though in his earlier essays Leavis has adversely analyzed the motives of Lawrence, it is only the need for tolerance which prompted him to do so. And it was Leavis who was the quickest to learn this lesson and later wrote about ‘the insight, the wisdom, the revived and the re-educated feeling for help, that Lawrence brings’ (15). In *D. H. Lawrence: The Failure and the Triumph of Art*, Eliseo Vivas follows the example of Leavis by concentrating mainly on Lawrence’s artistic achievement.

However the fact that in *Sons and Lovers, The Rainbow, Women in Love, Trespassers, The Lost Girl* and *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* which are successful as works of art, there is excess of passion cannot be over-ruled, forgotten or forgiven.
But the researcher’s function in this dissertation is not to accuse and condemn the writer or to acquit or absolve him of his excesses, but only to reason out the motive and influence behind such a tendency as his. A deep study sympathetically made Lawrence’s mental and physical make-up would do well to understand Lawrence the man and novelist. Born in a family where there was parental discord Lawrence’s mind, as a child, was naturally ill-balanced. At times he adored and pitied his mother and went her for comfort and affection. At other times Lawrence respected the man in his father and almost loved him but the two attitudes were never simultaneous but on the other hand were one opposing the other. Again Lawrence was more sinned against than sinning for it was Lydia Lawrence the little woman who was Lawrence’s mother, and who was the chief architect of Lawrence’s fall. For Lydia having seen disappointment in her relationship with her husband turned to her sons for the fulfillment of her disappointed passions. And it was Lawrence who reciprocated it in sheer sympathy for his mother. The man in him matured before his time and his mind was so psychologically twisted that he was unable to live and think normally. Hence readers have a variety of abnormalities either in familial relationships or out of the familial relationships which abound in his novels. Though the researcher has selected only six novels which elaborately discussed in the above said perspectives in Chapter II and III as examples of his preoccupation with the unpleasant and the abnormal yet he cannot limit these tendencies to only these six stories. Every novel every plot and every character is twisted and mauled according to the contortions of the psyche of the novelist himself. And so it is seen Oedipus complex in *Sons and Lovers* and Electra complex in *The Rainbow*. Lawrence is no doubt an outstanding psychological novelist, who is influenced by Sigmund Freud’s psychoanalytical theory. In *Women in
Love, readers can find Lawrence widely uses psychological description to portray and analyze the characters, and that is conducive to reveal the theme—the mixed feeling of love and hate of the four characters. The “psychological pattern” (Leavis, 135) created by Lawrence is used to describe the characters and to promote the development of their relationships.

Lawrence’s exploration on the psychological development of his characters is clearly seen in Women in Love. The psychology of the characters is the basic element in the novel, the subconscious mixed feeling of love and hate is like a driving force to promote the development of the novel and establish the relationship, while, in a sense, the novel becomes a kind of “psychodrama” Although influenced by Freud, Lawrence thought he shared little or nothing with Freud. His technique in expressing the psychology of the characters surpasses his contemporary writers and the traditional concept. Lawrence says:

You mustn’t look in my novel for the old stable ego of the character. There is another ego, according to whose action the individual is unrecognizable and passes through, as it were, allotropic states which it needs a deeper sense than any we’ve been used to exercise, to discover…like as diamond and coal are the same pure single elements of carbon. The ordinary novel would trace the history of the diamond… but I say “diamond, what! This is carbon.” And any diamond might be coal or soot, and my theme is carbon. (Kirkpatrick, 708)

The over dominance of the mother on Lawrence proved to be fatal in his life and he was trying hard to retain his independence, individuality and singleness. This took the shape of a homosexual tendency which is most obnoxious under normal,
social conditions. However the close associates of Lawrence and Lawrence himself have justified and diagnosed this tendency to be an outcome of his desire to be wholly male, forming friendship with another male and thus retaining his singleness. One should remember that in his early period of youth Lawrence was so much possessed by his love for his mother which one tends to call Oedipal. Things did not stop there, but, the mother herself never let her boy alone and strived to fulfill all her yearnings lost on her husband through her son. This perhaps shattered the dreams of the young Lawrence and made him absolutely enjoyed what he experienced. For he had done so, the stories of Paul Morel, Ursula Brangwen, and Rupert Birkin would be something entirely different. Lawrence would have presented these characters as having achieved something great and as living as absolutely successful life.

On the other hand, the climax of each story is in the tragic end of the hero or the heroine. In *Sons and Lovers*, Paul is unable to marry Miriam and lead a normal life with her. He strikes a friendship with the married woman Clara Dawes and then loses her. He hopes to cling to his mother eternally and ‘live comfortably ever after’. That again is denied him and the end is most disappointing and disillusioning both to the reader and Paul himself. Lawrence accentuates on this tragic aspect, by calling very chapter “Derelict”. What could be more poignant than this caption?

The mother was the only life-force,

That held him up, himself, amid all, this. And she was gone,

intermingled herself. He wanted her to touch him, have him alongside with her. But no he would not give in. (510)

In *The Rainbow*, the plight of Ursula Brangwen is equally tragic and hopeless. Lawrence does not present Ursula the lesbian, the frigid and the nymphomaniac, as a
character that triumphs in her abnormalities, but as a pitiable sight, a most miserable woman, who can neither, marry the man she loves Anton Skrebensky, nor remain single enjoying the perverted pleasures of a lesbian with her school mistress, Winifred Inger.

The horse scene in *The Rainbow* is explicitly symbolic. Though Lawrence has used it many times previously, yet in this novel he communicates the sense that the spontaneous self in Ursula is secretly yearning for the liberation and fulfillment of the deepest and most powerful sexual nature.

If he ends the final chapter of *The Rainbow* with Ursula dreaming of the rainbow, then, the only interpretation that comes to one’s mind readily and vividly is the hope, the promise of an escape, in the future that Ursula earnestly wishes for, which takes the form of a dream. For are not dreams, the intense desires and the fond wishes of the dreamers come to afford them relief and comfort at the moment of sleep?

What Lawrence earnestly hoped would happen in his life; what he greatly asked for was some kind of hope, however slender it might be, to hold and lead him forth after his mother’s death. The young man, so overcome with the Oedipus complex, unable to marry Miriam, unable to break away from the ties of the mother, leads a life of torment and misery. He hopes that his mother’s death would release his bonds. But the death of the mother proved to be greater disaster. All this is vividly portrayed in the character of Paul Morel. All the mental, physical and moral struggles of Paul are nothing but the artistic reflections of Lawrence’s own.

The struggles of Ursula Brangwen in *The Rainbow* are the picturesque descriptions of the various struggles and the experiments that Lawrence tried out to overcome. And if Ursula in *The Rainbow* is presented to the reader as still dreaming
of release, a hope and a bright future, it was because the novelist himself was in similar positions.

In *The Rainbow* Lawrence tried to be a spokesman for women, in the various relationships in *Women in Love*, he seeks to distinguish between truly creative conflicts and those which, like war, leave only scars and damage. He insists on the differences between the sexes as more than obviously physical: the beings of men and women are also determined mentally and emotionally. Yet the author believes that the sexes can live ideally in balanced harmony with each other, neither claiming possession of the other: 'The man has his pure freedom, the woman hers', he writes in *Women in Love*. Each relationship in both novels explores ways in which such a balance may be established, testing the claims of each kind of partnership in an earnest search for proof that the ideal can be realized. Tom and Lydia, perhaps most positively Ursula and Birkin, but also Will and Anna show moments of perfected union, though none of these relationships survive without conflict. Lawrence knew from his own marriage that a measure of struggle and argument between both partners was a natural part of a developing relationship, and that once these ceased the union was threatened with extinction.

In Lawrence’s earlier work one can see several instances of male-male friendships. There are Cyril and George, Paul Morel and Baxter Dawes, Siegmund and Hampson, who are all intimate to some degree. However, their relations are portrayed as incidental rather than vital. But in *Women in Love* the men have a vital need for each other - throughout the novel there is the suggestion that it helps Birkin to keep the necessary emotional distance to Ursula, in his fear to be overruled by the Magna Mater in her. He frequently seeks out Gerald when in need of advice or
support in his struggle with his girlfriend. Though not expressly sexual, their union has a physical as well as a mental and emotional side. In the chapter ‘Gladiatorial’ Gerald and Birkin’s wrestling match has a sensuous connotation as the two ‘seemed to drive their white flesh deeper and deeper against each other as if they would break into a oneness’ (p.270); they “seemed to penetrate” and interfuse in admiration of each other’s body. Their being physically close satisfies a need in both of them; Birkin says it “makes one sane” and to Gerald “it is life” (p.273). They agree that, as they are mentally and spiritually intimate, they should be more or less physically intimate, too, to make the friendship “more whole”. Still, the most valuable part of the friendship is portrayed in the young men's conversations, which remind us of the kind of intimate friendships women often have – without raising suspicion of homosexuality. The reader gets to see the warm and human sides of both Gerald and Rupert as they look for each other’s company, mostly to talk about what occupies their minds, in which they may be crudely direct. ‘You force yourself into horrors, and put a millstone of beastly memories round your neck’, says Birkin, aware of Gerald’s fascination with tragedy in the chapter “Water-Party”, when Diana is drowned. It may be his attempt to put his friend's morbid feelings of guilt about the accident into perspective, or to prove his own unsentimental nature – in which he goes too far by his fascist comments.

The self-consciousness of life and even art are the products of sexual struggle, whether between individuals, or within an individual over his sexual identification, from this ecstatic pain, both life art strive to return to calm and silence. Therefore, in Lawrence last novel, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* there appear the motifs of restful chastity, and the rejection of elaborated speech in favour of basic speech, and even
silence. At this stage, Lawrence felt the problem of his sexual imbalance very keenly, as it is suggested by a letter of 1913,

I should like to know why nearly everyman that approaches greatness tends to homosexuality, whether he admits it or not: so that he loves the body of a man better than the body of a woman … it is the hardest thing in life to get one’s soul and body satisfied from a woman, so one is free from oneself. And one is all tradition and instinct from loving men or a man – for it means just extinction of all purposive influences. (257)

Lawrence wrote The Trespasser at a particularly unhappy and disoriented stage of his life. Death illness in the close-knit family circle, uncertainty about his career, scant fulfillment in personal relationships – against that background he met Helen Corke, a colleague at the school in Croydon where he taught from Oct.’1908 to Mar.’1912. She was later to write her own version of the love affair she had briefly enjoyed with a music master, Herbert Baldwin Macartney, the in the summer of 1909. Helen Corke’s novel, Neutral Ground (1933), is at heart an autobiographical account of relationship between Ellis, the heroine, and her violin teacher, whom she calls ‘Domine’, and it covers much the same territory as The Trespasser. In 1975 her autobiography, In Our Infancy, appeared complete with the brief journal about the week on the Isle of Wight which she had written shortly after the Macartney affair sixty-six years earlier. This journal, and Helen Corke’s direct account, became the basis of The Trespasser.

Though Lawrence was, therefore, writing at second hand, basing his novel on events in which he had no share even down to small details like the discovery of a light-bulb on the beach, he knew that Helen Corke extremely well and was in love
with her and concerned to help her through her grief and horror, even her guilt. He saw her as the kind of woman who must exert her will on men, but he pitied her for this. She, meanwhile, had a personal view of him as a kindred spirit occupying the ‘neutral ground’ between the opposed poles of hetero-sexuality and homosexuality.

The truth of the novel lies as much in its general tone of unhappiness and discontent as in the particular analysis of its central relationship. Lawrence records in *The Trespasser* much of his sense wonder at discovering his own sexuality, but the typical bewilderment of early youth is there too. Doubts about religion, the purpose of life and the possibility of finding either spiritual equality or emotional case in the arms of a woman run through the novel.

In *The White Peacock* Lawrence had made a character’s reaction to music one touchstone of his or her sensitivity. In his second novel he draws specifically on motifs in Wagner’s *Ring*. Siegmund and Helena, the protagonists in *The Trespasser*, resemble Siegmund and Sieglinde, and Tristan and Isolde, though in Lawrence’s story it is the man who is married. Siegmund in the *Ring* is destroyed by the gods because he has a forbidden love. Lawrence used not as a rigid model for his own work, but as a standard for comparing his own values. He entirely rejects Wagner’s transcendental view that to die of love is a triumph. For Lawrence it is bitter and sordid, but he shares something of Wagner’s contempt for ordinariness and low materialism, the mere restrictiveness of conventional social marriage, and the sense that a passion is something to give oneself to, whatever the result.

In *The Trespasser*, however, the novelist is concerned only with the climax and destruction of a relationship. He establishes Siegmund’s adulterous passion for Helena as a fact but makes little attempt to demonstrate what it is founded upon. The
mechanical nature of Siegmund’s working day, the martyred attitude of his wife, ‘the grave, cold looks of condemnation from his children’ (18) obviously show his need to escape, but they do not in themselves explain why Helena Verden so enchants him. Of course, *The Trespasser* is still linked by strong ties with the traditional manner of telling a story. The firm traditional frame of narration in kept untouched. A specific inner state of mood of a character always gets crystallized into a scene, the spatial and temporal frame of a certain sequence is clearly indicated, the relations between inner and outer reality are not yet blurred. Throughout Lawrence uses the traditional narrative methods of description, the author’s commentary and the reproduction of the inner reflections of a character while keeping the logical relations clear etc.

Throughout *The Trespasser* Lawrence is on the verge of expressing in the central relationship a kind of semi-mystic communion of souls. It eludes him partly because of inadequate language and partly because he does not here provide the perspective through which, in later novels, the main characters are defined. The thinly drawn friendship of Helena and Louisa, with its mild hint of lesbianism, or the largely feminine household in which Siegmund’s authority has been dimmed almost to extinction, do not provide enough history for the main adultery to seem inevitable.

Helena, Lettie, and Miriam in *Sons and Lovers* respond to life in much the same way, refusing what it specifically offers and preferring a fantasy world. In this lie both their fascination and their danger. Lawrence invokes Helena’s rarity of imagination but makes it clear that a soul such as hers turns its back on the creative side of life by substituting its own mock creativity. The end-product of this process would be someone like Hermione in *Women in Love*, who wants to mould her man into an imagined shape rather than to accept the real personality he presents.
Lawrence makes it explicit that Helena’s fancies lead eventually to Hermione’s life rejection:

‘That yellow flower hadn’t time to be brushed and combed by the fairies before dawn came. It is tousled …’ so she thought to herself. The pink convolvuli were fairy horns or telephone from the day fairies to the night their bright hair to the sun. That was her favourite form of thinking. The value of all things was in the fancy they evoked. She did not care for people; they were vulgar, ugly and stupid, as a rule. (43)

Like Miriam in *Sons and Lovers*, Helena offers herself in sexual sacrifice. Lawrence was later to suggest a positive and even thrill in the notion of orgasmic sacrifice, as ‘The Woman Who Rode Away’ and *The Plumed Serpent* make explicit, Lawrence sees it not only in the early novels but latter too, in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* as an abuse of the total partnership of body, will and spirit which sex ought to entail.

Lawrence may have chosen a female protagonist in *The Lost Girl* because he wished to ‘rewrite’ Arnold Bennett’s *Anna of the Five Towns* (1902), as a number of commentators have suggested, but the narrative strategy of using a female perceiving consciousness whose own survival depends upon the sexual selection of a mate clearly also serves the compelling psychological needs of the author. The loss of self that is part of the significance of the novel’s title can be contemplated in a positive way at this point in Lawrence’s career only with respect to the female of the species. Although there is always something of Lawrence himself in his protagonists, male or female, any identification between Alvina and the author serves the ideological purposes of the period. In other words, Lawrence uses Alvina as a symbolic means of purging from himself his own unwanted weaker traits in the project of survival.
Lawrence believes that art is more effective on human soul when compared to abstract philosophies. Philosophy on its own is too dry to comprehend, and since there is no lifelike person to identify with in philosophy, it is hard to grasp philosopher’s intentions. The point is expressed through Alvina’s consciousness in *The Lost Girl*. When Alvina compares films and living performances, she notes that anything that a spectator can identify with is more appealing to the human soul:

> The film is only pictures, like pictures in the Daily Mirror. And pictures don’t have any feelings apart from their own feelings. I mean the feelings of the people who watch them. Pictures don’t have any life except in the people who watch them. (144)

According to Millett, Lawrence was very well aware of this fact, and that’s why she found him so dangerous (239). Like Millett, William York Tindall claims that “Lawrence’s art seems at times to carry a message with a preacher’s anxiety” and his art even “intensifies” the effect of his philosophy. In order to impose his male fantasies Lawrence chooses literature and propagandizes through his literary characters that readers can easily identify with *The Lost Girl* he advertises his philosophies.

In *The Lost Girl*, Alvina is presented as a young woman who tries her way in the world by going through a search for identity. However, Lawrence’s implication is that Alvina is indeed searching for a male who would signify her womanhood. In order to make Alvina realize this, Alvina is not only denied equal educational opportunities with men but she is also excluded from the professional world.

Lawrence’s presentation of Cicio as the savior of Alvina is a device to remind her of the necessities of her sex and that she searches for her identity in wrong places.
In the end, by marrying Alvina and Cicio he elevates Alvina to the status of sexed worker. Alvina is a sexed worker because her married life is not much different from women’s place in typical patriarchies. She deals with domestics, becomes the object of her husband’s sexual demands and submits to his superior power and deeper understanding. Furthermore, she is satisfied in her new state and does not want to go away from the protective presence of her husband Cicio.

In *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* depicts Lawrence’s views on complete freedom of expression on all human experiences and relationships particularly in sexual matters. In the novel Lady Chatterley’s Lover, Lawrence argues about individual regeneration which can be found only through relationship between man and woman. Love and personal relationships are the threads that bind this novel together. Lawrence explores a wide range of different types of relationships, the void in the relationship between Clifford Chatterley and his wife Constance Chatterley which is due to the sexual frustration of Lady Chatterley. She realises that she cannot live with mind alone, she must also be alive physically. The novel depicts a series of relationships, the brutal relationship between Mellors and his wife Bertha, the Perverse, maternal relationship that develops between Clifford and Mrs Botton, his caring nurse and finally the relationship between Mellors and Lady Chatterley that builds very slowly and is based upon tenderness, physical passion and mutual respect.

In *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, the relationship between men and women seems to resemble to the relationship between men and machines. Not only do men and women require an appreciating the sexual and sensual in order to relate to each other properly, they require it even to live happily in the world, as being able to maintain
human dignity and individuality in the dehumanising atmosphere created by modern greed.

The novel dramatizes two opposed orientations towards life, two distinct modes of human awareness, the one abstract, cerebral and unvital and the other concrete, physical and organic. Sir Clifford Chatterley represents a modern intellectual man from ruling class. In contrast, the gamekeeper Oliver Mellors, represent the organic way of life. The novel also portrays contrast between the two relationships – the Constance – Mellors and Constance – Clifford relationships. One is the union of physical consciousness, the other of mental consciousness, one succeeds, the other fails. The two opposing ways of life are summarized in the attitudes, behaviour and way of life of Clifford and Mellors. Clifford leads a mental life at the expense of physical one. For him, words are a substitute for living. He inhabits a social world which is seen as alienating, insensitive, class-conscious and manipulative. The consequences of this way of life affect Connie’s health. Mellors, on the other hand, strives for harmony between the mental and physical life, and a vital interaction between words and deeds.

Mellors is a symbolic figure – the preserver of natural life, the bringer of fulfillment to a woman and an adversary of the mechanical world. On the other hand, Sir Clifford is too much a symbol, a representative of mechanical world. Connie is an oddly colourless character, partly because she has to bear the symbolic weight of being every woman. Despite her obvious intelligence, one tends to think of her as ‘just a young female creature’. The novel portrays Connie’s maturation as a woman and as a sensual being. She comes to, despise her weak, ineffectual husband and to love Oliver Mellors, the game keeper on her husband’s estate. In the process of
leaving her husband and conceiving a child with Mellors, Lady Chatterley moves from heartless, bloodless world of intelligence and aristocracy into a vital and profound connection rooted in sensuality and sexual fulfillment.

The first important remark the researcher would like to make relates to Lawrence’s awareness of what – he is as a writer. In an essay called “Why the Novel Matters” he defines himself:

... being a novelist, I consider myself superior to the saint, the scientist, the philosopher, and the poet, who are all great masters of different bits of man alive, but never get the whole hog. (Beal, 105)

This ‘superiority’ refers to the author’s idea that he, as a novelist, deals with people in their wholeness of being. However, the novelist is an artist and, as an artist, Lawrence says in “The Spirit of the Place”, he is not perfect; the artist is a liar. This idea of the artist as a ‘liar’ refers to the author intending to write about, something, but producing a work which does not express this ‘something’. In other words, there is what can be called the battle between ‘intention’ and ‘feeling’. Lawrence says that

The artist usually sets out – or used to – to point a moral and adorn a tale. The tale, however, points the other way, as a rule. Two blankly opposing morals, the artist's and the tale’s. Never trust the artist. Trust the tale (Beal, 297).

The interesting point of Lawrence’s argument is that he is consciously or unconsciously including himself in this idea. As an artist he has a definite purpose, but his tales reverse what he wants to say and sometimes they deny his intention. This is the unconscious of the author fighting his conscious aims. And as Lawrence says, “Never trust the artist. Trust the tale”: he implies that his theory may be transformed
into another thing when he sets forth to write his novels. A good example of this battle may be seen in Lawrence's idea of ‘balance’ in relationships. Lawrence indeed wants his characters to achieve a stage of equilibrium in their relations. This ‘equilibrium’, however, is hardly present in his novels, except for Tom and Lydia in *The Rainbow* who attain a certain balance, but even this achievement, one could see, is not permanent, since Tom dies early in the novel implying that the other couples must continue the search. Other novels show the struggle between the couples but no one can really say that they get ‘there’. The couples would rather fight for dominance in the relation. This idea, the researcher believes, proves that the author's feelings are different from his didactic intentions.

Another of Lawrence’s ‘intentions’ refers to his idea is that man and woman form ‘the ideal pair’. In “Morality and the Novel” he claims that

The great relationship, for humanity, will always be the relation between man and woman. The relation:-between man and man, woman and woman, parent and child, will always be subsidiary. And the relation between man and woman will change forever, and will forever be the new central clue to human life. It is the relation itself which is the quick and the central clue to life, not man, nor the woman, nor the children that result from the relationship, as a contingency (Beal, 113).

In the novels taken for discussion, the novelist explores how man can develop an integrated personality only when he realizes that he is spirit and flesh, mind and body. The artificial division between the two is the root cause of all the wretchedness and misery of the modern man, and he can escape it only when he develops a new
integral faith, based on the fundamental cosmic harmony between the blood-consciousness of man and nature. With this end in view he advocates a return to nature. Sanity can be restored only by going back to a life of pure sensation, ‘mindless, utterly sensual.’ Harmony can be restored, and an integrated personality developed, by accepting the value of purely physical experience. However, it would be wrong to suppose, as has been frequently done, that he emphasizes merely the physical and not the spiritual. Thus for an integrated personality, for wholeness, the first essential is satisfactory balance between the spirit and the flesh, and secondly, the achievement of satisfactory relationship with others. In one novel after another, he explores human relationships in an effort to find out the basis of satisfactory adjustment with others. This dissertation is an attempt to analyse Lawrence’s *The Trespasser, Sons and Lovers, The Rainbow, Women in Love, The Lost Girl* and *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* focusing on the aspects of ‘familial’ and ‘non-familial’ relationships of man and woman including their themes. It is hoped that this dissertation will provoke further reading and discussion on these novels as well as the novelist and place them in new perspective.