CHAPTER IV

STYLE AND NARRATIVE TECHNIQUE

Basically, there are two critical approaches to art: one is a study of the mechanics used in the production of a work, and the other is the level of aesthetic identification one has with the product. From a simple mechanical consideration of the fiction novel, there are two basic component parts: the author and the story. However, beyond this point, there is a great amount of variance and perplexity. Terminology has become a perfected ambiguity and critics seem to have little or no reason for attaching myriads of connotations to such words as ‘tone’, ‘style’, ‘omniscience’, and ‘form’. One typical example is a rather rambling critique of Lawrence’s form which concludes as follows:

These passages are typical of many in The Rainbow where narrative uses the devices of incremental repetition, striking metaphor and incantatory rhythm to cast a penumbra over every day events. (Julian, 53)

One of the basic problems or understanding the mechanics of the novel is the role of the author. The author is overemphasized, underemphasized, and quite often completely misunderstood. Within the novel, the author is not present but he exists only at the level of creation and not as a force within the finished work. That presence within the novel proper will, for lack of a better term, be called the ‘implied author.’ It is the duty or the role of the writer to select the type of narrative technique, the style, and the content fashioning these into a work of art. Every piece of literature exists as an entity, good or bad, within itself, and within this work exists a narrator. The narrator is neither the author nor the implied author, but rather the medium
through which a story is told. The only method for an author to become a narrator would be for him to be physically present and verbally relate the story to an audience. The implied author exists in a work of art through the author but on a literary rather than a ‘real’ level. The author in the act of creative selection dictates the amount of omniscience with the narrator and/or any other characters will possess. Realistically, total omniscience is impossible. The author is limited by the fact that he is a human being, and, thus, his ability to know, to see, and to delegate this power is also limited. However, within these limits, the power delegated to the narrator may range from the ability to relate the thoughts of all of the other characters to a complete lack of omniscience, in which case only exterior conversations and actions are reported. Whatever method of insight is utilized, the author must maintain a congruity which allows the reader to trust the narrator. If he/she is not consistent, the result is a work such as Lawrence’s *Woman in Love* in which the narrator takes on a variety of characterizations and, thus, lacks credibility.

Another factor involved in analyzing the work of art is that of reader omniscience. This aspect of the novel is often misunderstood by critics who are symbol hunting or attempting by any means to ‘show what the author meant.’ The reader’s ability to know, see and understand a work is limited by two factors: one, the individual’s experiences and knowledge; and two, by those controls which are built into the story. The overstepping of these limits set up by the author will oftentimes lead to a gross misinterpretation of a work. These limits, as created by the author and delegated by the implied author may be either broad or narrow. In *Sons and Lovers*, the reader has a greater amount of omniscience than either character within the work. There are few if any, bounds set upon the interpretation. The reader may place his
own meaning upon a ‘judge penitent’ and understand it on any number of levels. However, reader omniscience is often limited by boundaries which actively exist within a work. However, the novels of Lawrence are interpreted by different readers in different perspectives. Many readers try to understand it from a modernistic point of view and attach much importance to the writing styles and through which to reflect the characters and to exhibit one of the themes of the novel - the reinvention of love of the characters. Lawrence’s portrayal of alternative sexual lifestyles - *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*, both depict homosexual relationships, while sometimes negative, still offers the possibility of bisexuality, an option the author himself explored in his personal life as a reaction against repressive Victorian attitudes. If a reader projects this concept into the scene he has overstepped the bounds of omniscience delegated to him. The narrator has related to the reader what he wants him to see; the implications of ‘perfect love’ are not those of sexual perversity, nor are they those of classical Greek imagery. If the literary shadow behind the characters seems to be evincing the homosexual values attributed to Lawrence, this is also a misconception. The only method of discovering if he had homosexual tendencies and promoted them in his works would be to ask him personally. However, even this resource is not sufficient, for the narrator functions within the bounds of the work and the author does not. The author as critic becomes only another reader; perhaps, from an aesthetic point of view more erudite, but from a mechanical consideration no more profound than any other trained observer.

A great deal of nonsense has been published about Lawrence of a ‘pseudo-autobiographical nature’ (Corke, 2). This type of criticism is for the most part valueless; one must, as Lawrence says: ‘Trust the tale and not the author’ (2). It is
the duty of the writer to put forth his material in such a manner so that it does not
degenerate or progress into an area which only has meaning to the creator. The
argument as to whether a book is good art, bad art, or even art in any form depends
not upon reader omniscience but upon certain rather intangible qualities that are at the
same time both rigid and flexible. The author must, upon the decision of creation,
select his narrative technique, style, and content through which he wishes to express
himself.

Narrative technique is the method by which the story is related to the reader.
According to Scholes, ‘style consists of the experiences he chooses and the type of
words utilized to verbalize the images he wished to create’ (280). This definition
includes such terms as theme, plot, characterization, symbolism a greater or lesser
degree of chronology and types of presentation. Content is the sum total and the
ability of the work to project one or many levels of aesthetic identification. Thus,
these qualities are not determined by one individual reader or by his taste, but rather
by a group of factors contained within the work itself.

Theme, the pervading abstract concept which is made concrete through its
representation in characterization, action, imagery and plot simply conflict or as
Friedman states as a basis for his concept ‘… a group of two or more episodes
effecting a completed process of change in the main character …’ (150) exist on the
periphery of style; however, they cannot be completely divorced from it, for the
nature of words chosen to express an image must, if a work is not incoherent, also
express an idea and its development.

Lawrence is not an author whose best endeavour was the novel form. His
characters never achieve believability, primarily because of a too intrusive narrator.
The narrator often assumes the duties of the character by ‘telling’ the reader rather than allowing the characters to ‘show’ the reader. Also in his early and intermediate novels, Lawrence was unable to stabilize the position of the narrator or the implied author. Emotionally speaking, the narrator and the implied author make impossible demands upon the reader. In overburdening the reader’s ‘willing suspension of disbelief’ on an emotional level, the entire narrative structure often collapses. Lawrence never mastered the craft of the novel; however, if the reader allows him to create a mood within and follows those changes dictated by the novel with an uncritical willingness, then the rewards will be more than sufficient for the reader to forgive the larger portion of the author’s fumbling.

Many critics particularly those of the twenties and thirties contend that Lawrence is not a novelist because his works lack ‘plot’ or ‘development’ in the classical sense. Others of this same general period place him in a variety of schools from sex mad, homosexual fascist to misguided genius. However, a group of later critics such as Dorothy Van Ghent and Mark Schorer have been rather enthusiastic in their ‘new interpretation’ of Lawrence’s work. Van Ghent believes that

We need to approach Lawrence with a good deal of humility about “art” and a good deal of patience for the disappointments he frequently offers as an artist for it is only thus that we shall be able to appreciate the innovations he actually made in the novel as well as the importance and profundity of his vision of modern life. (Mark, 16)

Whether it is the classical or the modern critical approach little if any help is gained from critics in understanding the mechanical aspects of Lawrence’s novels.
Although he is essentially a romantic, his works do not bear out the complete classical connotations of the word. Throughout all of his novels, one finds a strain of nature mysticism that is primitive, somewhat in the tradition of Rousseau’s ‘return to nature’ concept. Tindall has provisionally classified Lawrence a primitive romantic, although he has done so more by way of proving him a theosophist ‘compounded of animism and the occult’ (211) than by way of a label by which one may grasp Lawrence’s relative position as a novelist. In his *Sons and Lovers*, Lawrence is rather a blatant soap box orator preaching a ‘back to nature anti-industrialized’ (Frederich, 155) way of life. His primary spokesman for this rather romantic philosophy is his character, the game keeper, both in his first and last novel. This character gives a rather precise definition to life as it should be in *The White Peacock*. Annable (the gamekeeper) in explaining why his wife has nine children and lives a rather uncivilized existence, says:

> When a man’s more than nature he’s a devil. Be a good animal, says I, whether it’s man or woman. You, Sir, a good natural male animal; the lady there – a female un – that’s proper as long as yer enjoy it. And what then? [asks Cyril Beardsall] Do as th’ animals do. I watch my brats – I let ’em grow. They’re beauties, they are – sound as a young ash pole, everyone. They shan’t learn to dirty themselves wi’ smirking deviltry – not if I can help it. They can be like birds, or weasels, or vipers, or squirrels! so long as they ain’t human rot, that’s what I say. (*WP*, 131)

Mellors, the gamekeeper in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, is a more polished and sophisticated type; however, he also says of people that “… their spunk is gone dead.
Motor cars and cinemas and aeroplanes suck that last bit out of them” \( (LCL, 32) \).
Lawrence’s use of nature and romantic idealism place him in a category that, although not unique, is best termed romantic primitive. From the standpoint of craftsmanship in his novels, Lawrence in an overall evaluation falls short of being a master. In fact, only one of his novels, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, approaches any reasonably sustained level of dexterity involving narrative form.

Non-characterized third person omniscient is an invented term equal to the narrator’s existing within the story as a force which tempers, filters, and relates material to the reader, but he is not personified, nor he has a character role within the action of the work. *Sons and Lovers* is quite prone to such oversights. Most of the time, the narrator tells more about the characters than they themselves know. This helps readers accept and understand actions that might otherwise seem arbitrary or unmotivated. Since *Sons and Lovers* is highly autobiographical, many readers identify the narrator with Lawrence, who seems to be looking back and trying to come to terms with his own youthful problems and feelings through the character of Paul Morel. The narrator’s subjectivity about Paul shows through. At times he sympathizes with Paul, and at other times he condemns him. One may find the other characters judged in a similar way. Some readers find the narrator’s changing opinion indicative of Lawrence’s own confusion over his various past relationships. Others feel that the narrator is simply reflecting how people naturally change their perspective depending on the circumstances. However, even though he had difficulty identifying his narrator, he had even greater problems with characterization. For example, the problem involved in character presentation is that of dialogue. If there are more than three people present in a scene, the reader is quite likely to find himself at a complete
loss in attempting to discover who is saying what to whom. Moreover, his characters are very apt to change levels of understanding quite abruptly with little regard to pre-ordained pattern or character type. Lawrence utilizes this rather foreign approach (which quite often involves the implied author) many times in his earlier novels. A case in point occurs in *Sons and Lovers* when the protagonist, Paul Morel, must go to the local miner’s pub to collect his father’s wages: ‘The landlady [bar owner] looked at him *de haut en bas*, rather pitying and at the same time, resenting his clear, fierce morality’ (*SL*, 73). This passage is more than a bit taxing for the reader. It is rather difficult to visualize a bartender in a small English mining town, looking *de haut en bas* at anyone much less a small boy. Moreover, for this same landlady to resent any child’s ‘clear, fierce morality,’ whatever that might be, becomes a great strain in its demand upon the reader’s willing suspension of disbelief.

Although not all of the characters suffer major defects, Lawrence quite often attributes depths of emotion quite impossible for the reader to follow or believe. Such a scene appears midway through this novel. Miriam, Paul Morel’s ‘spiritual lover’ is in the family kitchen.

“Eh, my Hubert!” she sang, in a voice heavy and surcharged with love.

“Eh my Hubert!” And folding him in her arms, she swayed slightly from side to side with love, her face half lifted, her eyes half closed, her voice drenched with love.

“Don’t!” said the child, uneasy – “don’t Mirian!”

“Yes; you love me, don’t you?” she murmured deep in her throat, almost as if she were in a trance, and swaying also as if she were swooned in an ecstasy of love. (*SL*, 153)
This scene might not be so unbelievable if the reader were not aware of the fact that Hubert is Miriam’s brother of five and that Miriam is an adolescent of fifteen.

Lawrence often seems incapable of creating ‘round characters’ or, those capable of surprising in a convincing manner, or, for that matter, even being convincing. The center of the problem is the characters themselves. When they are allowed to ‘show’ or ‘do’ for the reader, they become quite believable. However, when, as so often occurs in Lawrence’s novels, the narrator tells the reader about the actions and emotions evinced by the characters, the strain becomes too great, and the passage fails to sustain itself.

Lawrence had a good command of dialect and was able to reproduce at times very believable dialogue. But as a rule the narrator tells much more than he shows. In The Rainbow, the characters have a difficult time presenting themselves in their own speech. In the following passage, the dialogue has been lifted out of context to demonstrate the amount and control over what they are allowed to do themselves.

Will Brangwen and his cousin Anna are gathering sheaves of wheat in the moonlight:

“Put yours down”
“No it’s your turn”
“My love”
“My love”
“Anna”
“My love”
“Anna”
“I want to go home” (RB, 113-114)
Although this scene is highly emotional, the two characters themselves have only nine ultra short sentences between them in a page and one-half. The following is the passage in its original form. The character movement takes the form of emotion which is not exhibited or demonstrated by the characters but is related by an omniscient third person narrator who is also present in the field. The reader, however, is not present:

“Put yours down.” she said.

“No. it’s your turn.” His voice was twanging and insistent.

She set her sheaves against the shock. … She was sweet and fresh with the night air, and sweet with the scent of grain. … all the discovery to be made.

Trembling with keen triumph, his heart was white as a star as he drove his kisses nearer.

“My love” she called, … He stopped, quivered, and listened.

“My love” came again the low, …

“I want to go home” she said, looking at him in a way he could not understand. (RB, 115)

In many instances Lawrence’s characters merely get in the way of his narrative dialogue and become simple, flat cardboard reproductions which move about at the direction of the narrator or implied author with little or no interior motivation.

As a rule, a large amount of reader omniscience is involved in all of Lawrence’s novels, although it is a factor that varies somewhat in its form from novel to novel and group to group. In these novels the reader is often allowed insights into the emotions of the characters that even the character does not recognize. Often, the
reader is told quite frankly that the character does not know or understand what is happening to him. At times, the narrator also breaks chronology to tell the reader what will happen to the character in the future. Typical of such passages is a philosophical soliloquy by the narrator of *The Rainbow* supposedly filtered through Lydia Brangwen after her husband is drowned:

> And how could age save youth? Youth must go to youth. Always the storm! Could she not lie in peace, these years, in the quiet apart from life? No, always the swell must heave upon her and break against the barriers. Always she must be embroiled in the seethe and rage and passion endless, endless, going on forever. (*RB*, 238)

The reader, the implied author, and the narrator are certain that this condition will be endless. However, Lydia, who is a Polish immigrant living in a small mining town, is allowed absolutely no voice in all this ponderous consideration of her future.

One other disconcerting aspect of reader omniscience in Lawrence’s works is the occasions upon which he prefers not to tell the reader some fact involved in a scene. One of several such examples is Tom Brangwen’s funeral. He has been, as was previously noted, drowned in a flood. His son arrives at home and looks at the coffin. The reader is told, “He even read the nameplate, ‘Tom Brangwen, of the Marsh Farm. Born _____, Died ____’” (*RB*, 236). If young Tom Brangwen can read the nameplate, surely he can read the dates. Perhaps, he cannot, or perhaps there is no date on the coffin, and only the implied author knows. Certainly, the reader is never informed. This quirk of holding back information that is not actually of great import in itself, but obviously arouses curiosity, appears in all three groups of Lawrence’s novels.
Although it is dangerous to generalize about a concept as variable as that of narrative distance, certain concrete statements can be made about Lawrence's early novels. First, there is, as a rule, a good deal of closeness between the implied author and the narrator. Secondly, there is an attempt at closeness between the narrator and the reader. And, thirdly, there is a false sense of nearness between narrator and character. The implied author as commentator and moral spokesman changes place on stage with the narrator literally hundreds of times throughout Lawrence’s novels, but in his early works it takes a distinct form that is more often relatively subtle than open and completely visible.

In his attempts to involve the reader, he places characters in emotional conditions that if followed emotionally become a rather ‘wring-the-reader’ type of game with the narrator and the reader as the leading characters. The following often quoted wrestling scene from *Women in Love* is a subtle example of the narrator's attempting to involve the reader emotionally while preserving what, at first glance, appears to be closeness with the characters Birkin and Gearld:

So they wrestled swiftly, rapturously, intent and mindless at last two essential white figures working into a tighter closer oneness of struggle, with a strange, octopus-like knotting and flashing of limbs in the subdued light of the room; a tense white knot of flesh gripped in silence between the walls of old brown books. Now and again came a sharp gasp of breath, or a sound like a sigh, then the rapid thudding of movement on the thickly-carpeted floor, then the strange sound of flesh escaping under flesh. Often, in the white interlaced knot of violent living being that swayed silently, there was no head to be seen,
only the swift, tight limbs, the solid white backs, the physical junction of two bodies clinched into oneness. Then would appear the gleaming, ruffled head of Gearld, as the struggle changed, then for a moment the dun-coloured, shadow-like head of the other man would lift up from the Conflict, the eyes wide and dreadful and sightless (WL, 462).

Upon closer inspection, this passage reveals a number of commonplace facets of Lawrence’s narrative distance. The narrator, although seemingly close to the characters, is actually almost as distant as is the reader. Thus, gasps and sighs are heard not seen, by both reader and narrator. It is as if the narrator were standing in the doorway of the room between the characters and the reader. All of the emotions and actions are interpreted by the narrator who is not characterized. This type of non-characterized narrator is a definite distorting factor which stands between the majority of Lawrence’s characters and the reader. Since the narrator exists as a non-visible, oftentimes interpretive force little closeness can be obtained between the emotionally volatile narrator and the reader.

Chronology is probably the most conventional aspect of Lawrence’s early narrative technique. Although there are many lapses and breaks, he uses time as a logical sequence of events one occurring after the other. However, the most frequent breaks in chronology appear when the narrator as a prologue or an epilogue to a scene abandons the story for a rhetorical flight often involving the beauties of nature. There are fewer such breaks in Sons and Lovers and Women in Love than in The Rainbow, and these are an evident characteristic of Lawrence’s narrative technique.

Lawrence’s The Lost Girl, there is a variety of changes or progressions visible in narrative presentation. Usually, the emotions are attributed to one of the characters.
In this novel the implied author openly assumes a rather large role. Before, the implied author and the narrator were quite close, often changing positions very subtly in the same paragraph. In the intervening years between *Women in Love* and *The Lost Girl* (More, 174), Lawrence changes his narrative approach and places the implied author in a position that is, for the most part, easily distinguishable from his narrator. In fact, his middle style, the implied author becomes the ‘I’ of the work; although he assumes no character role within the action of the novel proper. In Chapter VI of *The Lost Girl*, one finds an easily identifiable example of this technique which often involves the implied author’s stopping for a chat with the reader about the novel and among other things:

Now so far, the story of Alvina is commonplace enough. It is more or less the story of thousands of girls. … There have been enough stories about ordinary people. I should think the Duke of Clarence must even have found malmsay nauseating, when he choked and went purple and was really asphyxiated in a butt of it. And ordinary people are no malmsay. (*LG*, 97-98)

By the latter portion of this novel, however, this style degenerates into a form that is tagged by lines of pure melo-drama, such as ‘How she suffered no one can tell’ (*LG*, 227) or ‘For this year of our story is the fatal year 1914’ (*LG*, 291).

Characterization in Lawrence’s *The Lost Girl* is responsible for a number of serious narrative defects that also plagued his *Sons and Lovers*, *Women in Love* and *The Rainbow*. One particular problem also involves the credibility of the narrator’s omniscience. In *The Lost Girl*, the narrator looks into the future and tells the reader
quite frankly that ‘It was time for Miss Frost to die. It was time for that perfected flower to be gathered to immortality’ (LG, 45).

The narrator tells the reader on three separate times, ‘It was time for Miss Frost to die.’ However, Miss Frost does not die. In fact, she does not even get sick. She goes on and on in spite of the narrator’s best efforts to get rid of her. She lives through the rest of Chapter III and almost makes it through Chapter IV, but the narrator, by a lucky stroke, manages to get her sick and into bed:

The night passed slowly. Sometimes the grey eyes of the sick woman rested dark, dilated, haggard on Alvina’s face, with a heavy, almost accusing look, sinister. Then they closed again. And sometimes they looked pathetic, with a mute stricken appeal. Then again they closed - only to open again tense with pain. Alvina wiped her blood-phlegmed lips. In the morning she died … (LG, 61)

This type of false prophesying adds to the lack of credibility in what are already vague characters. Also, as in Sons and Lovers, Women in Love and The Rainbow, the narrator constantly tells the reader what is happening rather than allowing the characters to show the reader. The death scene described above covers one complete page, yet in the entire passage, the two characters share only five short sentences of dialogue between them. The narrator is only reasonably close to the characters and is unable to get closer because of the ‘flat nature’ of the characters themselves. The attributions of emotions and the lack of speech give a false sense of narrator-character closeness to the novels.

In comparing Sons and Lovers, The Rainbow and Women in Love with The Lost Girl, distance as it involves Lawrence’s narrative technique changes noticeably
in *The Lost Girl*. One of the primary distinctions again involves the characterized implied author. In this position, he becomes totally omniscient as versus the non-characterized third person omniscient narrator who is all-knowing, only so far as the actions and emotions of the characters in the story are concerned. However, as has been pointed out, in this type of technique, it is possible for the narrator to be wrong. Thus, since the implied author has assumed a role of omniscience superior to that of the narrator a fair amount of narrative distance is opened between them. This method contrasts rather sharply with the form of the other novels in which the narrator and the implied author were so close from the point of view of distance that both often existed in the same paragraph and were able to change places almost unnoticed. In developing a greater distance between his implied author and his narrator, Lawrence has also created a greater distance between the reader and the narrator and the reader and the character.

Chronology is a factor that remains quite static throughout all of Lawrence’s works, although the sentence to sentence usage of time includes more than the normal amount of artistic fumbling. As in *Sons and Lovers*, *Women in Love* and *The Rainbow*, the narrator will quite often change tense in a sentence for no apparent reason. However, *The Lost Girl* contains a time problem that also involves reader omniscience or rather the lack of it. Finally, on page 291, the reader is told that

> It was August Bank Holiday, that forever black day of the declaration of war, when his question was put. For this year of our story is the fatal year 1914 (*LG*, 291).

If the implied author deems this date important to the progress of the story, it is rather odd that he should wait almost until the end of the novel to inform the reader since he
has been very specific of his dates up to this point. Consequently, it appears to be more of an oversight on the author’s account rather than a premeditated inclusion.

Narratively speaking, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* achieves a merging of all of the techniques that he has used in all of his previous novels. The first paragraph of the work relatively positions and characterizes the implied author:

> Ours is essentially a tragic age, so we refuse to take it tragically. The cataclysm has happened, we are among the ruins, we start to build up new little habitats to have new little hopes. It is rather hard work: There is now no smooth road into the future: but we go round, or scramble over the obstacles. We’ve got to live no matter how many skies have fallen. (*LCL*, 5)

Although the implied author is supra-omniscient and dictates the philosophy to be used throughout the book, he is not intrusive to a high degree. The majority of the information he supplies is relevant to the story, and, thus, the narrative stream retains a high level of consistency. However, there are examples, in which he does intrude upon the story, breaking the structure without regard for his original role:

> For even satire is a spirit of fine, discriminative sympathy. It is the way our sympathy flows and recoils that really determines our lives. And here lies the vast importance of the novel, properly handled. It can inform and lead into new places the flow of our sympathetic consciousness, and it can lead our sympathy away in recoil from things gone dead. (*LCL*, 93)

Therefore, the novel, properly handled can reveal the most secret places of life: for it is in the passional secret places of life, above all, that the tide of sensitive awareness
needs to ebb and flow, cleansing and freshening. This passage also embodies an aspect of Lawrence’s technique which he seemed unable to improve upon. Even though the implied author has been designated a role distinct from that of the narrator, they evince magnetism for one another that is almost undeniable. The above passage began with the narrator and Constance Chatterley. However, after three sentences, Connie is no longer present, and, by the fourth sentence the narrator’s position is also usurped. This merging of narrator and implied author also leads to a number of inane colloquialisms on the narrator’s part, such as, ‘It’s an ill-wind that brings nobody good.’ Such comments are illogical and naive interruptions in what is otherwise a relatively sophisticated method of presentation. The characterization in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* is quite successful, perhaps, because there are only four main characters within the entire novel or, perhaps, because Lawrence was finally able to allow his characters enough freedom to characterize themselves. Constance Chatterley, though she passes through a number of emotional scenes that border on unreality, never strays outside of the bounds of believability established by the novel itself. This intrusive pseudo-character action weakens the narrative structure. If Connie is looking at herself in the mirror and thinking, it would not be normal for her to describe herself in such objective terms. Perhaps, one’s body does turn ‘greyish and sapless’ without love, but Connie has given the reader no indication that this is her conclusion.

There are passages, however, in which the narrator assumes what has been established as a character role and attributes to a character more than he would do or show for himself. The following passage is quoted in its entirety in order to have a
point of reference for several varying facets of Lawrence’s characterization and narrative distance in the succeeding pages:

When Connie went up to her bedroom she did what she had not done for a long time: took off all her clothes, and looked at herself naked in the huge mirror. She did not know what she was looking for, or at, very definitely, yet she moved the lamp till it shone full on her. …

Now it was going slack, and a little flat, thinner, but with a slack thinness. Her thighs, too, that used to look so quick and glimpsey in their female roundness, somehow they too were going flat, slack, meaningless (LCL, 65).

A method for allowing a direct character-reader relationship that Lawrence uses only twice in this novel is contained in his use of the letter. Although this method is as old as the novel form itself, it remains an effective means of transmitting information directly from a character Lady Chatterley’s Lover ends on this very private type of relationship between reader, Mellors and Connie:

Never mind about Sir Clifford. If you don’t hear anything from him, never mind. He can’t really do anything to you. Wait, he will want to get rid of you at last, to cast you out. And if he doesn’t, we’ll manage to keep clear of him. But he Will. In the end he will want to spew you out as the abominable thing.

Now I can’t even leave off writing to you.

But a great deal of us is together, and we can but abide by it, and steer our courses to meet soon. John Thomas says good-night to Lady Jane, a little droopingly, but with a hopeful heart. (LCL, 283)
In an overall consideration of the narrative technique used by Lawrence in his novels, it seems that, although he experimented and changed, he never achieved a truly mature method of communication between reader, character, and narrator.

*The Trespasser*, unlike most of Lawrence's novels, has a simple structure. There is one main action, which is enclosed by the framework of the first and last chapters. Siegmund and Helena are the major characters in the story; the other figures exist only in direct or indirect relation to these two. The plot is simple; there are no extensive digressions or flashbacks. The book can be divided into four distinct sections, excluding the framework. The main part of the story is concerned with the five days Siegmund and Helena spend together on the Isle of Wight; the rest of the book revolves around this situation. The first section concerns the preparations for the excursion; the second is about the vacation itself; the third is occupied with Siegmund and Helena’s trip home from the island, and the fourth describes the immediate and long range consequences of the holiday.

In its structural economy, *The Trespasser* resembles Lawrence’s short stories rather than his novels. In the novels, Lawrence tended to include chapters that were totally unnecessary as far as the plot was concerned, for example, “Bits” in *Kangaroo*, and “The Father” in *The White Peacock*. The short stories are more compact. The Trespasser is written with tightness and economy. The only chapters in the novel that could possibly be considered irrelevant are Chapters 13 and 30. Chapter 13 describes a chance meeting on the Isle of Wight one morning between Siegmund and an old acquaintance, Hampson. The two men talk lightly for a while, and the conversation ends with Hampson is bitter denouncement of ‘interesting’ women, and their effect on men. Hampson leaves as suddenly as he has come, and aside from Siegmund’s brief mention of the meeting to Helena, he is not referred to again.
Although Hampson does not participate actively in the story, he has, nevertheless, an important function in this novel. He serves as a type of chorus, pronouncing judgment on the characters, and predicting the outcome of the story. Through Hampson, Lawrence condemns false, destructive relations between men and women in general, and between Siegmund and Helena in particular. Siegmund is told that a woman like Helena

*can’t live without us, but she destroys us. These deep, interesting women … destroy the natural man in us - that is, us altogether (TP, 108).*

Hampson forecasts Siegmund’s approaching death with the warning;

*You haven’t much reserve. You are like a tree that’ll flower till it kills itself. … You’ll run till you drop, and then you won’t get up again (TP, 107).*

The second less obviously relevant chapter is Chapter 30. It continues the story of Siegmund’s wife and children after the violinist’s death. His wife, Beatrice, has opened a rooming house, and her three guests are described in some detail. This chapter, although not directly connected with Siegmund and Helena’s relationship, is essential to the story as a whole.

A wider exploration of Lawrence’s style shows that kernel or minimally transformed sentences are not characteristic of Lawrence, and that he does not prefer deletion to conjunction. Instead the numbers of expansion transformations, conjunctions and deletions fluctuate in a significant pattern. While discussing how the narrative technique controls the content Sale says:

*The simplest declarative sentence is one of the main aids the novelist has in building up a stable ego, an identity. … If we turn to a passage*
in *The Rainbow*, we can show how Lawrence tries there to break down
this natural building up process. … (30)

Sale’s comment suggests that in *The Rainbow*, Lawrence avoids the minimally
transformed sentences whereas, Ohmann states,

… an especially brusque, emphatic style, which results partly from
Lawrence’s affection for kernel (minimally transformed] sentences.
But his main idiosyncrasy is the use of truncated sentences, which have
gone through a variety of deletion transformations. (135)

The reasons for the changes in the styles of D.H. Lawrence’s novels are
generally found in the subject matter of each novel. More particularly, however, the
changes in his style are paralleled by the way in which each successive novel shows
changes in Lawrence’s opinion on the function and value of words. Lawrence’s
attitudes vary between acceptance of words as valuable means of individual
expression, and rejection of words because of their capacity for falsity in expressing
the individual. The notion of words as a means of communication is evaded in
*Trespassers and Sons and Lovers*, and parallels very obvious stylistic changes after its
introduction in *Women in Love*.

It is interesting to watch how Lawrence’s acceptance of words as a valuable
means of self-expression parallels his use of expansion, how his confusion of the
function of words in society leads him into mistrust, and how the whole notion of
words as a means of communication leads to deletion and ambiguity. Primarily, in
*Trespasser* and *Sons and Lovers*, Lawrence’s attitude towards is positive. In these
novels the narrator implicitly accepts the struggle into consciousness and the striving
for articulation as valuable, no matter what reservations or difficulties may be
depicted in the progress of the novels. In these two novels, Lawrence clearly implies that as words are expressions of an individual, they are of value to another person only as that other person finds the words true within his own consciousness. Words are not, therefore, a means of communicating new ideas or experiences, they are purely products of the individual either in expression or in comprehension. In *The Trespasser* for example, knowledge of words and names is seen as significant. Siegmund, the central character, who is searching for meaning and integration in his life, is shown to be fascinated by the names of things -- types of ships (*TP*, 37), the stars, constellations and wayside plants (*TP*, 57). His interest in names and naming is a reflection of Siegmund’s desire to explore and control the world which otherwise shows him his incompleteness and makes him feel lost as a kitten at the beach.

At the same time words are shown as an individual experience. After Helena’s isolate rapture over her lover, Siegmund expresses his insight on her character: ‘Hawwa -- Eve -- Mother!’ The words serve to crystallize a personal insight, and as such are valuable, but they communicate no more to Helena than her previous German quotations or broken romantic raptures had to him.

Words are much more central in *Sons and Lovers*. The major conflict in the novel involves opposing attitudes to words and speech: the mother is word-centered and battles the father who knows little of latter’s (*SL*, 27 and 47), and is unable to use words to express his feelings (*SL*, 40). Ironically, one of the attractions which Gertrude first has for Morel is her ‘southern pronunciation and purity of English’ (*SL*, 9). Later, the split between them is emphasized by Mrs. Morel’s refusal to speak the dialect of the mining community and her insistence that the children speak the King’s English in the house. She is particular about ‘correct’ English and judges others harshly on their failures to use the language precisely (*SL*, 56).
More particularly, Mrs. Morel finds her life through words, and the narrator accepts this as a positive characteristic. She is described before her marriage:

… She had a curious, receptive mind which found much pleasure and amusement in listening to other folk. She was clever in leading folk to talk. She loved ideas, and was considered very intellectual. What she liked most of all was an argument on religion or philosophy or politics with some educated man. This she did not often enjoy. So she always had people tell her about themselves, finding her pleasure. (*SL, 10*)

Because Morel cannot meet her in speech, Mrs. Morel turns from him to the children with her demands. “The children, alone with their mother, told her … everything. Nothing had really taken place … until it was told to their mother (*SL, 62*). By expressing their experience in words, the children are able to realize them, and themselves, and are urged on to greater growth.

In consistently presenting this view of words as necessary for personal, social and economic growth Lawrence may simply be championing one value inculcated by his mother and supported by the lower middle class ethos in which he was raised. In his consistent emphasis on the expressive nature of words and on the importance of the individual in using words and in judging their validity Lawrence adds a new dimension to the received ideas which he adopts.

In *Trespassers* the acceptance of words apparent in the whole context of the novel is repeatedly juxtaposed with the possibilities for evasions and deceptions which words present. At the same time, however, the problem of communication or disruption of communication, although clearly implied, is never directly confronted. Siegmund’s reliance on word symbols is seen as positive, and it is suggested that
words are a means of ordering and controlling the world. Helena uses words to evade or distort almost constantly, but the problems in communication that this raises are never considered.

For example, Helena cannot discuss ships, or constellations or the wayside plants with Siegmund, as she refuses to learn their names. She laughingly says, ‘Why should I want to label them? … I prefer to look at them, not hide them under a name’ (TP, 57). Yet this is a misrepresentation. Helena may not ‘label’ a ship a schooner, but she does not see ‘a ship with four sails,’ she metamorphoses the physical reality into ‘a housewife of forty going placidly round with the duster’ (TP, 37). By rejecting the ‘labels’ of others Helena frees the objects she perceives from the light of day and makes them completely subject to herself and her fancy. Similarly, she has no interest in the nature and function of flowers, but it pleases her to call them ‘tiny children in pinafores’ (TP, 99) or to create the fantasy that ‘the yellow flower hadn’t time to be brushed and combed by the fairies before dawn came’ (TP, 34).

Although Helena is condemned within the novel and by the narrator because of her evasive speech, the reason for the condemnation is not because evasive speech disrupts communication between the lovers, but that she simply does not express herself honestly and intelligibly. Implicitly, it is accepted that straightforward expression is valuable because it is truthful, and that words are important because they express the individual and aid in the individual’s development.

Solipsistic conversations abound in The Trespasser but are somewhat less frequent in Sons and Lovers, partly perhaps because the conversations in the latter book are often based on remembered conversations and native speech patterns, and partly because the heavy freighting of allusion is often missing. In the former book
however, the lovers are continually making statements and exclamations or asking questions which are not responded to, ignored, or even forgotten. Not only are the statements, ‘infelicitous,’ the possibility of any valid statement seems ignored in the lovers’ treatment of each other’s speech. The isolation of command and exclamation is almost complete.

*As The Rainbow* is a transitional novel, the attitudes towards words developed in the novel are also transitional. The style is hard to define because it changes as the romance progresses through four generations. In general, however, the style is a logical extension of the rich expansions of *Sons and Lovers*. The first point concerns Lawrence’s use of oxymoron as a consistent technique in descriptions of moments of crisis in all three relationships of *The Rainbow*. When Tom finally achieves marriage to Lydia he is described as pressing forward to meet her in ‘the blazing kernel of darkness’ (*RB*, 90), and further descriptions of the two use the same opposed elements; Lydia is described as ‘glowing and burning darkly’ (*RB*, 131). When Will first holds Anna in his arms after they have stoked the corn, he finds ‘all the night in his arms, darkness and shine, he possessed of it all’ (*RB*, 119). On their honeymoon, Will and Anna lie together like ‘the steady core of all movements, the unawakened sleep of all wakefulness’ (*RB*, 141). With Ursula, the paradoxical structures are associated only indirectly; it is only in her vision of the horses that the opposites are brought into proximity:

Their great haunches were smoothed and darkened with rain. But the darkness and wetness of the rain could not put out the hard, urgent, massive fire that was locked within these flanks, never, never.
… She was aware of the great flash of hoofs, a bluish iridescent flash surrounding a hollow of darkness. Large, large seemed the bluish incandescent flash of the hoof-iron, as large as a halo of lightning round the knotted darkness of the flanks. (*RB, 487*)

The second point is that the nature of the adjectives changes as the novel progresses. In the early chapters when the protagonists are inarticulate, but rich in their silent communion with the sail and each other the adjectives themselves tend to be richly physical, based on natural images. The glowing and blazing of Tom and Lydia reflect the natural warmth of the fire. As the generations progress, losing the closeness to the soil and natural communion of silence and becoming more and more articulate, the nature of the adjectives changes also, as has been noted by Ford and others. Imprecise and abstract adjectives such as ‘strange’ intrude more often into descriptions. Adjectives more often image mechanical, chemical or electrical activity; ‘frictional,’ ‘corrosive,’ ‘seething,’ ‘crystallized’ describe protagonists and their actions in a detached almost clinical fashion that has none of the warmth of early life. It is almost as if Lawrence were choosing his adjectives to reflect his protagonists becoming more detached and without the warmth of human communion as they are able to express themselves in words. The choice of adjectives emphasizes the emergence of a basic conflict.

The main changes shown by the style of *The Rainbow* are to be found in changed options in the conjoining transformations and in the deleting transformations. For the first time deletion of common elements in conjoined sentences almost exactly equals the use of ‘and,’ ‘but’ and ‘or’ as conjunctions. Other significant changes accompany this, as there is a sudden increase in the use of unnecessary conjunction
and in conjoining punctuation. The rich noun expansions, the rhythmic structures, and the compact narrative flow structure this romance showing the struggle of four generations of one family. The prose rhythms give an emotional power which reflects the nature of the Brangwens, Lawrence describes. Basing the survey of their being on the intercourse of farm people with nature, the Brangwen men are physically rich, and inarticulate. In contrast, the women search for something beyond:

… the women looked out from the heated, blind intercourse of farm life, to the spoken world beyond. They were aware of the lips and mind of the world speaking and giving utterance, they heard the sound in the distance, and they strained to listen. (RB, 2)

In the family, the woman is ‘the symbol for that further life which comprised religion and love and morality’ (RB, 13), but she, as the physical representative of abstractions, looks ever further, to conscious articulation of the abstractions she stands for. In her own steps toward this desire she is guided by the speech of those in the world she is familiar with:

At home, even so near Cossethay, was the vicar, who spoke the other, magic language, and had the other, finer bearing, both of which she could perceive but never attain to. (RB, 3)

The vision of articulation which is present in the speech of the vicar or in Mrs. Hardy of Shelly Hall is seen as a positive thing:

The women of the village might be much fonder of Tom Brangwen, and more at their ease with him, yet if their lives had been robbed of the vicar, and of Lord William, the leading shoot would have been cut away from them, they would have been heavy and uninspired and inclined to hate. (RB, 5–6)
In his treatment of the next generation Lawrence leaves the question of verbal communication in abeyance; the interest is still focused on the necessity of attaining self-expression. Will and Anna have not fully learned to express themselves in words. Anna is the more inarticulate; she belongs wholeheartedly to the world of rich physical communion found in Marsh Farm. She has a potential interest in the abstraction and their expression as is seen in her reaction to the rosary she inherits from her real father, Paul Lensky who was ‘very ardent and full of words.’ But Anna can never express the meaning of the rosary in words (RB, 99). Will is important to Anna because of his talk; he participates in words, and as she envisions him ‘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’ (RB, 109).

The way in which Lawrence manipulates lexical patterns to create telling differences in rhythm is made noticeable if the rendering of Anna’s mystical experience is compared with that of Will:

She too was overcome with wonder and awe. She followed him in his progress. Here, the twilight was the very essence of life, the coloured darkness was the embryo of all light, and the day. Here, the very first dawn was breaking, the very last sunset sinking, and the immemorial darkness, whereof life’s day would blossom and fall away again, re-echoed peace and profound immemorial silence, … (RB, 198)

The experience has a religious and emotional depth for Anna, and this is expressed in the rhythm. But it is also a physical experience which seems intelligible to the intellect because it is rendered in terms of familiar and comprehensible sensory images. The “coloured darkness” of the Cathedral is understandable in terms of experiences of stained-glass windows.
In *The Rainbow* the value of words is seen as even more problematical than in *Trespasser* and *Sons and Lovers*. The increased expansion and the increased deletion show the effect of the conflict about words, a conflict which is further explored in *Women in Love*. In *Women in Love*, Lawrence struggles to develop and reconcile his theories of words as means of individual expression with his emerging attitudes to communication is uncertain throughout the novel.

As a master of effective dialogue and this is evident at the very beginning of the novel in the conversation between Ursula and Gudrun about marriage. Not only is the dialogue interesting and arresting in itself, it is also a revelation of the characters of the speakers. Hence, it is throughout the novel. The dialogue is punctuated throughout with comments on the feelings of the characters taking part or the impact of the conversation upon them. The men and women in *Women in Love* live the world of intense and significant speech. Idle chatter and gossip are quite foreign to these characters.

The conflict in the attitude to words is reflected in the style, which presents two stylistic patterns simultaneously. *Women in Love* emphasizes expansion and deletion at the same time and uses the deletion transformations to produce a great deal of ambiguity. The novel has comparatively longer sentences and the greater number of transformational words in the Lawrentian canon. There is greater variety in the transformations than in *The Rainbow*, and a high proportion of true expansion transformations. It also has the greatest number of deletions. In addition to the number of appositives, deleted relatives and deletion of unnecessary words, inverted sentence order and displaced structures add to the opacity of the prose. As Lawrence Lerner notes,
The novel is full of conversation, far more than in *The Rainbow*, and all the characters are extremely articulate people, accustomed to analyzing themselves and their emotions, and defining and trans-valuating words. (196)

In Gudrun’s speech and her misuse of words coincide with misuse of communication. Gudrun’s foreign phrases, her elliptical statements, (*RB*, 1) half-finished comments (*RB*, 4), evasive playing with the meaning of words -- all these habits help confound any sort of conversational exchange with another person, and help keep Gudrun outside community, apart and isolated, and all are condemned in the narration.

Many of the resulting disjointed conversations between the characters sound like the artificial and disconnected speeches of the early novels like *Trespasser* and *Sons and Lovers*. The effect, however, is totally different because of the authorial awareness of evasion in conversation, and the psychological bases Lawrence prepares so that the reader may analyze and judge the disjointed exchanges. For example, one of the most confusing exchanges in the novel occurs between Gudrun and Gerald after Gudrun dances in front of the Highland cattle. Gerald frightens off the cattle with a shout, then calls to her, ‘What do you think you are doing?’ (*RB*, 160). Gudrun replies ‘Why have you come?’ an answer, typical of the exchanges in his earlier novels, which altogether ignores the question as if it did not exist. Then Gerald repeats his question, ignoring her cry in turn. In the ensuing conversation Gudrun attempts to ignore Gerald, then, when that proves impossible, to play with his words so that their sense is confounded and Gerald is confused. Finally she strikes Gerald. The slap destroys any possibility of communication. Lawrence’s explanation of
Gudrun’s conversational behaviour, and his suggestion of her fear of communication in speech, epitomizes a new attitude to words and conversation which appears in *Women in Love*.

Almost all the minor characters are condemned in their misuse of words; not only as they fail in self-expression, but particularly as they misuse words to evade communication with another. Gerald, for example, is shown as quite literate; he attempts to express himself and his ideas quite straightforwardly in statements which are honest and not evasive. But he is condemned because he evades word communication. As the narrator points out, when Gerald talks to Birkin on the London train there is no real love of words in his love of discussion.

In Gerald’s relationship with Gudrun Gerald’s vulnerability is shown more fully. Because of his perverse use of words, Gerald becomes prey to Gudrun who abstracts words from meaning and uses words to degrade and dominate him. An example of their duel illustrates the playing with word meanings which is the means of destruction. In the bedroom in the Tyrol Gudrun faces Gerald:

“*You know you never have* loved me, don’t you?”

“I don’t know what you mean by the word ‘love’,;”

he replied, “Yes, you do. You know all right that you have never loved me. Have you, do you think?”

“No,” he said, prompted by some barren spirit of truthfulness and obstinacy.

“And you never will love me,” …

“Fancy your actually having said it.” She said with a touch of raillery.

He stood as if he had been beaten. (*RB*, 434)
Gerald feels ‘degraded to the very quick, made of no account’ after such an episode, but his actions are simply a logical extension of his original attitude to words. Gerald avoided the meanings of words, and refused to recognize their value in communication. If this conversation is analyzed according to the criteria for felicitous communication, it will be seen that Gudrun is not actually attempting to communicate. She very rarely makes statements - usually she uses bullying questions, commands and exclamations and many of the statements she makes are inadmissible.

The complexity of the presentation reflects the contradictions and confusion in the novel’s attitude to words. Gerald desires to see the truth in words, yet he sees how words can be evaded, twisted and manipulated. He desires to communicate, yet he fears verbal communication as a destructive by-product of word manipulation.

The most complete presentation of the emerging complexities in Lawrence’s ideas on words and on communication is found in the portrayal of Rupert Birkin. Birkin’s development is an exploration, restatement, and development, of all of Lawrence’s theories on words and communication to this time. At the beginning of the novel Birkin is presented as an articulate and literate member of an educated society. For the first two chapters Birkin is shown as a quiet observer; during general conversation he often drops out of sight completely. In “Classroom,” however, he has a conversation with Hermione and Ursula which introduces clearly his attitude to words and the problems Birkin has with words.

The Ursula of *Women in Love* is an extension of the Ursula in *The Rainbow*. She is still articulate, but she is changed presumably through the experience with the horses which enabled her to recognize and accept herself, ‘sunk to the bottom of all change.’ In *Women in Love* she is no longer evasive. Her first speech is a demand for
clarification in meaning so that she can give a considered reply to her sister’s question. Gudrun may repudiate the conversation, saying that it is nothing but words, but Ursula finds value in words, and broods on what is said (RB, 4). She is always trying to find her truth in words, as George, Emily and Miriam sought to do in earlier novels; she is ‘always thinking, trying to lay hold on life, to grasp it in her own understanding’ (RB, 3).

Ursula is close to Birkin in the emotional aftermath of the evening, but she does not wish to listen to his words. The narrative almost implies that if she permits herself to realize the meaning of Birkin’s words she will accede to them:

Ursula listened, half attentive, half avoiding what he said. She seemed to catch the drift of his statement, and then she drew away. She wanted to hear, but she did not want to be implicated. … she drew back, even though her desire sent her forward. (RB, 178)

This passage is the most explicit presentation of the notion that words which communicate have the power of spell-words to put the hearer in the speaker’s power or to force him to take on the speaker’s identity.

It is interesting to note that the examples of verbal interaction between characters which occur in the earlier novels this type of loss of identity are also portrayed. In The Rainbow, Ursula listens to her grandmother’s words and imaginatively becomes part of her grandmother’s life. The assumption of identity here is not complete, and is in a sense positive, since it widens the child’s horizon, but it is also seen as a dangerous trap which may limit the girl in illusion. In Sons and Lovers on the other hand, the exchange of identity is complete and Mrs. Morel becomes Paul and lives his life vicariously. In this autobiographical episode,
significantly, the mother is still seen as dominating and absorbing even though she is a listener.

The exchange between Birkin and Ursula the novel generally emphasizes the inadequacy of words, either in self-expression, or in communication. Birkin, on the whole, speaks far more simply; his images are much more subdued, which should show ease of expression and facilitate communication. But after a sharp argument in “Moony”, Birkin decides to abandon words. He stops in despair thinking:

But what was the good of telling her he wanted this company in proud indifference. What was the good of talking, anyway? It must happen beyond the sound of words (RB, 242).

The narrative shows words to be unnecessary. Later, in ‘Excurs’ the same thing happens.

After an argument in which nothing is resolved verbally, Ursula and Birkin come together, and the author insists that now their perception of each other is changed, that they belong to each other in peace, and that words which express or communicate love or acquiescence are unnecessary. (RB, 302)

The evening before the marriage speech is found to be completely superfluous:

In the new, superfine bliss, a place superseding knowledge, there is no land you, there was only the third, unrealized wonder, the wonder of existing not as oneself, but in a consummation of my being and of her being in a new one, a new paradisal unit regained from the duality. How can I say “I love you” when I have ceased to be, and you have ceased to be: we are both caught up and silent, because there is nothing to
answer, all is perfect and at one. Speech travels between the separate parts. But in the perfect one there is perfect silence of bliss. (RB, 362)

In all these incidents Lawrence presents communication as a subjective state of apparent psychic communion which has little connection with that curious blending of objective knowledge and emotional empathy which communication in words usually means.

Besides, some of the most effective passages are concerned with nature, which, together with the mining background, is felt everywhere. Lawrence’s keen observation of nature is revealed in the descriptive passages. The blackness of the mining district is expressed in ‘the faint glamour of blackness’ which is present even in the country. Describing the countryside Lawrence is drawn to remark: ‘White and black smoke rose up in steady columns, magic within the dark air’ (RB, 6), and in a description of a churchyard:

There was a vague scent of sap and spring, perhaps of violets from off the graves. Some white daisies were bright as angels. In the air the unfolding leaves of the copper-beech were blood-red. (RB, 8)

The choice of words of Lawrence in this novel is often unusual, strange, startling yet appropriate. The miners’ wives hand ‘underworld’ faces. The ‘grey uncreated’ water makes the connection between the man and the water significant. The water-plants are ‘fleshy’. The mud has a ‘festering chill’.

Even in conversation and in descriptions of characters this strange insistence on opposition is maintained. Sometimes it is quite descriptive and comprehensible, as when Ursula says ‘I know’ … looking slightly dazzled and falsified, as if she did not know’ (RB, 4). Sometimes the comment simply outrages logic, as when Birkin
apologizes to Mr. Crich with the childish. ‘… I’m always late. But today I was really punctual, only accidentally not so’ (RB, 15). But with almost every page the contractions appear.

As can be expected, the style of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* reflects the uncertainty of the Eden in the game-woods of Wragby, and the acknowledgement that words must functional vehicles of expression and communication in the everyday world. The struggle to face the problem of communication without retreating into an Eden is reflected in the numbers of expansion and deletion transformations used. In *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* the relative totals of the expansions and deletions show very little difference; the use of deletion almost approaches the use of expansion in the way of *Women in Love*. The style of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* is much more simple and straightforward than that of *Women in Love*. There is a distinct limitation in the use of rhythmic repetitions and parallelisms in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*. The stylistic pattern shows only a broad outline, as *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* discusses, complex ideas about words in a way reminiscent of *Women in Love*.

Naturally the ideas of words which Lawrence expresses in this novel have been subject to critical interpretation, but the general tendency has been too simplistic interpretation. In her discussion of this novel in *The Appropriate Form*, for example, Barbara Hardy comments at some length on the language of Mellors and its relationship to the pattern of the novel. Her comments are interesting because they reflect the generally held evaluation of Mellors’ use of dialect and obscenity and of the way in which Lawrence solves the problem of communication:

Before we are allowed to hear the four-letter words, we are confronted with a dead poetic language [Clifford’s] which is an evasion of
relationships instead of an expression of them. The obscenities are the linguistics antithesis to this ready-made literary language which comes between her [Connie] and life. The language [dialect] which Mellors teachers her is also new to her, not ready-made. … Both the acts and the words are perilously exposed in literature, and may well fail in public communication, but they are here a consistent part of a truthful exposure and of a symbolic pattern. (LCL, 165)

The problem is given its depth and complexity because all three major characters are products of the modern world with its dissociation between words, truthful expression, and communication. All three are ‘educated’ in the modern sense that they can talk of a wide range of ideas. Although all characters face the problems raised by conditions in the modern world, difference may be perceived between the values of words used by one character and those used by another. There is, however, a unique concept introduced in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* in that the valuations of the words are not only based on the truthfulness of the expressions, but are explicitly connected with the attitudes to man and to communion held by the characters. In this novel the ‘felicity’ of a character’s speech is explicitly shown to mirror his attitude to his fellow man and his desire for community.

Sir Clifford Chatterley is the most easily interpreted character of the three. Clifford’s inability to be ‘in touch’ with others corresponds to the meaninglessness of his words, as both deficiencies have the same cause. As, Clifford has no self the words cannot express any reality of himself; there is nothing there to express. Old Sir Malcolm Reid is correct when he says that Clifford’s words mean ‘nothing’. In fact, Clifford is only able to write at all because he discusses his ideas with Connie before
he commits them to paper. She is the source, justification and value of his words, and if he ‘puts all his being into the stories’ \((LCL, 15)\), it is an illusion of being derived at second-hand to give an illusion of value to an otherwise meaningless existence.

This parallel between absence of valid speech and absence of relationship is new in Lawrence. It is the first time that the two values have been so explicitly connected, even in negation, although the connection was implicitly present in the theories of words put forward in other novels. This connection, however, is an innovation which pervades the novel, and controls all discussions of words.

Connie, then, is a woman of the modern world, but she is distinct from Clifford in her desire for human relationships and communication and in her somewhat inarticulate belief that both talk and sexual touch should lead to communion. Again, Lawrence is making a connection between speech and communication that was implicit in this theory, but totally absent from his novels until this time. Connie cannot embody theory, but she is the first to express the desire for communication in speech and the first to believe in the possibility.

Oliver Mellors is a mate fitting for Connie in that he too recognizes the necessity of communication. He is, however, a more complex character in that he is bitterly resentful of his need to be in touch with other people. After his first intercourse with Connie in the hut, Mellors watches her return to Wragby ‘almost with bitterness’ because ‘she had connected him up again, when he had wanted to be alone’ \((LCL, 110)\). But part of Mellors’ reaction away from communication with other is due to his recognition of its value as its peril. The way in which all three characters choose and use words mirrors the way in which they comprehend themselves and others, and the value they put upon words and communication. But a comparison of
the ward-usage of Connie and Clifford, at this point reveals some telling differences. Because she has been educated in Clifford’s world and has been so close to him, her use of words is often similar at first glance. Immediately before Clifford’s attitude to quotation is exposed, Connie’s attitude to words is scrutinized.

The words in Connie’s mind seem as much a web of quotations as those in Clifford’s, but there are two significant differences between Connie’s use of quotations and Clifford’s. First, Connie does not limit herself to single quotations or lines of thought, nor, does she always quote correctly. She associates many quotations, flowing from one to another as each helps to illuminate a facet of her mood. She juxtaposes many disparate elements to form a new whole. And, secondly, this web of quotations is not formed to protect Connie from experience but rather to form a structure of experiences glimpsed from others on which Connie may build her new perceptions of her state. Out of others’ words Connie is moving forward to create her own. Oliver Mellors’ use of words is more complex than either Clifford’s or Connie’s not only because his character is more complex than theirs when he is introduced, but also because he changes and develops in his attitudes as the novel progresses.

It is interesting to note that many of the passages in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* reflect this same technique of using other’s words to personal ends. In no other novel but *The White Peacock* Lawrence does so intersperse his descriptions and comments on society with reinterpretations of other’s words. The number of conventional clichés and classical images in the book is enormous. Yet Lawrence integrates the quotations as he never did in earlier novels, turning them to his own ends by a flippant tone which calls to question the conventional wisdom either in Page 1 or by a
complex of image and tone which give another dimension to the images especially, in pages 172 and 173.

Although Jeffrey Meyers points out that critics have ignored the crucial importance of *The Lost Girl* as a transitional novel (72), it seems that the novel deserves more attention as a transitional novel in terms of national and racial identity, the Lawrentian sense of place, and sexuality. With its transgression against what English culture has represented, Alvina Houghton, the protagonist becomes ‘lost’ to her civilized world and comes to stand on the threshold of the ‘uncertain’ world, turning from a stable status as a British citizen to an uprooted wanderer, from her attachment to her native places to her search for a new place, and from the heterosexual to the homosocial. Graham Hough rightly points to the significance of Italy as a new place for Lawrence around the time when Lawrence had written *The Lost Girl*:

> What really interested Lawrence at this time, what was really making him live anew, was Italy and the fresh possibilities of life he had discovered. (28)

*The Lost Girl* certainly explores the possibilities of Italy as a new way of life before Lawrence’s exploration of the spirit of Italy is, to use Philip Herring’s words, ‘soon eclipsed by a new preoccupation: the ‘primitive’ mind and America’ (19). Keeping in mind that *The Lost Girl* features a transitional phase moving from the ‘European mode’ of life to the ‘primitive’ way of life. *The Lost Girl* exhibits many metaphors and implications related to American Indians and the future journey to America. For Lawrence, Italy was like a stepping-stone to the New World, where he ambitiously planned to explore the possibility of an ideal society, what he called
‘Rananim.’ In *Lost Girl*, Lawrence creates the image of using odd/strange fish and extending the phraseological image over a large stretch of text, which are over twenty-five pages which create an effect of audible stillness:

He spoke in a slightly mouthing way, not well bred in spite of Oxford.

… Really an odd fish: quite interesting, if one could get over the feeling that one was looking at him through the glass wall of an aquarium: that was most horrifying of all boundaries between two worlds. … For he was a genuine odd fish. And yet she seemed to hear no sound, no word from him: nothing came to her. Perhaps as a matter of fact fish do actually pronounce streams of watery words, to which we, with our aerial-resonant ears, are deaf, forever (*LG*, 83)

Symbolism is an important tool for Lawrence to explore what he believes to be the feminine soul and to fictionalize its agony to find answers and above all an identity other than the false one imposed by a corrupt civilization with twisted priorities. The symbols employed here offer further substance to the projection of her subconscious self on the environment. They link mundane reality to the transcendent through the feminine, sacred, inner world. As Tresidder notes, animals have always been the most immediate, powerful and important foundation for symbol systems of all cultures. There is no other source that has offered such a varied range in iconography, because nearly all human qualities can be represented in animal form. Psychology and religion have attached to animals the essential symbolism of the instinctual, the unconscious, the libido and the emotions.

D.H. Lawrence is a naturalist among novelists; the surface of the earth furnishes the terms of his psychological climate. The forces of human nature are
assessed in terms of the forces of nature and its phenomena -- the sun, the moon, light and darkness, the wind, the sea, the woods and specific trees, animals and birds, the rhythm of the tides and seasons, crops and flowers. All of these are symbols, recurring and expanding in meaning.

Lawrence’s treatment of the canine animals distinguishes, unlike his treatment of the feline animals, between the domestic and the wild (or predatory) canines far more sharply. The attitude that Lawrence maintains towards the dog in his fictional writings is invariably one of contempt. He, thus, singles out the domestic canine. Far more than the other animals and their counterpart characters, Lawrence’s treatment of the dog and the dog-like character as well remains explicitly constant. That is, whether it is the actual dog or the dog-like human being, Lawrence’s attitude, with the exception of a few early works, has been one of contempt.

Lawrence writes in his essay Rex the following words about the servility of the dog, which, nonetheless, anticipates the later and more sharply defined usage of the animal as a symbolic image in his poem entitled “Bibbles” and a group of his works of fiction. “Nothing but love has made the dog lose his wild freedom, to become the servant of man. And this very servility or completeness of love makes him a term of deepest contempt—“You dog!” (Lawrence, 21). Furthermore, later in a significant passage in his essay “John Galsworthy”, he contrasts the dog with other canine animals:

... once you have the fall into social beings, sex becomes disgusting, like dogs on the heat. Dogs are social beings, with no true canine individuality. Wolves and foxes don't copulate on the pavement. Their sex is wild and in act utterly private. Howls you may hear, but
you will never see anything. But the dog is tame--and he makes
excrement and he copulates on the pavement, as if to spite you. (47)

As examples, instances from Lawrence’s few novels like *The Trespasser* and *Sons and Lovers* and the prose piece ‘Rex’ could be shown.

Technically, *The Trespasser* has two outstanding elements, symbolism and suspense. The symbolism, however, is awkward and unintegrated. There is no central, unifying image, and often no attempt has been made to establish a connection between the various images. Most of the symbols can be classified under one of two headings, either German culture, or the natural elements. Siegmund and Helena’s relationship is set against a background of German intellectualism. Lawrence has named Siegmund after a Wagnerian hero, and has made him an admirer of the German composer. When the lovers are together on the Isle of Wight, they hum fragments of Wagner. Helena refers to Nietzsche, and quotes snatches of poetry in the German original and in the English translation.

In *The Trespasser* the dog image is in the form of similes attributed to one of the main characters that is the hero, Siegmund. Lawrence describes the intimacy of Siegmund and Helena, after they both have reached the Isle of Wight to spend a week. This is to be a relief and an escapade for Siegmund from his unpleasant wife and the grubbiness at home. Lawrence writes:

> At length she found herself released, taking a great breath, while
> Siegmund was moving his mouth over her throat, something like a dog snuffing her, but with his lips (*TP*, 30)

Here, it is evident that Lawrence’s use of the simile, likening Siegmund to a dog, is indispensable, because it suggests more than a plain visual image. The dog’s sniffing
is to recreate the sensation, in an astonishing economy of words. It is a bold image, suggestive of the sense of touch.

In *The Trespasser*, the sun, moon, mist and sea all have symbolic connotations. Frequently, they either reflect the moods of the characters, or heighten the suspense of the story. There are some obvious parallels between *The Valkyrie* and *The Trespasser*. In both tales Siegmund’s fleeing, and is fated to die. The stories are both heightened with natural imagery. In *The Valkyrie*, Wotan’s anger is introduced by thunder and storm clouds. After he has decided Brunhild’s fate, the storm abates, and the clouds disperse. Wagner’s Siegmund had a magic sword which symbolized his life as a warrior, just as the violin of Lawrence’s Siegmund stood for the latter’s life as a musician. Each symbol plays an important part in its respective story. After the warrior is death, Siegmud recovers his sword; similarly, after the violinist’s death, Helena salvages his violin.

However, Lawrence did not successfully blend the German references with the rest of the story in *The Trespasser*. The story takes place in England. Siegmund and Helena delight in the beauties of the English countryside, and the German images seem self-conscious and artificial. Helena’s mixture of German and English phrases in her endearments to Siegmund is responsible for some of the worst passages in the novel, for example:

Die grosse Blumen schmachten, “she said to herself, curiously awake and joyous.” The big flowers open with black petals and silvery ones, Siegmund. You are the bit flowers, Siegmund; yours is the bridegroom face, Siegmund, like a black and glistening flesh-petalled flower, Siegmund, and it blooms in the Zauberland, Siegmund - this is the magic land. (*TP, 92*)
There are also occasional passages of Christian images. The lovers pass a small church on the island one night, and Helena is flanked by the figure of Christ on one side, and by Siegmund on the other. ‘It was unusual for her to be so humble-minded, but this evening she felt she must minister to him, and be submissive.’ (TP, 67) When the two are walking home the following evening, they use the Cross as their landmark, and losing sight of the Cross, they become lost. When the couple pass the chapel the second time, Siegmund mentally compares his life to Christ’s.

But we are the same; love, the brief ecstasy, and the end. … Yet he derived comfort from the knowledge that life was treating him in the same manner as it had treated the Master, though his compared small and despicable with the Christ-tragedy. (TP, 31)

On his final night with Helena on the island, Siegmund remembers the cathedral, and thinks, ‘At least it was all sacred, and whatever the God might be. Helena, herself, the bitter bread, was stuff of the ceremony, which he touched with his lips as part of the service.’ (TP, 121)

The main body of symbolic material in The Trespasser is reference to the natural elements. The sun, moon, sea, sand and cliffs on the Isle of Wight assume supernatural proportions. The sea and cliffs represent danger and death; the lovers, preoccupied with death, are alternately attracted to and repelled by the threatening elements. The sun and moon have an important, yet poorly defined role in the novel.

Moonlight is used in The Trespasser ‘more as a leitmotif drawing certain emotions together than as a coherently worked-out symbol.’ (Lawrence, 89) The moon is not a consistent term of reference in the novel; it seems to mean different things at different times. The night before Siegmund leaves for the island, the
moonlight fascinates and excites him. On the island, the moon light stimulates the
romantic, affectionate side of Helena.

On the levers’ final night together on the island, the appearance of the moon
has still another interpretation. On this occasion, the crescent of the moon is compared
to a drinking cup, which the night tips over the sea, ‘till at last the moon looked frail
and empty.’ (TP, 141) The empty moon may symbolize Siegmund, bereft of his life
force, which was spilled during his vacation with Helena. This analogy is carried one
step further with the appearance of the moon shortly before Siegmund’s suicide. The
moon is trying to flee from the light of approaching day, but is continually caught in
its net.

It is not very difficult to see that Lawrence’s use of the dog-simile for Siegmund
is not far different from the ones he has employed for Walter Morel in Sons and Lovers.
They are, invariably, contextual and are used simply to bring out an analogical parallel of
short-ranged import. Yet Sons and Lovers has to be singled out because the parallel
drawn between Walter Morel and the dog here appears to have a greater emphasis.

Sons and Lovers contains the dog image attributed to Walter Morel, the
collier, to describe his meanness. Morel has ‘denied the God in him’ (SL, 102) (that is,
he has sacrificed his human quality while nurturing the baser aspects--the animal and
the sensual) and his wife calls him less than a dog. The scene is the collier’s returning
home one night, slightly intoxicated, and getting enraged at finding nothing to eat.
The dialogue between him and his wife is as follows:

‘What are you doing, clumsy drunken fool?’ the mother cried.

‘Then tha should get the flamin’ thing thysen. Tna should get up, like
other women have to, an, ‘wait on a man.’
'Wait on you - wait on you?' she cried. ‘Yes, I see myself. ‘
‘Yis, an’ I’ll learn thee tha’s got to. Wait on me, yes, tha sh’lt wait on fie’
‘Never milord. I’d wait on a dog at the door first.’ (SL, 76)

Gertrude Morel, the collier’s wife, is too much the opposite of him. The puritanical and self-righteous Mrs. Morel ‘in seeking to make him [Walter] nobler than he could be ... destroyed him.’ (SL, 51) And all the contempt that Lawrence shows for his father-figure, Walter Morel, in the novel still does not degrade Walter so much as to place him on a par with an Arthur Saywell in *The Virgin and the Gipsy*, or even a Rico in *St Mawr*.

Walter Morel has scenes to show his bright, good naturalness. And these scenes stand out with an authenticity and they even undermine the contemptuous tone of the narrator which allegedly due to the borrowed standards of the author. (Sagar, 14) Moreover, the analogy of Walter to a dog could have been merely a mechanical exercise on the part of the writer since convention associates the dog with contempt and loneliness. The word ‘cur’, though at present not much in use, is a standing evidence for the pejorative and condescending manner in which the dog is often looked at. Hence it can be deduced that Lawrence’s use of the dog image here does not permit the assumption that it springs out of a well-developed personal symbolism.

In addition, the scenes that are pro-Walter in the novel together seem to embody the ‘black tom-cat’ which the author tries unsuccessfully to hoodwink. The impression created by these scenes, that Walter Morel is not so despicable as the author intends us to see him, is far from being negligible. The cat for Lawrence has a ‘predatory selfishness’ and it is, hence, dispassionate. It has a natural existence of
Because of its aggressiveness and selfishness the cat never relents to satisfy anyone other than itself. It’s being is thus unintersected and distinct. A cat is ‘aloof’. The two apparently contrary characteristics of the cat--its aloofness and predetermines--are not, ironically, mutually exclusive.

The cat, on the other hand, exemplifies a blissful state of self-oblivion for Lawrence. It is not even aware of its voluptuousness and its thirst to kill. The cat is incapable of knowing or feeling the throes of its prey. Its world is supreme and secluded. And Lawrence voices this aspect of the cat emphatically in his novel *The Rainbow*. Tom Brangwen, the step-father of Anna, is irritated by Will Brangwen since he started courting Anna. Tom’s love and affection for his daughter are intense enough to make him possessive of her. And unable to bear the reality that Will and Anna are both in love with each other, Tom unconsciously attributes the cause for his anger and irritation to be Will’s callousness. Tom’s discomfort is accounted for by Will’s cat-like nature.

Tom Brangwen was irritated. His nephew irritated him. The lad seemed to him too special, self-contained His nature was fierce enough, but too much abstracted, like a separate thing, like a cat’s nature. A cat could lie perfectly peacefully on the hearthrug whilst its master or mistress writhed in agony a yard away. It had nothing to do with other people’s affairs. What did the lad really care about anything save his own instinctive affairs (*RB*, 152).

The cat has ‘nothing to do with other people’s affairs’ and it is separate. Its exclusiveness preserves or retains the otherness of the other. The cat’s distinctness does not violate the inner life of the other. This may sound paradoxical, as the cat is
known for its aggressiveness. Yet the cat, according to Lawrence, does not reckon the inward life of its prey even as it pounces with an intent aim on its prey. Its kill is outside and totally objectified. An acknowledgement of its prey *viz.* its feelings, implies automatically a sympathetic merging with the other. And such a merging, intuitive or otherwise, alters the individuality of both the hunter and the hunted to an irreparable extent.

The horse, as an image and a symbol, occupies one of the most important positions in Lawrence. In *The Rainbow*, the horse is so central figure that a considerable part of the understanding of the story depends on a certain explication of the symbolism involved in the image of the horse. The Jungian proposition that the horse, by tradition, has been symbolizing things which ‘psychologically belong to the unconscious of man’ (Jung, 29) and that, as such, the horse are a symbol for the unconscious undergoes a slight modification and an extension in the Lawrentian metaphysic. Yet it does not affect the conclusion that Lawrence’s horse is also a symbol for sex.

The Lawrentian horse represents, as a symbol, an unmixed physicality and a state of oblivion achieved through sex. Thus, the link between the horse and the palpably concrete physicality or flesh surfaces unmistakably, when Lawrence writes the following in his *Apocalypse*:

> Far back, far back in our dark soul the horse prances. He is a dominant symbol: he gives us lordship: he links us, the first *palpable* and *throbbing* link with the ruddy-glowing Almighty of *potence*: he is the beginning even of our *godhead in the flesh*. (61)
The balance between the two states of being, the sensual and the spiritual, of man has been jeopardized by the setting in of the Christian era. And the effect is the gradual rendering of the spiritual as superior to the sensual. And Lawrence’s life-long effort was to restore the balance by upholding the sensual and physical above the spiritual.

Lawrence subtly suggests this state of unhealthiness—the shying away from the sensual—through Clifford Chatterley in The Lady Chatterley's Lover. Clifford’s paralysis is symbolic of his unusual nature. Clifford who was terribly wounded in the war has got his lower half of the body paralyzed. Propped up on a wheelchair, he allows it to himself to attend to his coal mines. And he losses himself to the world of machines and gradually becomes a part of the ‘system’. His physical disability only expediting his disintegration, he ends up as the embodiment of that which is mental or cerebral. His physical calamity aggravates his inclination for immortality into madness. Unconsciously and insensitively, Clifford compels his wife into his sterile and inhuman life. He tends to deny her womanhood. By sheer negation he ill-treats Constance, his young wife, who hardly enjoyed a year's marital happiness. Through a dialogue between Clifford and Constance, Lawrence suggests the voluptuousness and physicality for which the horse becomes a symbol.

Constance perceives herself to be the black horse which Clifford, like a charioteer ‘anxious for immortality’, pulls violently and inhumanly at the reins and cruelly breaks her. Lawrence’s adaptation of Plato’s chariot to suit his need can be seen in the following passage:

Clifford bullied her, not by obvious compulsion, but by insidious negation. Some part of her soul he just absolutely ignored. ... As one might kill a person by withdrawing all the air from her. ...
He would have done just the same if he had never been wounded in the war. Only then she would not have seen so clearly. The terrible catastrophe had made her clairvoyant.

The poor black horse of her body! He had been lying now for months as if he were dead, with his neck twisted sideways as if it had been broken by some specially vicious twist of the reins. She had felt him dead, a corpse inside her. (LCL, 39)

As in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, in *Women in Love* Gerald Crich is seen to force his red Arab mare to stay and wait while a locomotive passes by. Unlike the figurative or metaphorical use of the image of the subjugation of the horse in the former instance, here in *Women in Love* the atrocity done to the horse is actual: the rearing horse against a rattling and clanking train on the move is a tableau-like picture suggestive of the tension between the living and the non-living, the machine. Gerald Crich, like Clifford Chatterley, fixes his will on love and or sex.

As it mentioned earlier, in the works of Lawrence where the horse appears, of course, with the exception, it can be perceived that the horse is used in the background or as a casual instrument. Only in *The Rainbow* does the horse loom Omnipotently to indicate the destiny of the central character Ursula Brangwen. Of Anton Skrebensky, Lawrence writes that he is a good horse-rider and so, he has a "down-to-earth" forcefulness. Lawrence observes:

He seemed so balanced and sure, he made such a confident presence.

He was a great rider, so there was about him some of a horseman’s sureness and habitual definiteness of decision, also some of the horseman's animal darkness. (LCL, 493)
And for the great rider in Skrebensky, Ursula becomes the horse-like woman wanting to be mastered. Hence, the writer likens her to a horse:

[Skrebensky] saw Ursula kindle and flare up to the romance of the situation. She raised her head like a young horse snuffing with wild delight. (*LCL*, 350)

However, the aspirations of Ursula place her at the polar opposite of Skrebensky, who is gradually disclosed to be a finished being. Whereas Ursula ‘was a traveller, she was a traveller on the face of the earth’, and “could not help it, that she was a traveller’ (*LCL*, 467). Similarly, Birkin in *Women in Love* retreats to the hillside and ‘saturates’ himself with a communion with the cool primrose, after his climactic encounter with Hermione (*WL*, 165). It is a common predicament of the Lawrentian protagonists to seek a recession from the world of mankind since there is no fulfillment possible for them from that world. The horses that appear towards the end of *The Rainbow* symbolize this helpless longing.

The sense of Ursula’s unusedness and the deep unrest caused by the frustration of her are evoked by Lawrence through the dream-vision of the ‘herd of horses’. Fearing herself to be pregnant with Skrebensky’s child, Ursula writes him a letter pleading with him to accept her. And while she awaits his response, she is frenzied and exhausted by the attack of the massive and powerful horses. The groups of horses that threaten to trample her down are, unmistakably, an externalization of the yearning within herself, to be possessed physically. The horse is, in no uncertain terms ever, a symbol for the physicality of a woman. Crude it might sound, the horse seems to pose a one-to-one parallel with a woman, as far as these particular narratives of Lawrence are concerned. The woman is to be possessed as the horse is to be mastered.
Paradoxically, being thus possessed, the woman is released from the burden of her own self. As the symbolism has suggested, Ursula can be safely fitted in the place of the horses. Staying indoors becomes suffocating for her and she escapes only to wander aimlessly.

The horses Ursula encounters symbolize vitality. But they also reveal the anguish that arises when that vitally is balked, for these horses are not free like the horse in Apocalypse. They are hedged into a meadow awaiting man’s enslaving use, and Ursula is immediately aware of their tension and their drive toward madness. (RB, 179)

Very much like the group of horses that annoy Ursula, in Lady Chatterley’s Lover, Constance Chatterley is also pictured to undergo a similar trauma before she meets the gamekeeper, Parkin. Like Ursula, Constance also is tormented not merely by a sexual hunger, but something greater which is concomitant with sex. And the irony of their situation lies in their struggle to express that other which eludes expression.

In The Lost Girl, Ciccio is associated with horses and performs feats of horsemanship whenever the Natcha-Kee-Tawara group comes to a new town. On horseback, Ciccio is extraordinarily velvety and alive. When Alvina sees him with horses, she is aware of him physically, yet is rather afraid of the sensuality he represents. Ciccio tells Alvina that in England ‘horses live a long time, because they don’t live - never alive - see? In England railway-engines are alive and horses go on wheels.’ (LG, 159) As in ‘Strike Pay’ this again points to the destruction of real life by industrialization. It also applies to Alvina’s state of being; she too is not really alive.
Lawrence’s determination to express the deeper level of reality, the powerful undercurrent that runs through human life, instead of devoting his energies to the recording of the surface, led him to call upon an extensive range from the heritage of cultural symbolism. Symbols in his work may comprise whole scenes as well as particular animate or inanimate objects. In *The Lost Girl*, there recurs the same dominant symbolic images: the moon as a feminine presence: ‘Only the moon, white and shining, was in the sky, like a woman glorying in her own loveliness’ (*LG*, 192); the mountains as a symbol of aloofness, coldness and death: ‘The very mountain-tops above, bright with transcendent snow, seemed like death, eternal death’ (*LG*, 200). The use of symbolism is even more frequent in *The Lost Girl* in the scenes where Alvina is alone with nature.

Lawrence seems to be a myth maker precisely because he has tried to understand man in relation to the Cosmos. He differs from ancient mythology because the ancients constructed their myths from the actions of the gods who set man in the world and created his conditions of living. Lawrence’s myths are a record of man in his sometimes unsuccessful attempts to relate himself to the cosmos and carve out his own conditions of living. His nostalgia for that other mythology explains much of his symbolism. The search of every man for his whole alive self seemed to Lawrence to be the search for this deep sensuality of the body that the Lady Julian understood so well, not the mechanical thing which registered the shallow range of fricative sensation but the literally unknown country of which the veins and arteries are the rivers - a metaphor that he uses in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*.

Lawrence turns to both myth and history, blending in his own ideas on religion, particularly Christianity, and advocates with passionate eloquence the life of
instincts and the flesh, as lived by people of other, more primitive yet far wiser and healthier civilizations, a life now generally forsaken by the modern industrialist culture which has arrogantly overthrown natural life and distorted human sensibility. In *The Lost Girl*, Lawrence criticizes a number of specific modern inventions and institutions, among them the cinema for the way it promotes emotional sterility and thus accentuates the dehumanization of society:

The film is only pictures ... And pictures don’t have any feelings apart from their own feelings: I mean the feelings of the people who watch them. ... And that’s why they like them (*LG*, 116).

Lawrence considers the industrial man as the slave of modern times; living divided from the real human self of feeling and intuition.

Lawrence has many names for the metaphysical unity of the sexes as one can notice: the Holy Ghost, the Crown, the Rose or the Rainbow. He sees the sexual experience as a central one in human life and a necessary condition not just for healthy individual lives, but for healthy societies. And it is mostly based on the attraction between opposites, for difference between the two sexes is essential, since their roles are fundamentally complementary. Lawrence’s description of the local society in which young Alvina lives is succinct, precise, and ironic:

Here we are then: a vast substratum of colliers; a thick sprinkling of trades people intermingled with small employers of labour and diversified by elementary school masters and non-conformist clergy; a high layer of bank-managers, rich millers and well-to-do ironmasters, episcopal clergy and the managers of collieries: then the rich and sticky cherry of the local coal-owner glistening over all. (*LG*, 1)
Lawrence begins the novel with a description of Manchester House, the place that lies at the centre of this sterile world where Alvina was brought up. The name carries clear echoes of Victorian ambition and commercial prosperity, the latter long gone, the former still lingering beyond reason. Its imposing presence serves as a symbol of the failed hopes and the deadening dreariness that casts its shadow upon the whole community. It was a building actually meant to be quite ‘a monument,’ with built furniture of solid mahogany (LG, 3), a grandiose mausoleum for many lost souls.

Miss Frost and Miss Pinnegar are the other important females in the Houghton household. Frost and Pinnegar: ice and vinegar are the defining elements of Manchester House, suggests Lawrence with a sardonic pun. Miss Pinnegar is Mr. Houghton’s trusted employee, manageress of the work girls and later his housekeeper. These two are the feminine characters around Alvina. Lawrence provides clear and thorough portraits of them, carefully delineating their personalities as well as their functions: both are strong women, bastions of social convention, and Alvina feels a special devotion to each one. Miss Pinnegar has ‘pale grey eyes, and a padding step, and a soft voice, and almost purplish cheeks’ (LG, 12).

The descriptions in the second section of the novel exhibit an unrivalled lyricism. The language is fluid and expressive, warm and sensual exuding a strong sense of femininity. It is not the only time that Lawrence employs a discourse with such characteristics. In Twilight in Italy, but also in his last novel Lady Chatterley’s Lover, instances of écriture feminine are also numerous and easily identifiable in his choice of words, images and rhythms of the language as well as the things he dwells upon. These features are constantly repeated in The Lost Girl and their employment is no accident. It represents a release within the text from rigid constraints; the vibrant
colours and sound recall the richness of life not as a human construct but as a natural phenomenon, and the flights from linearity hint unmistakably at the instinctive force that lies beneath the surface of things, far more important and true than a mere procession of meticulously ordered characters and events.

Lawrence’s engagement with feminine ways of expression, or gender issues in general, are conscious attempts to present in his writing a feminist point of view. They may be seen as symptomatic of a period when the development of a general rethinking and reworking of values was intense and widespread. It is quite remarkable though, how Lawrence, a writer who has been extensively considered guilty of misogyny, attempts a detailed exploration of the feminine soul, using as his main tools the traditionally feminine means of intuition and impulsive emotion. *The Lost Girl* provides numerous examples of a so-called feminine discourse – which also serve as examples of a feminine, if not quite feminist, approach to the world and reality. The description of the spring morning in the landscape of Pancrazio is a harmonious mingling of the natural beauty and the feminine susceptibility and sensitivity:

And then she had continual bowl-fuls of white and blue violets, she had sprays of almond blossom, silver-warm and lustrous, then sprays of peach and apricot, pink and fluttering[...] The sun was on them for the moment, and they were opened flat, great five-pointed, seven-pointed liliac stars, with burning centers, burning with a strange lavender flame, as she had seen some metal liliac-framed in the laboratory of the hospital at Islington[...] And she felt like going down
on her knees and bending her forehead to the earth in an oriental submission, they were so royal, so lovely, so supreme. (*LG*, 332)

The long, intense, slow-flowing sentences, replete with references to light, fire, smell, the repetitions of attributes and adjectives, the joyful mood, all communicate a lyricism mingled with admiration and a religious feeling to ‘submit’ to the malevolence of nature. The passage celebrate the beauty and the rejuvenating force of nature, but they also imply a certain pre-existing weariness, an emotional debility which the heroine carries within and makes her burst into tears a moment earlier, before this new unknown, enchanting and ultimately healing reality. This strange mood of Alvina’s constantly enchanted, yet always on the verge of tears, yet, stranger still, not unhappy, comes in sharp contrast with another description of a positive psychological feminine mood of hers, when she gets rid of her first Australian fiancé, a description taken from the first part of the novel the symbolic part:

> So Alvina packed up his ring and his letters and little presents, and posted them over the seas. She was relieved really: as if she had escaped some very trying ordeal. For some days she went about happily, in pure relief. She loved everybody. (*LG*, 26)

The feeling of relief and happiness is given here in a plain masculine language and most of Alvina’s feelings are described in this way in the whole first part of the novel. They serve as a good contradictory example of the feminine language that Lawrence uses when accessing the fragile feminine soul of Alvina moved by the astonishing beauty of her new environment in the second part.

*The Lost Girl* is the predominance of the instincts in the appreciation of nature turns the scenes into dreamlike, yet clear and unforgettable experiences. Through this
narrative, loaded with emotion and lyricism, Lawrence achieves a genuine expression of his heroine’s psyche. He shares and articulates her excitement, amazement and conflicts, as she negotiates the new life promised by the new world she has moved in. What Alvina experiences here is a sacred fusion with nature which will lead to the revelation of her sacred entity. As Michael Squires argues,

 human subject and natural object fuse … not to hear a message but to achieve a new identity, impregnated with a new selfhood, cleansed of corruption (Squires & Cushman, 46).

The discovery and integration of this new self is usually achieved through the sensual and emotional sensitivity of the Lawrencian heroine. The world of nature becomes a sacred place filled with religious and mythological connotations, the place where the soul is reborn. Moreover, this fluid, confident and celebratory lyrical language of the unconscious enhances the process of Alvina’s mythicization. Taken together with the extended symbolism and the numerous allusions to the mythological past, they show the woman detaching herself from the brutal reality in order eventually to become what Lawrence believes a woman ought to be: ‘the flow which seeks to intermingle with the opposite male flow and finally create life and be consummated’ (Phoenix II 542).

The descriptions of the Italian landscape constitute Lawrence’s most admirable equation of symbol and natural mystery within the novel. Alvina’s inner conflicts and tensions are symbolically expressed through the strange beauty of her natural surroundings which leave her: ‘startled, half-enraptured with the terrific beauty of the place, half-horrified by its savage annihilation of her.’ (LG, 314) This is an exotic, new, extremely attractive reality for Alvina, who sees it constantly
transformed through her enhanced perception. Yet, the first impression given by the narrator of Ciccio and Alvina’s new home, is one of coldness, harshness and remoteness, the difficult narrow passage to the other. The mountains look ‘congealed’; the rush of the river is ‘glacial sounding’ \((LG, 308)\), the air is ‘crystal,’ the starlight ‘frosty’ \((LG, 309)\). Similarly, the house where Alvina and Ciccio will live offers no promise at all even of a modestly comfortable life. It is a ‘stone floored’ house with a ‘dim-walled room,’ ‘fireless,’ with ‘iron-barred windows,’” definitely ‘not meant to be lived in’ \((LG, 310)\).