M. L.

T H E S I S

D. H. LAWRENCE: SEX FOR THE ANTI-PURITANICAL PURITAN

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA

Departamento de Língua e Literatura Estrangeiras

D. H. LAWRENCE: SEX FOR THE ANTI-PURITANICAL PURITAN

Tese submetida à Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina
para a obtenção do grau de
MESTRE EM LETRAS

Bonifácio Moreira Pinto

Novembro - 1975

Esta Tese foi julgada adequada para a obtenção do título de

MESTRE EM LETRAS

Especialidade Língua Inglesa e Literatura Correspondente e aprovada em sua forma final pelo Programa de Pós-Graduação.

Prof. John Bruce Derrick, PhD
Orientador

Prof. Paulino Vandresen, PhD
Integrador do Curso

Apresentada perante a Comissão Examinadora composta dos professores:

Prof. John Bruce Derrick, PhD-Pres.

Prof. Arnold Selig Gordenstein, PhD

Prof. Thomas Eddie Cowin, MA

AGRADECIMENTOS

À Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina

pela oportunidade que me propiciou de aperfeiçoar os meus conhecimentos.

Ao Professor Dr. John B. Derrick

pelo zelo e interesse com que me orientou neste trabalho.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS *

ABL - D.H.Lawrence, Anthony Beal

AIS - A Interpretação de Sonhos, S.Freud

APL - "A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover", D.H.Lawrence

BOD - D.H.Lawrence: Body of Darkness, R.E.Pritchard

CLP - Cinco Lições de Psicanálise, S.Freud

CPA - "Contribuições à Psicologia do Amor", S.Freud

DDM - Double Measure-A Study of the Novels and Stories of D.H. Lawrence, George H. Ford

DHL - David Herbert Richards Lawrence - D.H.Lawrence

ELS - English Literature-A Survey Course for Students, John Burgess Wilson

ETJ - D.H.Lawrence-A Personal Record by E.T., Jessie Chambers

ETS - Três Ensaios sobre a Teoria da Sexualidade, S.Freud

FRL - D.H.Lawrence-Novelist, F.R.Leavis

FTU - Fantasia of the Unconscious, D.H.Lawrence

GIP - A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis, S.Freud

ILC - "Introduction to Lady Chatterley's Lover", Mark Schorer

LCL - Lady Chatterley's Lover, D.H.Lawrence

LDV - "Leonardo da Vinci e uma Lembrança de sua Infância" e outros trabalhos, S.Freud

MAB - Estrela da Vida Inteira-Poesias Reunidas, Manuel Bandeira

OSM - Os Sete Minutos, Irving Wallace

PAO - "Pornography and Obscenity", D.H.Lawrence

PAU - Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious, D.H.Lawrence

PGB - Portrait of a Genius, But..., Richard Aldington

SAL - Sons and Lovers, D.H.Lawrence

SLC - Sex, Literature, and Censorship, D.H.Lawrence, edited by H.T.Moore

SPS - D.H.Lawrence-A Selection, P.J.Shepherd and R.H.Poole

SUN - "Sun"(a story), D.H.Lawrence

TDS - The Dark Sun-A Study of D.H.Lawrence, Graham Hough

TFF - The Forked Flame-A Study of D.H.Lawrence, H.M.Daleski

TIH - The Intelligent Heart-The Story of D.H.Lawrence, H.T.Moore

TLC - "The Three Ladies Chatterley", Bernard Jones

TRB - The Rainbow, D.H.Lawrence

TTL - The Trial of Lady Chatterley, edited by C.H.Rolph

TWP - The White Peacock, D.H.Lawrence

WIL - Women in Love, D.H.Lawrence

WIS - What is the Short Story?,(a selection of essays), Eugene Current-García and Walton R. Patrick

---

* For further information look at the bibliography at the back of this work.

A B S T R A C T

D. H. Lawrence's central theme in most of his works is sex. From his first novel, The White Peacock, to the last, Lady Chatterley's Lover, which became a "scandal" in English Literature, Lawrence created a new doctrine of sex, advocating the supremacy of the body's life over the mind, actually based on the assertion that complete fulfilment in sexual relations is the key to solve the problems of human relationships. Paradoxically though, the man who became a "priest" of sex had a puritanical background, was educated by a puritan mother, and grew up at the end of the Victorian age, an epoch marked by strong moral restrictions. But the early Lawrence, the puritan of The White Peacock, who favoured a euphemistic style became, in his last period, (the "realistic" period of Lady Chatterley's Lover), an anti-puritan. His very insistence on the subject of sex and on the necessity for purifying the sexual acts leads me to the conclusion that he was not only an anti-puritanical puritan, but also that he, in his own terms, was a case of "sex in the head".

R E S U M O

D. H. Lawrence fez do sexo um tema central na maior parte de suas obras. Desde seu primeiro romance, O Pavão Branco, até o último, O Amante de Lady Chatterley, que se tornou um verdadeiro "escândalo" na Literatura Inglesa, Lawrence criou uma nova doutrina de sexo, defendendo a supremacia da vida do corpo sobre a mente, baseado, na realidade, na afirmação de que a completa realização nas relações sexuais é a chave para resolver os problemas do relacionamento humano. Embora paradoxalmente, o homem que se tornou um "sacerdote" do sexo teve uma formação puritana, foi educado por uma mãe puritana e cresceu ao final da era Vitoriana, uma época marcada por severas restrições morais. Mas o jovem Lawrence, o puritano de O Pavão Branco, que era a favor de um estilo eufemístico, acabou se transformando, em sua última fase, (o período "realístico" de O Amante de Lady Chatterley), em um anti-puritano. Sua completa insistência em assuntos de sexo e na necessidade de purificar os atos sexuais, leva-me à conclusão que ele não só era um puritano realmente anti-puritano, mas também que ele tinha sexo na cabeça.

"His main concern:
the new man, the new woman,
... capable of rising like a
Phoenix
from the ashes of the dead self."

(P.J.Shepherd)

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

A. A Victorian moralist or a case of sex in the head

Forty-five years after his death, D.H.Lawrence continues to exert a remarkable influence. He seems to speak to the modern reader with the same forcefulness and freshness that impressed, and sometimes shocked, his contemporaries.

The first fact to begin with is that it is impossible to separate Lawrence the man from Lawrence the writer. This is, at least in Lawrence's case, the starting point of his lifelong dualities or "double measures". In Lawrence's writings there is a constant rhythm of powerful forces pulling against each other: a contradiction between the man and the writer; an attraction or a repulsion between man and woman; a struggle between life and death forces, but most of all, a forked vision of human relationships towards both the darkness and the lightness.

One way to understand the quality of Lawrence's striking achievements is simply to accept the assertion of F.R.Leavis (now recognized as authoritative), who says that Lawrence is "a creative writer of genius".(FRL 17)* He devoted himself entirely to liter-

* Quotations in this work are indicated by a three-letter abbreviation followed by page numbers. Check work and author in the list of abbreviations at the beginning.

ature and his writings do not have any genre boundary. He wrote novels, tales, short stories, travel books, literary criticism, critical essays, poems, and even made some excursions into the area of painting. But he mastered above all the novel and in the novel he was considered an innovative genius. He was aware of this:

> "And being a novelist, I consider myself superior to the saint, the scientist, the philosopher, and the poet, who are all great masters of different bits of man alive, but never get the whole hog."(SPS 124)

He was not only a novelist but also a saint, sinner, scientist, wizard, philosopher, prophet, and poet, who looked for the light in the darkness and for the dark in the light.

In a sense, Lawrence's works are full of contradictions except for one thing: his main concern was always with human relations, with their importance and frequent falsity. On this basis he also found "the serpent of sex coiled round the root of all our actions."(PAU 201)

In pursuit of that central root of human consciousness he proposed to elevate the sexual theme, to show that it had the dignity of any other human or "spiritual" relationships. From the time he was young until he was a mature man, in his last phase as a writer, he tried to emphasize sex as a means to improve the relationships between man and woman. Because of this he was prosecuted several times and his books were banned. He was censored all his life, even by men of such literary influence as T.S.Eliot who talked of Lawrence's "sexual morbidity"(FRL 22) in After Strange Gods.

Lady Chatterley's Lover, his last novel dealing with this

misunderstood sexual theme, is going to be the core of my investigation, and unlike the critics in general, I have found it useful to compare and contrast the last novel with Lawrence's first, The White Peacock. I believe that this objective complements the existing critical approaches to Lawrence's dualities: light and dark, mind and senses, brain and body, male and female, and thus, the first and the last.

A group of good critical essays belonging to his last period which embody some of his best prose philosophizing will also be examined. A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover, written in defence of his last novel, and Pornography and Obscenity are two excellent essays of his last year, 1929, in which he presents not only his selfdefence, but as a dying man, his last arguments on the subject which became the touchstone of his writings: sex.

Yet, according to many critics, Lawrence never quite came to terms with sex. His friend, biographer, and critic, Richard Aldington, says:

> "For Lawrence sex was a flowering of the mysterious life force, an unknown God who must be brought into the consciousness."(PGB 105)

Carrying the point a bit further, Lawrence's first girl-friend, Jessie Chambers, wrote about him in her personal record:

> "I could not help feeling that the whole question of sex had for him the fascination of horror..."(ETJ 153)

There was (and still is) one sort of person who could think of sex as something "mysterious" or of having "horror": a moralist, or better, a puritan.

By exploring Lawrence's thoughts on the subject of sex I intend to examine to what extent he is a puritan and if so, what

kind of puritan. He is certainly not the common sort of puritan, even though he was originally educated in his mother's ingrained puritanism, through the Congregationalist Church. He is a "Double Measure"(1)* puritan, or better say an anti-puritanical puritan. Lawrence lived at a time of transition: his first books were written while Queen Victoria was still alive and the spirit of prudery was still strong in English Letters. But the early, prudish, Lawrence became a prophet of a religion of sex who advocated the salvation through the body, and who was even called a sexual fascist. A puritan would not admit sex or the body in so high a place, but this special puritan, Lawrence, believes that sex has to be purified, and tracing his doctrine of sex we can see that this "priest of sex" becomes, even unconsciously, a puritan who is against the old Victorian puritans.

Preaching his doctrine of sex Lawrence has gone probably too far, even for an anti-puritan, maybe "unwatched" as he says how "the novel comes out of one's hands". As I am going to show, he goes into a dangerous area which for now I will be content to call "dark sex", diverted from normal sexuality. And this is typically a product of a puritan mind. I think we have to consider again his contradictions, his dualities. I have to agree with Jessie Chambers when she says that Lawrence overemphasized the importance of sex (he was 21 then), but spoke of those who suffered from "sex in the head"(ETJ XXXIII), which is a good statement, recorded by Jessie in 1935, five years after Lawrence's death and many years before R.Aldington's(1950)

---

* Look for notes in the appendix at the end of this work.

identical reasoning:

> "There can seldom have been a more obvious case of "sex in the head" than Lawrence himself, although he was always denouncing it in others; but then he had a habit of denouncing in others what he did himself."(PGB 114)

On the same page we find Aldington's account of Frieda - (Lawrence's wife) being accused of the Lawrentian crime of "sex in the head". I would not call it a crime, but I have to admit that tracing Lawrence as an anti-puritan puritan I have found him guilty of "sex in the head".

Although the Lawrence of Lady Chatterley's Lover is stylistically different from the Lawrence of The White Peacock, there are many fundamental similarities which derive from Lawrence's moral background. In the transitional period between these first and last works, (Sons and Lovers, The Rainbow, Women in Love, and the essays Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious), I will try to give a sense of the changes in Lawrence's attitude towards sex.

B. Prior Scholarship

In his introductory essay to D.H.Lawrence - A Selection, P.J.Shepherd, a senior lecturer at Eastbourne College, says:

> "One thing is certain about Lawrence: it is impossible to remain indifferent to him."(SPS 1)

I would also say that it is impossible to remain indifferent to Lawrence's dominant theme: sex.

There is a great quantity of scholarly and critical material concerning Lawrence's work. Some of his biographers and critics were his contemporaries and friends like Richard Aldington and Harry T. Moore. Some of them were called as witnesses for the defence in the Trial of Lady Chatterley in London in 1960: Graham Hough, Vivian de Sola Pinto, Richard Hoggart, Rebecca West, Kenneth Muir, Stephen Potter, and even a person of such a literary stature as E.M.Forster, to mention only a few.

According to R.Aldington more than 600 books, essays, and articles on Lawrence were written up to 1950.(PGB 353) And according to Graham Hough, giving evidence in the trial, in 1960 there were over 800 books about Lawrence's work.(TTL 42) The 60's were the most active period of all - especially in America - the number of articles was staggering.

Of course, in most biographies and criticisms I have found many points of contact with my subject and I will take advantage of those which are in the same line of thought. As a rule, although the critics may widely diverge in their approach to Lawrence's work, they generally agree in discussing his bipolar

attitudes.

In this respect, it is especially worth noting H.M.Daleski's The Forked Flame, George H. Ford's Double Measure, and R.E. Pritchard's Body of Darkness.

Daleski, a very serious and clear critic, is completely aware of Lawrence's dualities. He relates everything to a double rhythm of life in Lawrence. The author's first period, the period of The White Peacock and Sons and Lovers, is "The Duality"; the second is the period of "Two in One", and the third, "One Up, One Down". He even presents us a complete table of Lawrence's opposing tendencies.(TFF 30) But what interests me most of all in Daleski is the nature of our agreement about Lawrence's puritanism. He admits Lawrence's problems with the "dark sex" which I shall discuss later, but he avoids asserting strong arguments against him, as in Pritchard's case. Indirectly, though, Daleski accuses Lawrence of remaining a puritan and of having too much "sex in the head".

George H. Ford's critical study as its title declares, is one of a Double Measure. Ford unfolds the oppositions in Lawrence's characters and his divided vision of life and death forces. The analysis is in exact agreement with my own when we say that Lawrence is a controversial puritan and his most controversial passages are about sex. So far, Ford is one of the few who have found some contrasting rhythms in the early Lawrence of The White Peacock. However, it seems to me that he is not particularly critical of Lawrence's puritanism.

R.E.Pritchard deals openly with "dark sex"(anality) and makes in fact a Freudian approach to Lawrence's works. Some -

times he seems to be too critical of Lawrence's treatment of sex, and I must say that I find myself very often in the same position. But, after all, Pritchard is a good critic because he is frank, open, and truthful, even if shocking. His psychological interpretations of Lawrence's sexuality can certainly be related to Freud's theories. For him Lawrence is puritanical both in form and style, from The White Peacock to Lady Chatterley's Lover.

P.J.Shepherd's D.H.Lawrence-A Selection (co-edited with R. H.Poole) is a series of essays covering Lawrence's major themes. His "Lawrence and Sex" is a good essay to expand my own ideas of Lawrence's "puritanical streak" but it does not have any indication that the novelist should be considered a case of "sex in the head". On the contrary, Shepherd says that "...it is even less true of Lawrence than it is of Freud that he thought 'everything comes from sex'..."(SPS 38) But I can see that both Shepherd and Poole avoid dealing with "dark sex" and Lawrence's puritanism.

F.R.Leavis portrays Lawrence as "a creative writer of genius"(FRL 17) and the purpose of his book is to provide a study of Lawrence as a great novelist. He carefully analyses scenes and passages more as an admirer than a critic. He refutes those who find an overdose of sex in Lawrence and says that Lawrence is not more preoccupied with sex than T.S.Eliot, his greatest detractor. I wonder why Leavis does not study Lady Chatterley's Lover in his book. Maybe one of the reasons is that he would find it difficult to agree with the critics who believe that Lawrence is a case of "sex in the head".

Graham Hough gives us a full-length critical study of Law-

rence's works in his book The Dark Sun. For him, sex is only a part of the central field of Lawrence's philosophy: the study of man. I think he is quite hermetic and it is impossible to say that he wants to present Lawrence either as a puritan moralist or as a sex-centered individual. I guess that he does not enter the real "heart of darkness" (to use Conrad's title) of Lawrence's doctrine. He deals with "dark sex" but does not make it very clear, like Lawrence himself. He is basically a formalistic literary critic who does not want to go too deeply into the writer's personality. And here resides our disagreement, although he has given me fresh commentaries about the distinction between The White Peacock and Lady Chatterley's Lover.

H.T.Moore's The Intelligent Heart is so far the most valuable biography one can have at hand, because it is also full of criticism and excerpts from several letters. Moore admires and defends Lawrence. Lawrence is certainly a puritan, but according to Moore, it is not necessary to emphasize this and this critic does not call our attention to Lawrence's probably "perverse" sexuality, or "dark sex" in its last stage. Moore depicts Lawrence the man very well but does not look for the psychological insights in the man's writings.

About Richard Aldington I have already had the opportunity to say that he sees Lawrence as an anti-puritan puritan and an obvious case of "sex in the head". His is really a Portrait of a Genius, But...[2] Aldington had the advantage of knowing Lawrence personally. Yet as biography and criticism, this book is not so convincing. One gets the sense that Aldington is a little against Lawrence, maybe because he is against Lawrence's puritan-

ism. But he remains as one of the first, after Jessie Chambers, to define Lawrence's case of "sex in the head","which he built up into a philosophy of salvation."(PGB 310)

Jessie Chambers is certainly neither a biographer nor a critic, but as Lawrence's first girl-friend, the heroine of his first two novels, and the woman who launched him on his literary career, her D.H.Lawrence: A Personal Record has to be read by those who like me want to shed more light on Lawrence's early period - particularly his Oedipus complex, and its influence on the plot of Sons and Lovers. As I have already said, J.Chambers observed as early as 1935 that Lawrence was a case of "sex in the head".(ETJ XXXIII)

Since I am going to deal largely with Lady Chatterley's Lover, I find it valuable to look at C.H.Rolph's account of the historic trial with the transcript of evidence and the speeches of many influential people and literary minds. Lawrence's controversial morality was tested again and Richard Hoggart even called him a "British nonconformist Puritan"(TTL 95).

As an outstanding authority on sex and psychoanalysis, Sigmund Freud must be considered in this work, not because of his direct (or indirect) influence on Lawrence, but because both Freud and Lawrence aroused their contemporaries' attention toward sex. Although Lawrence disagreed with psychoanalysis at many points, both had the same intent: to put sex on its right place in human relationships. Because of this both were called sexual fanatics. Both were cases of "sex in the head", but they were both puritans. Freud's self-analysis, moreover, provides a useful frame for the discussion of his literary comrade-in-arms.

Chapter II

PURITANISM DEFINED

Historically the term "Puritan" was first used during the late 1560's as a label for those Englishmen who urged that the English Church go further in the rejection of papal practices and beliefs. "Puritanism" really began with the formal separation of the English Church from Rome, under Henry VIII, in 1534, with the Act of Supremacy.

Some thirty years later, the most ardent reformers who were still attempting to complete, as they saw it, the work of "purifying" the English Church came to be designated, and to designate themselves, as "Puritans". Elizabeth I (1558-1603) was somewhat against that big conflict about religious matters and under James I, who came to the throne in 1603, things got worse. For the Puritans and the repression drove many of them to exile, and it is well known how a Puritan colony settled in New England in 1620, because of that repression.

Theologically Puritanism is based on the Calvinist doctrine which advocates the ultimate and complete authority of the Scriptures, the necessity of uniformity, the evil of toleration, and the responsibility and authority of the magistrates in matters of religion. Puritanism is further associated with the dogma of original sin, and a strict determinism which places salvation in

God's act of 'electing' those chosen few whom he means to save, rather than the efforts of the individual toward salvation. The puritan god is a God of fear, an angry God who threatens continual damnation rather than the merciful God of the New Testament. Puritan reformers understood that it was necessary to "purify" religion and the State, unifying them and unifying the religious sects (a goal they never achieved).

But the term "puritan" came finally to be generally applied to overprecise moralists or to reformers intent on such matters as the abolition of alcohol and tobacco, and as an extension, on matters of sex and general behaviour.

> "They wanted a Christianity so pure that it would admit of no toleration, no joy, no colour, no charity even; an austere religion which frowned on easy pleasure and punished vice in the sternest possible way... Calvin taught that free will did not exist and that men were predestined from the beginning of time to go to either heaven or hell... Old Testament became the book of Law, pleasure was regarded as sinful, moral crimes were savagely punished."(ELS131)

Three hundred years later, under Queen Victoria(1837-1901), especially during the Industrial Revolution, the theological inference of Puritanism lessened in England, for reason was much in conflict with religion. Yet there was a re-hardening of its psychological and moral influence, Victoria herself being a reformer and a moralist.

D.H.Lawrence's mother, Lydia Beardsall, was Congregationalist, one of the sternest branches of Protestantism under Victoria and her children were brought up in her faith, which had puritanic roots. Born in 1885, Lawrence was educated in this rigorous belief, under the guidance of his tempermentally puritanic mother.

The actual meaning we find in dictionaries today for "puritan" is "a person of or affecting extreme strictness in religion or morals." The Victorian moralists associated puritanism with middle class to what the Lawrences belonged. Lydia Beardsall's education laid a great emphasis on Law (the Bible) and later on, young Lawrence would use what he learned from the Scriptures in his writings. G.H.Ford says that Lawrence was affected by the Bible in the composition of The Rainbow and dedicates a whole chapter to this. (DDM 115-137) Lawrence's prophetic side and preacher's habits are also indications of his biblical background.

So that in a broad sense the background of Lawrence's family was really puritanical. Indeed his mother's father was a minister, but his father seems to have had no religious education. However, some critics even call his mother a "back-street Victorian age Puritan". Harry T. Moore does not go so far but quotes from Lawrence himself:

> "From early childhood I have been familiar with Apocalyptic language and Apocalyptic image: not because I spent my time reading Revelation, but because I was sent to Sunday school and to Chapel, to Band of Hope and to Christian Endeavour, and was always having the Bible read at me or to me."(TIH38)

In his introduction to Sex, Literature, and Censorship Moore adds:

> "Lawrence, growing up in the Nottinghamshire coal-field in the decline of the Victorian age, was conditioned by that era and by the Congregationalism of the miners' bethel of his childhood."(SLC 8)

R. Aldington states that religion was a more important factor in Lawrence's puritanic background than education and adds:

> "The family were Congregationalists, a fact in which Law-

> rence took perhaps excessive pride, rather as if he believed himself called eventually to sit at the right hand of Oliver Cromwell. ... Lawrence as a child - and, never forget, a very intelligent and oversensitive child - surrendered to this powerful, raucous religious emotionalism. However much he may have rebelled against it intellectually as a youth and man, the influence never wholly left him."(PGB21)

So here lies Lawrence's puritanical background: his mother who became his protector was an "ingrained puritan" of the old tradition, to use Lawrence's own words. In Sons and Lovers he states: "She (Mrs. Morel) was a puritan, like her father, high-minded, and really stern."(SAL 18) Certainly he inherited some puritanic factors from his mother: the preaching and protesting side of his nature, the neurotic nonconformist Protestantism, and self-righteousness which influenced his life and his works.

His early readings were often chosen from among "prophetic" authors like Carlyle, Whitman, Spencer, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Blake, and Ruskin. According to R. Aldington "you might add that both (Ruskin and Lawrence) were fanatics about sex; Ruskin for purity through abstinence, Lawrence for purity through what he called 'fulfilment'."(PGB 42) Each in his own way tried to "purify" sex.

Shepherd says that "theoretically unshockable, Lawrence in practice had, one might almost say, a puritanical streak."(SPS38) And Aldington points to a primary contradiction in Lawrence's puritanism, which will figure large in the general argument of this work:

> "He achieved a most strange mixture of his mother's back-street Victorian morality and intellectualized emancipation. The sexual habits and behaviour of everyone else were wrong,

> and he alone right. Having run away with a married woman he gravely dogmatized on the irrevocable sanctity of marriage."(PGB 309)

This is not difficult to understand if we remember Lawrence's contradictory nature, his double measures and double rhythms. But, indeed, there is a "puritanical streak" not only in his early period as we can see in The White Peacock and Sons and Lovers, but in the late period of Lady Chatterley's Lover and his last critical essays, Pornography and Obscenity and A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover.

In her personal record, Jessie Chambers tells us about an interesting event which happened when Lawrence was 21. Lawrence heard of the deflowering of a girl by one of his friends; the scene shocked him and made him display his puritanic feelings:

> "As soon as we were alone he asked me if I had heard about his friend.... - He was very distressed. His mother had said how terrible might be the consequences of only five minutes' self-forgetfulness. - Then he startled me by bursting out vehemently:
> 'Thank God ... I've been saved from that ... so far.'
> He seemed relieved after he had told me about it."(ETJ 125)

Because of the old puritanic tradition of the Victorian age, virginity was considered a positive force which must be preserved even in men. How long did Lawrence remain virgin? One cannot draw a line precisely. Nevertheless, drawing conclusions from what the critics, biographers, and Jessie Chambers (his first girl-friend) say, I should calculate that Lawrence remained virgin till the age of 22. To be more specific, I cannot find evidence that he had sexual intercourse before that age. And although even H.T.Moore does not make it very clear, he implies

that Lawrence was initiated into love-making by a married woman. He says that William Hopkin heard his wife talking to a married woman of Eastwood who said:

> "Sallie, I gave Bert sex. I had to. He was over at our house, struggling with a poem he couldn't finish, so I took him upstairs and gave him sex. He came downstairs and finished the poem."(TIH 131)

R. Aldington observes, furthermore:

> "Whatever else may be denied Lawrence there can be no doubt that he had a great attraction for many women, all the more so since his innate puritanism kept them at a distance." (PGB 106)

Thus, biographically we can find enough material relevant to Lawrence's character-formation and identification with his puritan mother. From The White Peacock to Lady Chatterley's Lover both by content and form Lawrence displays, even if unconsciously, the puritanical factors which were transferred to him by his mother and they are embodied especially in his autobiographical novel Sons and Lovers, written in 1910 and published in 1912.

The conflict in this Freudian novel (even though Lawrence did not intend it to be Freudian, since he did not know Freud's theories yet) is Paul Morel's (Lawrence's) relationship with his mother. Mrs. Morel centres all her expectations on her son, but as he grows older, tensions develop in this relationship and his frustrated passions for two other women, especially Miriam (his first girl-friend Jessie) trap him in a nearly fatal conflict of sexual love and maternal possessiveness.

This theme has raised the question of the Oedipus complex in Lawrence himself. Many critics have studied this novel from a Freudian point of view. Graham Hough says that "the situation

presents the Freudian imbroglio in almost classic completeness". (TDS 39). R. Aldington not only believes that Sons and Lovers takes the Oedipus complex as its theme, but that Lawrence himself was a victim of this psychological problem. John Middleton Murry presents a theory to the effect that Lawrence was "a pitiable victim of the Oedipus complex", and H.T.Moore refutes Murry in this manner:

> "The clinical view of Lawrence as a lifelong victim of the Oedipus complex, with all conventional outcroppings of that affliction, including homosexuality, is easily dismissed."(TIH 84) (3)

I do not think it is so easy to dismiss this subject. Certainly the main fact is that Sons and Lovers, closely autobiographical is, as R.E.Pritchard says,

> "an attempt (Lawrence's attempt) to present and master the agonies and sexual disorientation consequent upon his 'Oedipal' feelings for his mother, (the novel) betrays the involvement in - or lack of detachment from - the experience presented by its author."(BOD 32)

I agree with G. Hough when he says that the book is really a special case, a peculiar relation to reality and it "is a catharsis, achieved by re-living an actual experience."(TDS 36) But what kind of catharsis did Lawrence need? As we can see through Sons and Lovers, having come so close to incest, Paul (Lawrence) feels that Miriam (Jessie), as his mother's representative, must be purged of sexuality. Paul wants to purge, to purify Miriam. This is Lawrence the puritan, seeking purity and avoiding dirtiness, from the very beginning. For the Puritans, for his mother and for himself sex was still dirty and they almost displayed a horror of sexual life. The most one can say is

that Lawrence, the artist, tried to be free from this influence, from this wrong idea of "purity" through the composition of Sons and Lovers. There is an interesting passage about "purity" in that novel, when Paul is talking to Miriam:

> " 'And I don't know', he repeated. 'Don't you think we have been too fierce in our what they call purity? Don't you think that to be so much afraid and averse is a sort of dirtiness?' "(SAL 343)

As Aldington says, "complete purity meant complete ignorance"(PGB 80), and Lawrence certainly began to understand that at the same time he wrote Sons and Lovers and was seemingly released from his mother's "ingrained puritanism". H.M.Daleski also remarks that "viewed in the light of Lawrence's future development, however, the ultimate significance of Sons and Lovers is that it was a catharsis."(TFF 73)

So Lawrence's incestuous love for his mother, which certainly provoked in him many "repressions", made him psychologically aware of his mother's puritanism, that kind of puritanism he would blame later on as "perverse" and dirty in A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover:

> "Keep your perversions if you like them - your perversion of Puritanism, your perversion of smart licentiousness, your perversion of a dirty mind."(SLC 87)
>
> ...
>
> "Like a real prude and Puritan, I have to look the other way."(SLC 65)

Contradictory as these passages may seem, they are not. The "real" puritan that Lawrence became killed the old dirty puritan Lawrence, after the release from his mother, who died in 1910, the year he wrote the first draft of Sons and Lovers. And

it is perhaps worth noticing that Paul himself kills his mother (Mrs. Morel) by giving her an overdose of morphia, to end her misery, in the chapter titled by Lawrence "The Release".

Chapter III

THE EARLY LAWRENCE

(The White Peacock)

Freud says that the period of adolescent voyeurism can be indefinitely prolonged due to an inhibition of the libido-function and this is one of the stages which precede the final phase of maturity, when "the impulses of skoptophilia (gazing) and curiosity are powerfully active."(GIP 336)

It is possible that Lawrence did not know that "voyeurism" a sexual trait often displayed in his first novel, The White Peacock, belongs to the primitive stage of the libido-development, but it is clear that he knew that only a "primitive"(natural, direct, physical) man would look only at a woman's external features. Lettie talks to George(they are central characters in the novel):

> "Some look at my hair, some watch the rise and fall of my breathing, some look at my neck, and a few - not you among them - look me in the eyes for my thoughts. To you, I'm a fine specimen, strong! Pretty strong! You primitive man!"(TWP 40)

Gazing as a sexual trait is one of the "abnormal" impulses which Freud calls "polymorphously perverse", defined in this manner:

"to look for gratification not in the sexual organs only

> but in many other parts of the body which yields analogous pleasurable sensations, playing thereby the part of genital organs."(GIP 219)

Mere traces of these impulses are found in children, but they can manifest themselves in later life and even suppress normal sexuality.

This raises the question of a Freudian "analysis" in The White Peacock. My work does not follow a full Freudian "approach" of Lawrence, which so far has already been indicated by many critics like Mark Spilka, Daniel Weiss, R.E.Pritchard, D. Cavitch, and F.J.Hoffmann. But I think that Freudian "assertions" can always be suggested for the interpretation of Lawrence's works, who was, from the very beginning, unconsciously Freudian.

The White Peacock contains more of Lawrence's early life than the directly autobiographical novel Sons and Lovers or any other work. He wrote the first draft of his first novel in 1906 (published in 1911) under Jessie Chambers' influence and encouragement. He was a youth of 21 and she was 20. This novel is partly autobiographical too and Jessie herself said: "Cyril and Lettie (characters in the novel) are each aspects of Lawrence, with Emily (herself) as a foil to both."(ETJ 118)

Although F.R.Leavis says that it "is painfully callow", (FRL 19) The White Peacock is full of descriptive details. It reveals the country landscape seen by a country man who loved it passionately. It describes the rural environment of his youth where Lawrence constantly rediscovered the green hills and woods around his birthplace, Eastwood (Nethermere in the novel), and where he thought he could still erase the vision of the signs of industrialism in the pits.

No other novel by Lawrence is so full of natural vitality as The White Peacock. Cyril (Lawrence) the narrator, observes nature lyrically and acutely and is always delighted with it. He is never tired of describing mountains, valleys, trees, flowers, animals, birds, and butterflies.

The novel begins, "I stood watching..."(TWP 13) and throughout the book we find a euphemistic style, full of freshness and lyricism. Lawrence prefers verbs of perception and inhibited action, an overabundance of adjectives, and the passive voice. I examine some sentences at random:

> "The day had been hot*and close. The sun was reddening in the west...(TWP 34)
>
> ...
>
> The trees were silent, drawing together to sleep. (35)
>
> ...
>
> He sat a few moments looking at me. (36)
>
> ...
>
> She was a short, plump girl, pale, with daring, rebellious eyes. (37)
>
> ...
>
> ... and if you looked at the ground you'd find there was a sense of warm gold fire in it, and once you'd perceived the colour, it would strengthen till you'd see nothing else. You are blind;...(42)
>
> ...
>
> Where the sky was pale in the east over the rim of wood came the forehead of the yellow moon. We stood and watched in silence. Then, as the great disc, nearly full, lifted and looked straight upon us, we were washed off our feet in a vague sea of moonlight."(TWP 70)

Studying the underlined adjectives and verbs of perception

---

* I am underlining some adjectives and verbs of perception.

or inhibited action we are tempted to relate Lawrence's sensuous pleasure in nature to his puritanism, as deflection of his sexual unfulfilment. In fact, Anthony Beal, an English critic, says that "in his first novel, The White Peacock, he (Lawrence) is nearer his mother's world; in the last, Lady Chatterley's Lover, very far from it."(ABL 4)

Lawrence's sensibility is implied in the various ways he describes the physical immediacy, from the first to the last novel: auditory, tactile, muscular, and synaesthetic as well as visual imagery. He started this kind of writing in The White Peacock, using "art nouveau" elements of scenery, i.e., using landscapes, plants, flowers, animals, and birds to convey a tentative treatment of sex in nature. The whole body functions as a "receptor" for the sensations of nature. Thus, sex itself is seen in a kind of haze, unclear and obscure, euphemistically. The plot and the narrative angle also reinforce the hypothesis that Lawrence was immature or at least that both in form and content, his sensual love of natural detail is qualified by his puritanism. Before I develop this point of view and relate it to the novel, a brief plot-outline is necessary.

The Beardsalls (the Lawrences) and the Saxtons (the Chambers) live on opposite sides of the valley of Nethermere (Eastwood). Their very differences create a subtle attraction and the story unfolds around two couples: Lettie Beardsall and George Saxton on the one hand, and Cyril Beardsall and Emily Saxton on the other.

Among the secondary characters there is the "dark figure" of a gamekeeper, Annable, who plays a small but important role

in the novel, as the embodiment of the natural violence against civilization and he is the precursor of other important gamekeeper, Mellors, in Lady Chatterley's Lover.

The relationships between Lettie and George grow for a long time, but Lettie, wanting more than animal attraction from a man, marries the higher-class industrialist Leslie. The effect of her perverse decision on George - which she never fully realizes - forms a great part of the theme of the book. George's slow degradation begins with his marriage, out of despair at Lettie's rejection, to Meg of the Ram Inn and ends up with his degeneration through drinking.

Cyril, the narrator and watcher, fails in his love for Emily, and indeed he seems to be more interested in Emily's brother, George. The novel's main interest is in the triangle George-Lettie-Leslie. At the end of the story everybody is more or less unfulfilled, but only Cyril is really frustrated and left alone. Even Emily marries somebody else. Lettie and Meg were not able to make the right choice but reign over their husbands. Cyril is left watching life, frustrated and quite unnoticed.

From a letter to his friend Blanche Jennings,(4) we can see that Lawrence himself admitted that most of the characters in The White Peacock are people from Eastwood:

> "Today - Bank Holiday, we are having a picnic at Beauvale Abbey - not far away. Mother and the weary will drive. Alice Gall(Hall) is going - Emily(Jessie Chambers) - George (Alan, Jessie's brother) - a fellow something like Leslie - Louie(Burrows) - ...; Louie, Emily, and George will be there (these are not their proper names, and the people are not like the fictions)* - We shall have some fun..."(SPS 62)

* This last parenthetical observation is not mine but Lawrence's.

And about Cyril (himself) he said:

> "If you think it worth the trouble, I will write the thing again (the novel), and stop up the mouth of Cyril - I will kick him out - I hate the fellow."(SPS 63)

He probably hated Cyril because, as the critics say, Cyril is too much Lawrence himself. Certainly this is one of the many early hints of Lawrence's contradictory nature.

As I have already said, Cyril and Lettie are frustrated because of their sexual unfulfilment, and according to J.Chambers they "are each aspects of Lawrence". Lettie's representation, based on Lawrence's favourite sister Ada, is the embodiment of the intellectualized woman who makes the wrong choice and remains as an inaccessible love-object, frigid but dominating, the magna mater, "reigning supreme" as Pritchard says. Undoubtedly she is the peacock symbol of the book, looking like the white peacock that "perched on an angel" of the churchyard, "as if it were a pedestal for vanity."(TWP 174) Cyril is too timid, passive, "merely childish, mentally clever but emotionally undeveloped", as G.Hough says.(TDS 28) As a watcher and narrator he seems to be more a woman than a man, which is what caused Lawrence to have the novel reviewed as if the author were a woman. As G.H.Ford points out, "Lawrence ought to have been entitled to a high rank in Mrs. Woolf's hierarchy" (DDM 58), for Virginia Woolf argued that the most satisfactory writers are neither masculine nor feminine, but androgynous. Indeed, in Woolf's sense of the word, the early Lawrence of The White Peacock is androgynous, as I will presently argue.

The critics could never separate Cyril from Lawrence, both as narrator and watcher. G.Hough comments that "he(Cyril - or

Lawrence) is sensitive in a rather girlish way."(TDS 28) Looking and touching as described through Cyril's eyes do not pass the limits of lyricism and the veiled style which is usually associated with feminine fiction is present throughout the book. Full contact between Cyril and Emily is always avoided:

> "He looked at her again, his eyes flickering. Then he took her hand. She pressed his fingers, holding them a little while."(TWP 45)

R.H.Poole maintains that Lawrence's first novel shows an "original feeling" for sexuality:

> "In January 1911 Lawrence published his impressive first novel, The White Peacock, (which is) notable for its fresh capture of the moods of landscape and season, and for an original feeling for the sexuality of man and woman."(SPS XIV) (5)

We see that no small part of the originality here lies in Lawrence's (or Cyril's) "voyeuristic" ability to project sexual content into observed nature. His first novel is a book of a country boy who has little experience of life, and if it has already been experienced, than it has not been digested, understood. This "voyeurism" and this treatment of sex in nature is the first seed of sex as a Lawrentian theme. But his techniques of description are still idealistic and sex is indirectly treated, sublimated or veiled:

> "We crossed the tangle of fern and bracken, bramble and wild raspberry canes that spread in the open space before the house, and we went down the grassy slope to the edge of Nethermere. The wind whipped up noisy little wavelets, and the cluck and clatter of these among the pebbles, the swish of the rushes and the freshening of the breeze against our faces roused us.

> The tall meadow-sweet was in bud along the tiny beach and we walked knee-deep among it, watching the foamy race of the ripples and the whitening of the willows on the far shore. At the place where Nethermere narrows to the upper end, and receives the brook from Strelley, the wood sweeps down and stands with its feet washed round with waters. We broke our way along the shore, crushing the sharp-scented wild mint, whose odour checks the breath, and examining here and there among the marshy places ragged nests of watter-fowl, now deserted."(TWP 23)

This passage like many others in the novel shows how Lawrence's early treatment of sex appears in his description of the landscape and many details cloak sexual meanings. There is an overabundance of adjectives to reinforce the quality of the verbs of perception which are used to give clear auditory, visual, olfactory, and tactile impressions, but a sexual excitation is really concealed. What "rouses" the narrator is certainly the "whipping" of the wind, "the swish of the rushes and the freshening of the breeze", the "watching" of the "ripples", the "sweeping" of the wood, and the "odour" of the "wild mint", but he transfers to other senses the sexual feelings which are evoked or excited through these impressions.

What Eudora Welty says of Lawrence's short stories is also valid for his first novel:

> "It is in the world of the senses that Lawrence writes in, works in, thinks in, takes as his medium - and if that is strange to us, isn't the loss ours?..."(WIS 114)

According to Mr. Gadjusek,(6) counting symbols in The White Peacock he found "145 different trees, bushes and plants which are presented; 51 animals are introduced; 40 different birds slide, hover, flutter, fly and change direction through the un-

folding of this novel."(ABL 166)

I would not only say that Lawrence writes in "the world of the senses", but that he recreates a complete pastoral setting in The White Peacock. Later on, in Lady Chatterley's Lover he cannot describe the lyric rural environment of Nethermere as quoted on pp. 26-27, because it (Eastwood) becomes Tevershall, "the utter negation of natural beauty."(LCL 158)

However, in this early world of the senses, visual perceptions play a very important role. The necessity of "voyeurism" and touching at the time of adolescence is neither infrequent nor unnatural, as we have learnt from Freud. These are common traits of the sexual impulse. Although touching is always in the centre of Lawrence's themes, in The White Peacock it is still inhibited, because the puritanical young man still objected to people who wanted to "gather" and to "fondle" things. Jessie Chambers tells us a passage from the time Lawrence was writing The White Peacock when he scolded her, resenting her touching and kissing some daffodils:

> " 'Why must you always be fondling things!' he said irritably.
> 'But I love to touch them', she replied, hurt.
> 'Can you never like things, without clutching them as if you wanted to pull the heart out of them? Why don't you have a bit more restraint, or reserve, or something? You wheedle the soul out of things. I would never wheedle - at any rate, I'd go straight'."(ETJ 229)

Maybe his love of flowers made him jealous of her touching or maybe it was one of his perverse moods, but this touching of flowers is so frequent in The White Peacock that we remember Freud's assertion that flowers are symbols that stand for female

genitals. Certainly Lawrence's puritanic mind could not admit this explanation, but this is one of the indirect descriptions of sexual feelings transferred to nature that we find in his first novel. Flowers, bindweeds, and brambles combined are indications of Lawrence's early ideas of sex: they are tangled, twisted, intertwined, and scattered among the fallen leaves on the soil:

> "Under the groves of ashes and oak a pale primrose still lingered, glimmering wanly beside the hidden water. Emily found a smear of blood (Cyril and Emily were on the track of a wounded dog) on a beautiful trail of yellow convolvulus. We followed the tracks on to the open, where the brook flowed on the hard rock bed, and the stony floor of the quarry was only a tangle of gorse and bramble and honeysuckle."(TWP 84)

And unlike Mellors in Lady Chatterley's Lover, who adorns Connie's navel and vagina with flowers, Cyril makes a garland for Emily:

> "I plucked a few bunches of guelder-rose fruits, transparent, ruby berries."
>
> ...
>
> "She thrust the stalks of the berries under her combs. Then, with the ruby bunches glowing through the black mist of curls, she looked up at me, brightly, with wide eyes. I looked at her, and felt the smile winning into her eyes. Then I turned and dragged a trail of golden-leaved convolvulus from the hedge, and I twisted it into a coronet for her."(TWP 85)

The young couple is still immature and virginal and sex for them, as well as for Lawrence, is seen in a kind of lyrical haze, obscure, and inaccessible.

However, Cyril (Lawrence) develops this visual sex, this "voyeurism", this talking and feeling with the eyes. As Aldington says, "...(Lawrence is) tirelessly observant, his eager eyes taking everything in."(PGB 34) Sometimes even the "voyeurism" is

inhibited:

> "She looked up, and found his eyes. They gazed at each other for a moment before they hid their faces again. It was a torture to each of them to look thus nakedly at the other, a dazzled, shrinking pain that they forced themselves to undergo for a moment, that they might the moment after tremble with a fierce sensation that filled their veins with fluid, fiery electricity. She sought almost in panic, for something to say."(TWP 43)

The inhibitions described in this disguised style reveal the repression of normal sexual instincts. At the time Lawrence finished The White Peacock he was 25 and if this "voyeurism" is an indication that he was undeveloped in his sexual life, this was due to his mother's puritanism. But add to it other factors, such as his Oedipus complex and his constant illness (pneumonia), and we will understand that Cyril, the "voyeur", the watcher, did not have his libido-function fully developed.

Another of the most important primitive sexual traits seen throughout The White Peacock is the kiss. There are more than thirty passages showing this sensual and perfect form of touch, thus revealing Lawrence's incipient sexuality.

A strange Scotch woman at the Ram Inn induces Cyril to kiss Emily, for the first and only time in the novel, although Lettie has been kissing all the time:

> "Look at her, look at her! How many kisses a night, Emily? Ha! Ha! Kisses all the year! Kisses o' nights in a lonely place'.
>
> ...
>
> When we were out on the road by the brook Emily looked at me shamefaced, laughing eyes. I noticed a small movement of her lips, and in an instant I found myself kissing her, laughing with some of the little woman's wildness."(TWP 306)

Of course, one can imagine how in 1911, when the novel was published, the "grey puritans" considered such passages indecent and lascivious. Now, curiously, and for other reasons, Freud says that sensu lato a kiss is a perversion,

> "for it consists of the union of the two erotogenic mouth zones instead of the two genital organs. Whenever the sexual act which serves the reproductive process is rejected with exclusiveness and the deviation is maintained we have a perverse sexuality."(GIP 331)

However, sensu stricto the kiss is not a perversion if it is not the sexual aim itself, again according to Freud:

> "In so far as perverse performances are included in order to intensify or to lead up to the performance of the normal sexual act, they are no longer actually perverse."(GIP 332 and ETS 152)

Although kisses in The White Peacock do not lead to "normal sexual act", they are not exclusively used as a gratification in themselves. Kisses in this novel are similar to "voyeurism": both are signs of the author's original awakening yet largely incipient sexuality. Both are closely related to touching, an important element of the advanced sexual organization of human beings. While "voyeurism" is a deficiency in those who still are not able to touch, the kiss is the supreme touching, though not more supreme than genital touch.

Contrasting the early to the late Lawrence in terms of first and last novels, I say that while the kiss is the central sexual trait in The White Peacock, sexual intercourse is the central activity in Lady Chatterley's Lover. While the mouth has a central place in the first book, it yields in the last to the genitals themselves.

Because of Cyril's "voyeurism" and the fact that he "feels" sex in nature, as we have seen, a strong element of sado-masochistic flavour - which is still an indication of undevelopment of the libido-function - is introduced in the considerations of The White Peacock. This is another of those "polymorphously perverse" dispositions which appear in almost all Lawrence's novels. The sadistic passages that describe the killing of rabbits, dogs, and mice show us more than a streak of the sadist, for we have to consider that the author is a tireless defender of natural life. According to R. Aldington "the rabbit plays a considerable if wholly obscure part in Lawrence's early erotic symbolism."(PGB 53) Of course, the Haggs was infested with rabbits, which destroyed the crops, and they are killed with a sort of excitement and pleasure in this novel; yet it seems that the observer (Cyril) is the sadist:

> "As I (Cyril) walked round I caught sight of a rabbit skulking near the bottom corner of the patch.
>
> ...
>
> I felt no pity for it, but still I could not actually hurt it.
>
> ...
>
> Leslie was upon it in a minute, and he almost pulled its head off in his excitement to kill it."(TWP 66)

The girl who is so timid and sees everything in a lyrical state shows, even if it is unconsciously, sadistic impulses when she (Emily) is trying to kill a dog:

> "There, in the mouth of one of the kilns, Emily was kneeling on the dog, her hands buried in the hair of its throat, pushing back its head. The little jerks of the brute's body were the spasms of death; already the eyes were turning inward, and the upper lip was drawn from the teeth by pain.

'Good Lord, Emily! But he is dead!' I exclaimed."(TWP 84)

Also, Lawrence's treatment of man-to-man relationships in The White Peacock raises the question of homosexual trait in the author himself. Later on Lawrence developed what he understood to be a necessity for men for a kind of blutbrüderschaft(7), especially in The Rainbow, Women in Love, and Aaron's Rod. By the time he wrote Lady Chatterley's Lover he had already given up the idea. Yet in this first novel, the theme is associated with Cyril's "voyeurism". Cyril is observing George:

> "George was siting by the fire, reading. He looked up as I entered, and I loved him when he looked up at me, and as he lingered on his quiet 'Hullo!' His eyes were beautifully eloquent - as eloquent as a kiss."(TWP 106)

The narrator speaks like a woman who is admiring a handsome man. And there is the way he "feels" George's touching too: "George came and bent over my shoulder. I could feel the heavy warmth of him."(TWP 186) For Cyril gazing at his friend George makes his admiration more explicit than gazing at Emily:

> "I have never known the time when he looked handsomer, when he was more attractive. There was a certain warmth about him, ..." etc.(TWP 202)

Lawrence included in The White Peacock the chapter "A Poem of Friendship", which emphasizes the necessity for touching between male friends. Cyril and George have bathed together in a pond, and George is rubbing Cyril with a towel; Cyril is the passive, feminine partner:

> "He saw I had forgotten to continue my rubbing, and laughing he took hold of me and began to rub me briskly, as if I were a child, or rather, a woman he loved and did not fear. I left myself quite limply in his hands, and, to get a bet-

> ter grip of me, he put his arm around me and pressed me against him, and the sweetness of the touch of our naked bodies one against the other was superb."(TWP 257)

Now, keeping in mind Freud's theories on homosexuality, mainly, that it is a result of arrested development or a reaction to restraint, I cannot feel it otherwise in relation to Cyril - Lawrence. Lawrence was probably not aware - at least he did not mention it, even when it echoed in the wrestling scene of Women in Love - of the fact that unsatisfactory sexual relationships between man and woman might lead to homosexuality. In fact, the kind of man-to-man relationships he insisted on, with its implications which he probably never fully realized, were an alternative for the relationships with women. Freud also regards homosexuality as "a bisexual predisposition related to the inversion (of the sexual object - especially in those victims of the Oedipus complex), although we don't know what does this predisposition consist of."(ETS 144)

However, H.T.Moore, a critic who always tries to protect Lawrence against undesirable blemishes, maintains that

> "... despite all innuendos, Lawrence does not seem to have been an homosexual; certainly no one spoke out on sexual matters more boldly and clearly, and there is no passage in his works in which he writes approvingly of sexual relations between men - that is, of sexual gratification in such a union. Indeed, he writes disapprovingly of such things."(TIH 82)

Let's accept what we overtly see in Cyril-George's intimacy: two men striving for spiritual harmony through physical contact but without overt sexual activity. This should be Lawrence's blutbrüderschaft. But I think that the passage from The White Pea-

cock just quoted in the two previous pages, partly disproves Moore's statement. Maybe for Moore homosexuality is only a sexual relation between men, probably including anality. Certainly homosexuality does include sexual practices between men, even anality, but it does not exclude the possibility that it is only the necessity for man's contact and the pleasure of being with man instead of woman, as we see in The White Peacock. The "latent" homosexuality of Cyril and George is confirmed by the idealistic and indirect style of the book, which tends to substitute fantasies for realities, or men ("ego" substitutes) for women. Cyril tends to be more "roused" by the contact with nature than by the contact with women, and he tends to substitute Emily for George.

While the triangle George-Lettie-Leslie is the basis of the main plot in The White Peacock, the secondary plot which presents the same failure and sexual unfulfilment, deals with the relation of Cyril to George's sister Emily. Jessie's history as Lawrence's first girl-friend was the background for Lawrence's creation of Cyril and Emily, and both in real life and in fiction the relationship was unsatisfactory and practically platonic. While Jessie launched the artist in Lawrence and seemed to ignore the man, he simply ignored the woman in Jessie. They were both puritanical as we can see in Jessie's A Personal Record and the same puritanism is seen in the novel in relation to Emily and Cyril. Even an innocent kiss, so common in the story, (written under Jessie's influence and even supervision), is denied to Emily though she and Cyril have experienced years of close friendship.

What prevents Cyril - Lawrence from loving Emily - Jessie

is not only his long-standing mother-son attachment, the Oedipus complex, but also his unconscious "ingrained puritanism". Only twice in six years of intimacy Lawrence talked about sex to Jessie (according to her own account), even after having asked for permission. In both occasions he did not speak openly, (which he certainly did in later novels), but said that women should not discuss sex. When he introduced the subject to Jessie, he said that women were "purely emotional" and not intellectual:

> "Well, you see, it means that you're governed entirely by your feelings. You don't think, you feel. There's a lot of difference, you know."(ETJ 130)

The actual term "sex" appears only once in The White Peacock, on page 234, in the last third of the book:

> "...; then they settled down, and talked sex, sotto voce, one man giving startling accounts of Japanese and Chinese prostitutes in Liverpool."(TWP 234)

These people are talking in the Ram Inn sotto voce: Lawrence wanted to talk openly about sex, but in this novel his treatment of sex is still inhibited.

R. Aldington says that in his Croydon period, The White Peacock period, "sex had become so complicated in him(Lawrence) that he would have denied that he could ever want ... any woman that he knew."(PGB 76) This period is also the period of the breakdown in his relationship with Jessie who points out:

> "he (Lawrence) began to overemphasize the importance of sex, ... and later on in life he spoke contemptuously of those who suffered from 'sex in the head'."(ETJ XXXII)

The disguised treatment of sex in The White Peacock accompanies as I have argued, the general theme of sexual frustration in this first novel. Almost all the couples in the book are

frustrated: Mr. and Mrs. Beardsall (Cyril's parents), Cyril and Emily, George and Lettie, George and Meg, Leslie and Lettie, and Annable and Lady Crystabel.

Another reason for his indirect style was the presaging of his future problems with censorship. His mother was actually his first censor, when Lawrence showed her the manuscript of The White Peacock and she, "in a pained voice", according to Moore, said: "To think that my son should have written such a story."(TIH 100) But this was not the only problem with censorship in the first novel. In its original version there is a passage which was considered pornographic by the puritanic publisher:

> "God! - We were a passionate couple - and she would have me in her bedroom while she drew Greek statues of me - her Croton, her Hercules!... Then gradually she got tired - it took her three years to have a real bellyful of me."(TIH 143) (8)

This was a significant realism Lawrence was trying to apply to all his novels and it is especially visible in Lady Chatterley's Lover. But Heinemann, his first editor, persuaded him to make a change on this passage, which ended up in this bowdlerized version:

> "Lord! - we were an infatuated couple - and she would choose to view me in an aesthetic light. I was Greek statues for her, bless you: Croton, Hercules, I don't know what! She had her own way too much - I let her do as she liked with me.
>
> Then gradually she got tired - it took her three years to be really glutted. I had a physique then - for that matter I have now."(TWP 177)

The passage became cloudy and obscure, to avoid the direct reference to sex in the original text. Everyone can see that such a kind of censorship is a hindrance to comprehension. This event

anticipates the kind of problems his later, open references to sex would cause the author. Of course, he met a public quite unprepared at this time. Thomas Hardy's Tess of the D'Urbervilles (1891) was still branded "immoral and obscene". For generations sex in English Literature (in contrast to say, French) had been represented by a "faded symbolism" according to Aldington.(PGB105)

I have already referred to a separate episode in The White Peacock, a story inside another story, that of the gamekeeper Annable, who is "an embodiment of the suppressed natural violence in the world of the novel", as Pritchard remarks.(BOD 27) With his brutal, direct voice, that of a natural man who is set against the evils of civilization, Annable is just the opposite of Cyril, the "alternative to euphemism", the "dark figure" that comes "to fascinate Cyril", as G.H.Ford points out.(DDM 51) But most of all, he is the anti-puritanical prototype for Mellors, the gamekeeper in Lady Chatterley's Lover. "Be a good animal, true to your animal instinct, was his motto."(TWP 173) So Annable also anticipates the importance of the physical being over the spiritual being that Lawrence makes Mellors stand for in Lady Chatterley's Lover.

However, it seems to me that Lawrence could not handle Annable very well, and he is suppressed (he dies in a not very clear accident in a quarry), because he could not live in the new structure of civilization which he did not accept, as Mellors could in Lady Chatterley's Lover. Furthermore, his death is representative of father-killing and male rejection in opposition to mother-favouring, a strong element of the Oedipus complex, which appears not only in The White Peacock but also in Sons and Lovers.

So far, Lawrence's early views on sex examined through The White Peacock, show a conservative youth, a puritan, shyly and euphemistically trying to deal with sex in the open, but still not completely aware of this "mysterious force", because he himself did not have a normal development of the sexual life. The White Peacock is the work of a younger, more reticent author, groping toward sexual themes. Nevertheless, despite his proved deficiencies Lawrence displays a keen observation of the problems which are going to be the central themes of his writings, from The White Peacock to Lady Chatterley's Lover. And we may anticipate that the "insurgent tenderness"(TWP 45) that we feel in Lettie's voice is the basic clue to understand Lady Chatterley's Lover and its author.

Chapter IV

LAWRENCE IN TRANSITION

(The Rainbow and Women in Love)

The Rainbow and Women in Love together mark Lawrence's apogee as a novelist. For most critics these are his two best novels. But for my purposes I classify this period of an outstanding literary production as "transitional", in the sense that it reveals Lawrence's changes and his growing awareness of the significance of sexual relationships. From The White Peacock to Lady Chatterley's Lover there is a great change in Lawrence's treatment of sex.

In The White Peacock the author is a man seeing sex euphemistically, rather unresolvedly, and in an unconsciously puritanical manner. Cyril's relationship with Emily is nothing more than platonic and is reduced to frustration. In The Rainbow and in Women in Love Lawrence deals with sex directly and openly and the characters regard it not as a dirty functional process but as a fulfilment, necessary for a perfect union of man and woman. Yet between The Rainbow and Women in Love there is a significant shift in the emphasis that Lawrence places on the ideal sexual relationship.

In The Rainbow the ideal relationship for man and woman can be said to be the "two in one", that is symbolized by the

rainbow arch; it is the "togetherness in unison", a quest for fulfilment in marriage. In Women in Love the relationship can best be described as a "mutual unison in separateness"; "otherness", "oneness", and "singleness" become more important, according to Lawrence's measure, a reflection of his dualism: separateness in the union of man and woman. This is a typical Lawrentian paradox reflected in Birkin (Lawrence in Women in Love) about which H.M.Daleski observes:

> "The sex act is the means by which 'the admixture of sex' is 'surpassed', is the means, that is to say, by which the complex union of male and female components in the individual man and woman is reduced to elemental singleness, the man becoming 'pure' man, the woman 'pure' woman."(TFF 165)

Complex as this paradox is, it is taken for granted in Lady Chatterley's Lover and the real basis of Lawrence's doctrine of sex in the last phase is this fulfilment, if it is possible, with tenderness.

In 1912 Lawrence began a book at first called The Sisters and later on The Wedding Ring. In 1913 the final draft of the first part was ready, under the title The Rainbow, and in 1915 it was published in London for the first time. As soon as he earned his definite place in the literary world, his happiness vanished rapidly and he was deceived and wearied by reviewers, critics, and "his England", which he could not forget till the end of his life. Success became a trauma. It was Lawrence's first encounter with the censors. The Rainbow was suppressed, following press attacks upon it as "indecent". Of course, the press, the critics, and the reviewers' standards were the standards of Victorian morality.

According to H.T.Moore they objected to a passage of suggested lesbianism between Winifred and Ursula, from the chapter "Shame":

> "Ursula lay still in her mistress's arms, her forehead against the beloved, maddening breast.
> 'I shall put you in,' said Winifred.
> But Ursula twined her body about her mistress."(TRB 340)

There were many other objections to love scenes between Ursula and Skrebensky or Anna and Tom. The charge was obscenity. Critics' opinions were stamped in the newspapers in big headlines like these:

> "Obscene Novel to be Destroyed. -
> Worse than Zola." - (The Daily Express - PGB 172)
> "A Monstrous Wilderness of Phallicism." - (Robert Lynd, in The Daily News - TIH 254)

Even the first publisher, Methuen, became opposed to Lawrence in court and said that The Rainbow was "... an orgy of sexiness that omitted no form of viciousness, of suggestiveness."(TIH 254)

The Rainbow was finally prosecuted in London in 1915, completely suppressed and more than 1.000 copies were ordered to be destroyed, "under Lord Campbell's Obscene Publications Act; this dated from 1857."(TIH 260) What was it that labelled this novel as "indecent" and stigmatized the author as "obscene"? It was the first novel in English Literature where sex was a central idea, and that was enough. But not really because of "obscenity"; the real reason - was "a confusion of mind, aggravated possibly by the hysteria due to war conditions"(TIH 258), and it was said that the novel hampered the recruiting efforts of the government, simply because Ursula made fun of her best boy, saying: "I hate soldiers, they are stiff and wooden."(TIH 259)

Lawrence said in his defence:

> "There is no more indecency or impropriety in The Rainbow than there is in this autumn morning - I who say so ought to know. And when I open my mouth let no dog bark." (FRL 145)

This novel unfolds the story of three generations of a Midland family, the Brangwens. Lawrence tried to build up a study of his own beliefs in marriage based on the union of the sexes to attain an accomplished life for man and woman. Tom Brangwen marries a Polish widow, Anna Lensky, and discovers that love must come to terms with the other forces that make up a human personality, including sex. But Ursula (Anna's grand-daughter) and Skrebensky form the couple(in the third generation) who are really striving for fulfilment in the sexual relations. The Rainbow is the least autobiographical of Lawrence's novels and only Ursula bears something approaching an autobiographical relation to Lawrence, according to F.R.Leavis.(FRL 137)

In this novel Lawrence began to "preach" his doctrine of sex which became the cornerstone of most of his writings, especially in his last period, the critical essays and Lady Chatterley's Lover: the supreme importance of fulfilment in the individual and a faith that the sexual fulfilment is the ultimate.

Women in Love is a sequel to The Rainbow and grew out of the second part of the first draft of The Sisters. The final draft was written in 1916, but (because of The Rainbow's fate) the publication took place only in 1920, in New York; it was published in England in 1921.

Women in Love is the story of two sisters, their lives, their lovers, and the emotional conflicts they face because of the necessity for sexual fulfilment. Ursula (the same character

as in The Rainbow) falls in love with Birkin (a self-portrait of Lawrence) and Gudrun has a demonic affair with Gerald. These four and other minor characters such as Hermione and Loerke make dramatic appeals for an increasing sexuality between man and woman. Lawrence tests and questions the institution of marriage.

The author raises too many questions and is practically defeated by the difficulty of the problems that he analyses, but cannot solve. The necessity for fulfilment in sexual relations is again profoundly examined, probably more deeply than before. Lawrence is in quest not only for fulfilment in the man-woman relationship but also for fulfilment in the man-man relationship, a blutbrüderschaft, which he finally sees as impossible to attain. Birkin says that he feels the problem of love between two men as necessary, but Gerald, his partner, does not clearly understand it and does not accept Birkin's offer of brotherhood. Birkin claims that "... it had been a necessity inside himself all his life - to love a man purely and fully."(WIL 231)

Lawrence's idea of a blutbrüderschaft began in The White Peacock with Cyril and George's relationship and continued through Women in Love, Aaron's Rod, and Kangaroo, although always inconclusively. In Women in Love Birkin and Gerald's friendship raises the same question of homosexuality which was raised in The White Peacock. Certainly the basis of this question of blutbrüderschaft is Lawrence's continuous need to bring the theme of touching rites through the novels. For one who advocates the search for complete fulfilment in sex, touching has to play a major role. But this ritual brotherhood appears as a quasi-homosexual trait in Lawrence's characters. Like the bathing and

rubbing passage of The White Peacock (pp. 33-34) the wrestling scene between Birkin and Gerald in the chapter "Gladiatorial" of Women in Love contains a clearly sexual element, although the passage is obscure; the men are undressed, wrestle "rapturously", and the narrator (Lawrence) seems to be Birkin:

> "So the two men entwined and wrestled with each other, working nearer and nearer.
>
> ...
>
> At length Gerald lay back inert on the carpet, his breast rising in great slow panting, whilst Birkin kneeled over him, almost unconscious.
>
> ...
>
> He slid forward quite unconscious over Gerald, and Gerald did not notice.
>
> ...
>
> When he realized that he had fallen prostrate upon Gerald's body he wondered, he was surprised.
>
> ...
>
> He put out his hand to steady himself. It touched the hand of Gerald, that was lying out on the floor. And Gerald's hand closed warm and sudden over Birkin's, they remained exhausted and breathless, the one hand clasped closely over the other. It was Birkin whose hand, in swift response, had closed in a strong, warm clasp over the hand of the other.
>
> ...
>
> 'Is this the blutbrüderschaft you wanted?' "(WIL 304-308)

One would like to say that sexual gratification seems to be out of question. There is no anal intercourse, but the reader feels somewhat uneasy and strangely ambiguous as to the scene's purpose, whenever this strong element of curious homosexual feeling is raised by Lawrence. Pritchard points out that "Birkin's wrestling-match with Gerald is like a sexual encounter, the ob-

literation of consciousness and separation in physical sensation." (BOD 100) Taken as a ritual, as something mystically sensual, these experiences remain "perverse", since Freud says that rituals permit partial satisfaction of denied impulses, and that homosexuality is the most frequently repressed component impulse.

Lawrence expressed his repugnance to sodomy, anality, buggery, or anything linked to the excretory functions, as we can see in Pornography and Obscenity:

> "The sex functions and the excrementory functions in the human body work so close together, yet they are, so to speak, utterly different in direction. Sex is a creative flow, the excrementory flow is towards dissolution, decreation, if we may use such a word."(SLC 70)

In fact there are other obscurities both in The Rainbow and in Women in Love which are connected to the "excrementory functions" and its "dissolution" and "decreation". Of course, Pornography and Obscenity was written in 1929, Lawrence's last year and the two novels above belong to his middle period. But the whole question of anality, the atmosphere of Sodom, the sexuality based on the excretory flow, which appear in The Rainbow and in Women in Love in foggy passages, anticipate the same kind of obscure scenes in Lady Chatterley's Lover.

In The Rainbow Will and Anna (a couple of the second generation) partake of "a sensuality violent and extreme as death", exploring the "secret shameful things", but Lawrence does not say openly what is happening. On the contrary, he simply asks and answers some veiled questions for Anna:

> "Shame, what was it? It was part of extreme delight. It was that part of delight of which man is usually afraid. Why afraid? The secret, shameful things are most terribly

beautiful."(TRB 238)

Why afraid? Because as a Puritan he was afraid of speaking about these perversities openly. On the other hand, as G.H.Ford remarks, the exploratory anality could "serve as a kind of discovery and purification" (DDM 204) for Lawrence himself.

In Women in Love the terms used are similar to those employed in The Rainbow. A whole chapter - "Excurse" - is devoted to foggy sex passages, that is, a special kind of sexual experience Birkin and Ursula have together, and as for Daleski's, Ford's, and Pritchard's opinions, I agree with them all, that some sort of realization of anality between man and woman, and vice versa, is presented in both novels. The fingers are used in the strongest perverse connotation possible - these passages suggest sado-masochistic acts and anality combined:

> "Unconsciously, with her (Ursula's) sensitive finger-tips, she was tracing the back of his (Birkin's) thighs, following some mysterious life-flow there. She had discovered something, something more than wonderful, more wonderful than life itself. It was the strange mystery of his life-motion, there, at the back of the thighs, down the flanks.
>
> ...
>
> And she did not speak, but only pressed her hands firmer down upon the source of darkness in him."(WIL 352-356)

What is important for the present is that Lawrence surely provides us with an anticipation of the problems concerning anal relations between man and woman which Mellors and Connie have to face in Lady Chatterley's Lover. Mellors' "phallic hunt" will not only be a means of asserting his manhood over Connie but also will purge their bodies of false shames.

Pritchard points out that in The Rainbow and in Women in

Love "conventional morality is under a 'ban', as the lovers achieve more than conventional sexual intercourse in mutual anal caresses."(BOD 102) But let's not forget that the critics have stated this clearly, and not Lawrence. The texts of the novels are always foggy and the reason for this obscurity was evidently still Lawrence's puritanism, which prevented him from facing conventional morality. I suggest that contemporary mores would not permit him to speak openly about "dark sex" yet.

Chapter V

LAWRENCE AND PORNOGRAPHY

(Critical Essays)

"His (Lawrence's) essays and 'philosophy' always came after he had worked out his ideas in fiction or poetry"(SLC 18), says H.T.Moore in Sex, Literature, and Censorship, and the author said that "the novels and poems come unwatched out of one's pen."(FTU15) This seems to be the reason why his middle-period critical essays Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious came after his principal novels. And after his last novel he wrote his two last and most important critical essays, Pornography and Obscenity and A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover, in 1929. The second contains a profound critical explanation of the moral case raised by the "scandal" of Lady Chatterley. It was written in defence of the novel and its subject, an attack on the "censor-morons", is a ratification of all his pronouncements on the subject of sex, literature, and censorship, and a repetition of the ideas presented in Lady Chatterley. The first essay, Pornography and Obscenity, is also a confirmation of his theories, but there are some fine arguments and fresh ideas about pornography and it seems to have been written to challenge the censors too. It is a very polemical essay. But the final Lawrence is the Lawrence of Lady Chatterley's Lover. Nothing he wrote after that novel re-

presented a significant change or advancement in his theories or doctrines, especially in relation to sex.

The two other critical essays, Psychoanalysis, written in 1921, and Fantasia, written in 1922, although belonging to his middle period, are worth considering in the investigation of his doctrine of sex.

Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious is not a long essay - some 50 pages - about Lawrence's tentative incursion into the area of the unconscious, this "nebulous part of our mind". It contains Lawrence's own estimate of the roles of the conscious and the unconscious and, incidentally, his arguments against Freud and Psychoanalysis.

Lawrence begins the essay in a mixture of fear of psychoanalysis and rage against Freud. He talks about "a sinister look" in psychoanalysis which he calls the "Freud look". This "Freud look" he fears, is a look into the unconscious part of the mind, where all mental diseases and complexes reside. Unaware of Freud's research, Lawrence was yet reaching parallel conclusions, although not scientifically like Freud, but as a writer and an artist. At the time he wrote Psychoanalysis, Lawrence was still one of those who (as Freud said) wanted to throw stones at him, though later on, one might observe, many people wanted to throw stones at Lawrence too. Both writers committed the same "crime": talking about sex openly. Gershon Legman, quoted by Irving Wallace in The Seven Minutes, says:

> "Murder is a crime. To describe a murder is not. Sex is not crime. To describe sex is." (OSM 518)

In fact, in this essay Lawrence does not accuse the "Freud look" of pan-sexualism. What really occupies Lawrence's discus-

sions then is Freud's theory of the unconscious. It is too much for Lawrence that Freud goes into the impenetrable darkness of the unconscious and comes back with "repulsive little horrors" of sex and its repressions. Lawrence's argument is that by consciously exploring the unconscious, Freud "creates" the repressed "dirty secrets" that he finds there. In self-contradiction, Lawrence says that the repressed secrets should be kept in the unconscious, but he fights for sex fully and openly.

Freud slowly developed his theories of the unconscious throughout his life. Very frequently, in each book, at the end of every chapter, he returned to the subject, confirming or reviewing previous ideas, with an outstanding accurateness and based on clinical cases. Nevertheless, Lawrence deliberately says: "Freud's unconscious amounts practically to no more than our repressed incest impulses."(PAU 206) But Freud's unconscious is not only this, for Freud points out

> "that mental processes are essentially unconscious, and that those which are conscious are merely isolated acts and parts of the whole psychic entity."(GIP 25)

On the other hand, "repressed incest impulses" are only a small part of the mental excitations which, being originally unconscious, usually do not have admittance into consciousness. Freud remarked that mental organization was still a mystery and Lawrence agrees with him when he finds the unconscious a mystery too. They differ in the way they approach the mystery:

> "We are trying to trace the unconscious to its source. And we find that this source, in all the higher organisms, is the first ovule cell from which an individual arises." (PAU 213)

It would be more logical to the scientist to discuss the physical side of the question. But it happens that the scientist in this case is a psychoanalyst, who is more interested in the psychic part, and it is Lawrence, the artist, who is trying to discuss the physical side. However, I can understand this tendency, for it is in accordance with his vital philosophy, his physical universe, his "world of the senses", and his idea that "blood is basic". So it is interesting to notice that Lawrence in his middle essays took up the ostensible methods and terminology of science in order to refute the scientists.

Fantasia of the Unconscious is a continuation of Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious. The central ideas are the quarrels with Freud and the theories on sex and the unconscious. Also, there is much good sense on such subjects as human relationships, education, and the right and wrong manifestations of love, for Lawrence often a counterfeit emotion. Now Lawrence accuses Freud of pan-sexualism, i.e., he implies that for Freud sex is everything and everything is sex. He says of the Freudian sexual theories: "The real clue is sex. A sexual motive is to be attributed to all human activity."(FTU 17)

But Freud always defended himself against this accusation throughout his works. He even says: "At the bottom society's motive is economic."(GIP 321) And elsewhere he affirms that

> "the sexual instinct is not the only basis of all manifestations of the psychic activity, but the most important." (CPA 200)

For the puritan Lawrence, (since all is not sex):

> "Sex means the being divided into male and female, and the magnetic desire or impulse which puts male apart from fe-

> male, in a negative or sundering magnetism, but which also draws male and female together in a long and infinitely varied approach towards the critical act of coition. Sex without the consummating act of coition is never quite sex, in human relationships: just as a eunuch is never quite a man. That is to say, the act of coition is the essential clue to sex."(FTU 17)

Sex only interested Lawrence in terms of fulfilment, in the "consummating act of coition." But, would a puritan advocate sex for sex, sex for pleasure? We never find in Lawrence any idea of sex as an end for the procreation of the species. The real nature of his sexuality, a neurotic sexuality, a perverse sexuality as we have seen in his novels had to be sublimated through his literary art. One can see how incomplete is his definition of sex when one thinks about Freud's views. Freud says that a definition always leads to difficulties, and instead of "sex" he prefers to try to define "sexual". So, in Freud's views, sensu lato, the term "sexual" means: "Everything connected with the difference between the two sexes." And sensu stricto: "Everything which is directed to the union of the genital organs and the performance of the sexual act."(GIP 312) Freud warns that the first definition "is perhaps the only way of hitting the mark" (GIP 312) because the study of sexuality which interests science must not exclude the so-called degenerations, like skoptophilia, fetichism, sadism, masochism, anality, and all the inversions, and all the frustrations and disfunctions.

In the next chapter we will confirm that Lawrence glorifies the act of coition in Lady Chatterley's Lover, and attributes a mystical importance to the fulfilment in the final consummation of the orgasm. For in Fantasia he has already pointed out this

tremendous significance of the act as a creative motive for mankind. Hence some critics say that sex for Lawrence became a sort of religion. As long as one understands religion as a form of mental attitude to recognize superhuman power in anything he does not know how to explain, the sexual impulse, as a creative impulse for mankind is a sort of religion. If we remember Lawrence's puritanical religious background, we understand how this treatment of sex as a sort of religion is coupled with his puritanism. G. Hough thinks that

> "Lawrence has done nothing less than manufacture a new religion - a religion of the Flesh, with a devotion and a discipline of its own."(TDS 58)

Finishing the essay Fantasia, Lawrence returns to the theme of sex, in his usual but controversial preaching manner:

> "Sex as an end in itself is a disaster: a vice. But an ideal purpose which has no roots in the deep sea of passionate sex is a greater disaster still."(FTU 187)

The first sentence reveals the puritan, but the second proves that he is against false puritanism about sex; this is the very tone of Lady Chatterley's Lover, and I think that Connie's search for tenderness could only be achieved through"sex in the head".

As we have seen, Lawrence's early problems with censorship began with The White Peacock, when his editor asked him to change a passage which "might be" objectionable (p. 37). His real first encounters with censors though, were with The Rainbow, because of its "suggestiveness" of perverse sexuality. In the euphemistic first novel and in The Rainbow, (although here there is clear treatment of sex scenes) many obscurities probably imply his puritanical fear of pornography. But in Lady Chatterley's Lover,

he directly faced the censors and brought sex fully into the open through the use of four-letter words and other physical descriptions. G. Hough states his dilemma very precisely:

> "Of course it is quite true, we have no proper vocabulary to discuss sex. There is the scientific, which sterilises it by depriving it of all emotional content, and the 'obscene"... and the fact remains that the connotations of the obscene physical words are either facetious or vulgar - (slang). But in Lady Chatterley's Lover the passages which are describing the sexual act more fully than has ever been done before, can be justified by the whole intention of the book."(TDS 160)

In Pornography and Obscenity Lawrence says that if he uses four-letter words there is a reason: the reason is to use realistic language for a realistic treatment of sex, for a "phallic" reality. As Stephen Potter, giving evidence in the trial of Lady Chatterley, said:

> "What he (Lawrence) was trying to do was to take these words out of what you may call the context of the lavatory wall and give them back a dignity and meaning, away from the context of obscenity and of the swear-word."(TTL 188)

Because of this "context of the lavatory wall", the books which deal directly with the sexual acts and contain the taboo words are called "pornographic", that is to say, they contain obscenity. Now the question is, what is the usual meaning of these terms, "pornography" and "obscenity"?

Pornography comes from the Greek pornographos, which means "what is written by licentious people", or "pertaining to harlots". Justice William Rehnquist of the United States Supreme Court, a very conservative jurist, defined pornography ("hard-core porn") as:

> "... representations or descriptions of ultimate sexual acts, normal or perverted, actual or simulated, masturbation, excretory functions, and lewd exhibition of the genitals."(9)

Mr. Gerald Gardiner, opening address for the defence in the trial, gave this complementary definition:

> "Pornography means literally the writings of prostitutes, but it is now(in 1960) used in a much more general sense, and you may think the best definition is 'dirt for dirt's sake' - "(TTL 27)

Lawrence began his essay by discussing the two words which compound the title:

> "What they (pornography and obscenity) are depends, as usual, entirely on the individual. What is pornography to one man is the laughter of genius to another."(PAO 60)

And a little further on, we find his short definition:

> "Pornography is the attempt to insult sex, to do dirt on it." (PAO 69)

Pornography in itself, as something dirty, unpleasant, or calculated to arouse lewd sexual excitations, Lawrence's puritanism could not admit. He says, as I have already quoted: "Like a real prude and Puritan, I have to look the other way."(PAO 65) He confesses he is a "real Puritan". What is an 'unreal" Puritan? The "grey puritan" who is polarized with the pornographer, because he uses sex appeal for everything and keeps the "dirty little secret", i.e., furtive sex, because of fear. The puritan pornographer is unpardonable because Lawrence finds pornography unpardonable, be it picture post-cards, the books they sell in the under-world, nudism, or even dirty jokes, which show a profound disgust for the creative flow of sex and an attempt to identify it with the reverse "flow" of excrement. He adds the point that

> "the whole question of pornography seems to me a question of secrecy. Without secrecy there would be no pornography.
>
> ...
>
> This 'dirty little secret' has become infinitely precious to the mob of people today."(PAO 71)

Lawrence goes on to say that "the mob knows all about obscenity" (PAO 65) and "when it comes to the so-called obscene words, (I) should say that hardly one person in a million escapes mob-reaction."(PAO 67) And to define "obscene" is perhaps more difficult than to define "pornography". According to the Oxford Dictionary the term comes from the Latin obscenus, or ob+scena. Lawrence understands it as "that which might not be represented on the stage."(PAO 64) In this case, Lawrence probably is simply describing what happened in the late 1700's, when the censors ascribed their power over English drama. If he is working from the genetic meaning of the word, I cannot entirely agree with him, or his definition is not clear enough. Scena means "stage", but ob means "in front of", "in direction to", or "because of". This preposition - ob - changed its semantic value inside Latin, for the adjective obscenus already had the meaning "dirty, ugly, filthy, funest, dishonest, impudent, lewd" in Latin. By analogy we can say that ob never changed its meaning to a negative value, i.e., "out of", "contrary to", or "in opposition to". See, for instance, obvius - "obvious": that which goes to meet something; obstare - to be in front of, hence the English "obstacle"; or obscurus, in the dark or invisible because of the dark, hence the English "obscure". So, I would say that the original meaning of "obscene" was that which happens, is said or is represented in front of the stage or because of the stage representation.

Havelock Ellis, sexologist and precursor of Freud, the author of many books on sex, (who was even prosecuted because of his works), says about obscenity:

> "How to define such a nebulous notion which is not in the watched thing itself but in the spirit of the observer?" (OSM 38) (10)

Actually this question contains a good idea of obscenity: it is that "which is not in the watched thing itself but in the spirit of the observer". And is not the observer who stands in front of the "stage"? You show a naked woman's picture to a man and he says it is "art", and you do the same thing to another and he says it is "immoral".

At the end of The Trial of Lady Chatterley, in Justice Byrne's summing-up there is this definition of "obscene", drawn directly from the English law, to be specific, from the new Obscene Publications Act:

> "... an article shall be deemed to be obscene if its effect is, if taken as a whole, such as to tend to deprave and corrupt persons who are likely, having regard to all relevant circumstances, to read the matter contained in it."(TTL 227)

As a matter of fact, even an obscene book tends to "deprave and corrupt" only a person who is already likely to be corrupted. There is no obscene book after all, but there are obscene people with obscene minds. The function of literature is to explore the human heart, with all its manifestations, and the sexual act is one of man's most important manifestations. To see the sexual act as pornographic or obscene is a trait of the dirty minds of those whom Lawrence calls "grey puritans". Lawrence is a puritan too, but of a different sort; he wants to regenerate human relationships through sex and cannot see obscenity in that. Maurice

Girordias,[11] famous editor and press man agrees with Lawrence, adding the point that

> "pornography and licentiousness are horrible ghosts which will disappear in the day of the regeneration of sex and eroticism."(OSM 342)

The last part of A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover is like a speech of a dying voice. Lawrence was terribly sick and died four months later, on March 2, 1930. In this essay he talks about a deeper and greater morality, which is concerned not only with persons but with all nations and mankind. One of the greatest needs is the knowledge of the dichotomy life-death. The rhythm of life and death is the rhythm of reintegration in the cosmos. This is possible through a vivid relation with the universe , and this relation begins with the relationship between man and woman which, for Lawrence, is complete only in the body, through sexual fulfilment. Lawrence, as usually, insists on his vital philosophy:

> "The body's life is the life of sensations and emotions.
>
> ...
>
> All the emotions belong to the body, and are only recognized by the mind."(APL 93)

This is really a doctrine of a religion of the Flesh. It preaches the supremacy of the body over the mind. And this is one of the reasons why Lawrence possibly disagreed with Freud: he thought that Freud's theories helped to mentalize sex. He believed that neurotics analysed by Freud were confirmed in their mentalizing of sex. The puritans always mentalized sex because they advocated the supremacy of the mind over the body. Lawrence's dualism represents just an inversion of the dualistic

puritan formula. This mentalization of sex is what Lawrence calls "white-sex", i.e., sex through the nerves and consciousness, but disintegrative, relegated to the status of a merely mechanical act. "White-sex" implies sex in the head, "cold, white, nervous, personal, bloodless, a pure matter of nerves."(APL 103)

However, Lawrence's puritan society could not understand the "phallic consciousness" the author tried to oppose to "white-sex". For the "grey puritans" sexuality in itself is indecency and dirtiness, but their morality, according to Lawrence, is false; it is based on the secrecy, and this is perversion, "a perversion of puritanism" as Lawrence says. (APL 92) They cannot feel the real emotions of sex and the harmony between body and mind. Why speak of the "body's life" to them, if they are "sexual morons"?

In Lady Chatterley's Lover Connie and Mellors, although belonging to different social classes, achieve a vivid relation because they learn to recognize the importance of the body's life for complete sexual fulfilment.

Therefore, for people unprepared to understand the importance of physical sensations, Lawrence's realistic doctrine is in fact inadequate. They are accustomed to fake sensations and fake explanations. Puritans tend to have two extreme attitudes concerning sex and "obscene" words: either they are puritans, but false puritans, or they are prurient. Being puritans, those whom Lawrence calls "grey puritans", they see prurience in everything related to sex, even if it is a literary work of art. Being prurient, they have a morbid desire for everything that is "sexual". As Lawrence says, they want to keep "the little dirty

secret". Neither can be of any help to Lawrence. Both suffer from a sort of "sex in the head". Lawrence wants people to deal with sex fully in the open, and to think in and to listen to the libidinous words without shuddering and without thrilling. He is puritanical in his doctrine of sex, but a different kind of puritan.

Chapter VI

THE LATE LAWRENCE

(Lady Chatterley's Lover)

In his last phase of writing Lawrence was already a man condemned by tuberculosis. No medical treatment could really save him. In this state he wrote the first draft of his last novel, Lady Chatterley's Lover*, from October 1926 to February 1927. The first title of the novel, Tenderness, was quite representative of the feeling that flows between the two lovers - Connie and Mellors. Subsequently this was changed to My Lady's Keeper. But this first version is now known by the title The First Lady Chatterley, with 253 pages (Penguin Books edition). Lawrence wrote the novel three times, reformulating scenes, pruning out the four-letter words and even changing the end of the story, due to forseen problems with censorship. From February to July 1927 he wrote the second version, significantly altered because of the severe pruning, and he added to it more than a hundred pages (the total version is 376 pages - Penguin Books edition) - which later on received the title John Thomas and Lady Jane, (these terms designate respectively "penis" and "vagina" in popular language). The third version, the final draft, was ready

---

* Henceforth I will use "LCL" for brevity.

by January 1928 and is now widely known as LCL, with 317 pages - (Penguin Books edition). This last version restored the ending of the original story and contains almost all the rejected "forbidden" words. It was published for the first time privately in Florence in 1928. In 1959 it was published again, this time in New York by Grove Press. In London it was published by Penguin Books only in 1960. The First Lady Chatterley, unexpurgated, was published in New York in 1944. Between 1928 and 1930 pirated editions of the third version were published in New York and Paris, according to Lawrence's own accounts. It was immediately prosecuted and banned in England but clandestine volumes concealed in travellers' pockets guaranteed a continuous circulation in Lawrence's country.

For the sake of clarity I must say that this study is based on the third version of LCL published by Penguin Books in 1960, which is considered complete and unexpurgated. However, Bernard Jones, in his essay "The Three Ladies Chatterley" maintains that

> "for the final version, which is the one widely known since 1960, Lawrence resorted to drastic pruning and produced a book just over fifty pages longer than the first version with the result that he lost some of the advantages of the comparative brevity of the original story."(TLC 46)

In any case, through Bernard Jones' article we know that The First Lady Chatterley has a few more "offending" words, as he calls the four-letter words.(12) Lawrence's intention (extensively discussed by the critics and in the London trial) is to regenerate sex and clean the four-letter words. In LCL he replaces the novel's conventional "row of asterisks" with the words they conceal, determined to break a taboo. There are only eight

of such words: "fuck", "penis", "cunt", "arse", "tail", "ball", "cock", and "piss", (we do not count "shit" which appears only once). Lawrence uses them because sometimes it is necessary to describe what is really going on in a woman's or man's head, using the same words with which they are thinking. A primitive, natural man like Mellors (Connie's lover) does not know the meaning of scientific words such as "vagina" or "copulate", and the so-called obscene words are natural and tender for him. However, Lawrence's essential intention is not the revival of these words, but the work of art that LCL really is. It became his most famous book not because it is his best artistic work, but due to its cause célèbre in the history of English Literature and censorship. From 1928 to 1960 this novel remained banned in England, and this last year Penguin Books were prosecuted under the new Obscene Publications Act of 1959, at the Old Bailey in London, but the jurors returned a verdict of "Not Guilty" for the first time. (TLC 248)

As I have already pointed out, there is a crescendo in Lawrence's artistic power from The White Peacock to Women in Love. In LCL this power does not exceed Women in Love in terms of new discoveries, for Women in Love is actually his most artistically finished novel, but the theme of human relationships with the background of the man-machine problem touches the reader to the quick. The story unfolds this theme but its center is the sex relation. It contains the thesis that the sexual impulse is the only creative and legitimate means to overcome the rottenness of industrial civilization and of the sterile and empty men it produces.

So the general subject matter of LCL may be broken down into two major themes: the relations of men and women and the relations of men and machine. The last is the problem of the industrial structure and its effects on men and nature. In fact, there is a close relationship between the mechanical world of industrialism and mechanical sex, the second being a by-product of the first. Both are condemned by Lawrence through Connie and Mellors. The first theme is much more developed and important, with the second as its background, but they are ultimately linked and as John B.Wilson points out, Lawrence "... in effect rejected civilization and wanted men to go back to the "natural world" of instinct." (ELS 286)

Lawrence always emphasized the importance of the man-woman theme in LCL:

> "I always labour at the same thing, to make the sex relation valid and precious, instead of shameful. And this novel is the furthest I've gone. To me it is beautiful and tender and frail as the naked self is."(LCL XV) (13)

Lawrence preaches a new doctrine, based on everything he has written up to LCL: a new relationship between man and woman which he calls "phallic consciousness", opposed to "mental consciousness", that is to say, mental life without the necessary and proper physical and sexual relations. According to J.B.Wilson, LCL was banned because "it too frankly glorified physical love".(ELS 286) This would be valid if the main concern of the story were "sex consciousness", that is to say, body without mind, sex without mind. But this is certainly not true and J.B. Wilson is one of the critics who simply joined their voices to a crowd of detractors like T.S.Eliot, without having a perfect

knowledge of Lawrence's life and works. Lawrence preaches this "phallic consciousness" as "a bridge for the future" when man is ready to put sex in the right place. Tommy Dukes, one of Sir Clifford's guests, who sometimes has Lawrence's voice in the novel, says:

> "Our civilization is going to fall. It's going down the bottomless pit, down the chasm. And believe me, the only bridge across the chasm will be the phallus!"(LCL 77)

Although this "phallic consciousness" is highly symbolic, the original reference of the word "phallus", from the Greek - φάλλος - "phallos", is the penis, venerated in old religious systems as symbolizing generative power in nature. And Lawrence explained the significance of the novel in a letter to Witter Bynner on March 1928:

> "It is a nice and tender phallic novel - not a sex novel in the ordinary sense of the word... I sincerely believe in restoring the other, the phallic consciousness: because it is the source of all real beauty and all real gentleness: And those are the two things, tenderness and beauty, which will save us from horrors..."(TDS 149 and SPS 24)

This "nice and tender phallic novel" brings a variation of the traditional romantic motif of folklore: Sleeping Beauty and Prince Charming. Connie is the Sleeping Beauty who is here awakened not by Prince Charming's kiss, but by his tender sexuality. Prince Charming is not a beloved knight and nobleman, but a gamekeeper, a natural man, speaking in broad dialect of "cunts" and "arses". From this point of view it would have been better if the title <u>John Thomas and Lady Jane</u> had been kept. In fact, the novel (even the third version) ends up like this:

> "John Thomas says good-night to Lady Jane, a little droopingly, but with a hopeful heart." (LCL 317)

The real theme, which recurs in many of Lawrence's works, is that of a woman of higher class who has sexual intercourse with a man of lower class. In LCL we have the case of the aristocratic lady, dissatisfied with her husband and her big old house, going to copulate in a hut in the woods with her husband's servant, who happens to be a civilized , polite, and tender man, in spite of his outward rudeness. One wonders whether there is not a special pleasure for Constance Chatterley in making love with a man in one moment and in being called by him "my Lady" in the following moment.

Lawrence began to use the keeper motif early in The White Peacock, as I have already said. Here and there the man is a gamekeeper, a natural man, almost a primitive, but the only one able to protect the natural world against the destruction of civilization. He is primitive in the good sense that he is still pure, living apart from the mechanical structure, and his sexuality can still be pure, conscious, and tender. In The White Peacock there is Mellors' precursor, Annable, the natural man whose motto is: "Be a good animal, true to your animal instinct."(TWP 173) Both Annable and Mellors cannot accept the mechanization of the world and the "mechanical greed" because

> "soon it would destroy the wood. - ... he(Mellors) knew that the seclusion of the wood was illusory. The industrial noises broke the solitude, the sharp lights, though unseen, mocked it. A man could no longer be private and withdrawn. The world allows no hermits." (LCL 123)

Annable is unhappy and cannot accept civilization. He is symbolically killed because he could not stand industrialism which by the time of The White Peacock was already beginning to destroy

natural beauty. In fact, he is killed by the mechanical "thing", that is, the "horror", the squalor of the mechanical world that Mellors abominates too. He says:

> "I'd wipe the machines off the face of the earth again, and end the industrial epoch absolutely, like a black mistake."(LCL 230)

Mellors cannot really fight the mechanical "thing" either, but he does not have to die, he remains as a symbol: the keeper of natural life. He is also the symbolic bearer of the "phallic consciousness", which is going to save civilization from the "thing". But like Lawrence he cannot prevent his lyric Eastwood-Tevershall in the novel - from being degraded by the machine.

The following long passage purports not only to show the ugly and dark face of industrialism in LCL, contrasting with that passage from The White Peacock (pp. 26-27) about the green hills and woods of Eastwood (Nethermere), but also offers the opportunity to compare the early, rural, idealistic style of The White Peacock with Lawrence's highly elaborate and seemingly hopeless lament against industrial civilization. Thus the later novel:

> "The car ploughed up hill through the long squalid straggle of Tevershall, the blackened brick dwellings, the black slate roofs, glistening their sharp edges, the mud black with coal-dust, the pavements wet and black. It was as if dismalness had soaked through and through everything. The utter negation of the gladness of life, the utter negation of natural beauty, the utter absence of the instinct for shapely beauty which every bird and beast has, the utter death of human intuitive faculty was appalling.
>
> ...
>
> The Wesleyan chapel, higher up, was of blackened brick and stood behind iron railings and blackened shrubs. The Congregational chapel, which thought itself superior, was

> built of rusticated sandstone and had a steeple, but not a very high one.
>
> ...
>
> Tevershall! That was Tevershall! Merrie England! Shakespeare's England! No, but the England of today, as Connie had realized since she had come to live in it. It was producing a new race of mankind, over-conscious in the money and social and political side, on the spontaneous, intuitive side dead, but dead.
>
> ...
>
> This is history. One England blots out another. The mines had made the halls wealthy. Now they were blotting them out, as they had already blotted out the cottages. The industrial England blots out the agricultural England. One meaning blots out another. The new England blots out the old England. And the continuity is not organic, but mechanical.
>
> ...
>
> Eastwood was gone." (LCL 158-163)

It is not the wind that is booming anymore, it is the car that is ploughing. The primitive Eastwood (the idyllic Nethermere) of Lawrence's youth is gone. We find no more a background of pastoral scenes but rather industrial squalor. The "new race" has no "organic connection" because the men are "highly-mental" and "relegate sex to the status of a merely primitive or mechanical act". (LCL XI) So it is George's case in The White Peacock - Lettie says he is a "primitive" man, in this sense. Sir Clifford and some of his habitual guests, Hammond and Michaelis, also are "highly-mental" and sex for them became a "brutish activity".

Mellors is against industrial squalor and the horror of mechanical sex, products of the mental life. On the contrary, he believes on the harmony of body and life, "sexual act in harmony with sexual thought", and for Connie he becomes the first

man to be capable of a tender sexuality. He is really the keeper of the "phallic mystery". Connie says he is the only different and true man in the world because of his tenderness:

> " 'Shall I tell you?' she said, looking into his face. 'Shall I tell you what you have that other men don't have, and that will make the future? Shall I tell you?'
> 'Tell me then', he replied.
> 'It's the courage of your own tenderness, that's what it is: like when you put your hand on my tail and say I've got a pretty tail'." (LCL 290)

This is "phallic tenderness". Lawrence feels it necessary now, but his early idea of the "primitive" man was a bit different. On page 20 of this thesis, we have seen Lettie scold George, ("you primitive man"), because he looked only at a woman's physical features. At the same time Lawrence the puritan scolded Jessie Chambers because she only "felt" and did not "think", as I have shown on page 36. What Lawrence was denouncing in George (and Jessie) is now a characteristic virtue in his symbolic Mellors.

Since Mellors stands so much for Lawrence, his residual puritanism is also evident in the character. Mellors is tender because he tenderly observes Connie's external features and most of all her tail. Here lies Lawrence's difficulty in reconciling his puritan morality with a healthy sexuality entirely based on the body's life. A real puritan (ingrained) would not admit the supremacy of the body and sex over the mind. So Lawrence is both more anti-puritanical and more rigidly moral in LCL. "Mental consciousness" has to be replaced by "phallic consciousness".

Both Annable and Mellors, despite their he-man image, despise "brutish activity" and are in retreat from masculine women

who want to dominate them. Mellors gives up his married life with Bertha Coutts because she is like a sexual animal and only wants "brutish activity", that is, animalistic sexual practices. Bertha is that sort of "clitoral woman", "a greedy sexual beast", as R. Hoggart points out (LCL VIII), whom Mellors accuses as a "beaked woman":

> "... she'd sort of tear at me down there, as if it was a beak tearing at me. - But I tell you the old rampers have beaks between their legs." (LCL 210)

This kind of woman would threaten Mellors' male supremacy and like him Lawrence feared brutish and dominant women too.

After Mellors abandons Bertha he chooses to live alone. R. Hoggart observes:

> "He (Mellors) is a grown man, has known married life, and presumably feels sexual needs. But sex in his married life had become a brutish activity, and he has chosen to live alone."(LCL X)

It seems to me that there is a frivolity in the first sentence above. The hero of the "phallic novel" "presumably feels sexual needs!" "Presumably!" Mellors must be a bit coy in his "sexual needs" and "presumably" does not succeed with his proverbial tenderness with his wife. Nevertheless he teaches tenderness to Connie, his lady-lover, and there is no indication of coyness in the various sorts of sexuality he enjoys with her, including anality, as we are going to see.

Thus the natural man Mellors - Lawrence - in quest of the primitive beauty catches hold of his erect phallus as a remedy for the maladies of civilization. But I think that the final diagnosis of these maladies is not going to change the Mellors-Connie relationship. They are not really affected by that indus-

trial background; they retreat to their love-making. Anthony Beal thinks that Lawrence is more preoccupied with the relationships man-machine than with the relationships man-woman in LCL. I do not think so. The central theme of the novel is "the study of man", as G.Hough points out, and the relationships between man and woman are of first importance.

Only the natural man like Mellors knows the "mysterious force" of sex. For Lawrence sex is always a great mystery, an unknown emotion, in the darkness:

> "The man (Mellors) lay in a mysterious stillness. What was he feeling? What was he thinking? She (Connie) did not know. He was a strange man to her, she did not know him. She must only wait, for she did not dare to break his mysterious stillness. He lay there with his arms round her, his body on hers, his wet body touching hers, so close. And completely unknown. Yet not unpeaceful. His very stillness was peaceful." (LCL 121)

But for the final Lawrence it is not necessary to know the mystery of sex. A peaceful stillness is enough. No "horror" and no "fascination" as Jessie said of his early feelings. However, is not this "mysterious stillness" itself the cause of the "dirty little secret" he so vehemently abominates in Pornography and Obscenity? "There is only one way: Away with the secret! No more secrecy!" (PAO 76)

And what has recently brought a tremendous publicity to LCL is just this "dirty little secret", which makes sex a furtive and prohibited subject, shameful and spicy smut, raised by the ban of the book and the London trial. There is nothing Lawrence could have hated more than this puritanical conception of the treatment of sex. However, it seems to me that here there is a controversial

question Lawrence puts to himself. He wants to eliminate the secrecy, wants to bring sex fully into the open. But he has a great belief in the mystery of sex, utterly unknown and in the darkness. If sex is properly explained, brought into the open, without secrecy, won't the "mystery of the phallos" (LCL 219) go away? Surely this is a sign of Lawrence's lingering puritanism in LCL. The secrecy must be finished because it is part of the old misconceptions of the "grey puritans" and in LCL Lawrence is anti-puritan, in his way.

Lady Chatterley is representative of all the unsatisfied women in the world. I cannot help thinking that her sexual needs were heavily restrained for almost all the twelve years before she met Mellors. Of course the whole novel unfolds around the fact that she does not want to renounce sex after she feels Mellors' tenderness. If she had renounced Mellors he would have been an affair and there would not have been a "phallic novel", but maybe a love-story with a tragedy. Yet Lawrence says in the beginning of the story:

> "Ours is essentially a tragic age, so we refuse to take it tragically." (LCL 5)

Moreover, he hates tragedy and later on, in a short story, he says: "Tragedy is lack of experience." (SUN, in SPS 217)

Before she meets Mellors, Connie has an affair with Michaelis, one of Clifford's friends and guests. Michaelis is one of those "mental-lifers" whom Connie and Lawrence hate. He is a mistake in Connie's attempt to find a lasting sexual connection. Technically they cannot have complete sexual fulfilment because they do not come together to their orgasm. Connie has to go on holding him after he has finished in a minute. They accuse them-

selves mutually; he of her getting only her own satisfaction; she of "his incomprehensible brutality". (LCL 57) Michaelis is definitely lost in his sexual stupidity like Bertha in her relationships with Mellors. But Connie is going to enter the "phallic consciousness" with Mellors, although I would rather say that she only reaches "sex consciousness", which means conscious of her sexual needs, and this can be classified as a sort of "sex in the head".

Sir Clifford is also a symbolic character. He stands for everything Lawrence hates: a"balless", "brainy", "mental-lifer". Lawrence himself talks about Clifford's paralysis, both physical and symbolical:

> "I have been asked many times if I intentionally made Clifford paralysed, if it is symbolic. And literary friends say, it would have been better to have left him whole and potent, and to have made the woman leave him nevertheless.
>
> As to whether the symbolism is intentional - I don't know. Certainly not in the beginning, when Clifford was created. When I created Clifford and Connie, I had no idea what they were and why they were. They just came, pretty much as they are. But the novel was written, from start to finish, three times. And when I read the first version, I recognized that the lameness of Clifford was symbolic of the paralysis, the deeper emotional or passional paralysis, of most men of his sort and class today." (APL 123)

In Clifford Lawrence presents the complete absence of any connection between mental life and sexual life. Not only because he is physically crippled but also because he is the chief representative of the "greedy mechanical world". His sexual failure can be seen as the failure of Puritanism, because Puritanism rejects the body's life, as something repulsive and mechanical, so

the mechanical images are deflections of mechanical sex, the only admissible form of sex for Puritans. Thus Clifford is the anti-Mellors or the anti-Lawrence and with him and with his ingrained puritanism the Chatterleys and Wragby are going to disappear.

At the beginning of his early period, The White Peacock phase, Lawrence deals with sex originally, but vaguely, and his callowness is evident. The narrator, Cyril-Lawrence- is a"voyeur" and kisser first of all. The real problems of sex are not yet properly focussed and Lawrence displays his inherited puritanism, through his veiled and evasive treatment of sex. In LCL, his last novel, although still lingering in his puritanism he becomes actually anti-puritan, that is, against the old puritan, against the old Lawrence. Then the doctrine of sex he preaches in LCL, the supremacy of the body's life over the mental life, for the necessity of complete sexual fulfilment, is finally embodied in the expression "phallic consciousness".

Since The Rainbow period Lawrence is already initiated and he wants to initiate us in the "phallic mystery" through LCL, which is our bible. Bernard Shaw said that this book should be in the libraries of all schools and that the girls ought to read it in order to get their marriage licenses. (BEA 133) And Lawrence remarks:

> "And in spite of all antagonism, I put forth this novel as an honest, healthy book, necessary for us today. The words that shock so much at first don't shock at all after a while." (APL 87)

What Lawrence tried to do with the four-letter words in LCL he continued in A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover and Pornography and Obscenity: to regenerate them, as I have stated in the

previous chapter. R.E.Pritchard argues:

> "It is doubtful if, for most readers, Lawrence has succeeded in 'cleansing' the four-letter words from obscene associations; in fact, they soon become little more than another motif in the book, little better than Mellors' switching of speech-styles." (BOD 188)

Since I am not concerned with the "cleansing" of these words, the first part of Pritchard's statement is beside the point, because I do not see anything to cleanse in the novel. But surely the treatment of these "tabooed" words becomes "another motif in the book".

Mr. Gerald Gardiner, opening address for the defence in the London trial said:

> "... and this author in a book in which there is no kind of perversion(?)[14] at all evidently thought that in using some words to describe physical union, words which have been part of our spoken speech for 500 or 600 years, he would purify them from the shame which was placed upon them!" (TTL 34)

In fact, before D.H.Lawrence, Joyce(1882-1941), Lawrence Sterne (1713-1768), Fletcher(1579-1625), Shakespeare(1564-1616), and Chaucer(1340-1400) used these words, as good old saxon terms.[15]

In LCL there is nothing of the euphemistic style of The White Peacock: but perhaps Lawrence's residual puritanism is evident in his intention to "purify" the words which describe everything that comes from sex and is considered dirty. His treatment of sex is completely uninhibited rather than brutal, but he refuses to idealize the physical parts. While in The White Peacock there are only kisses, touching, and gazing, and the description of physical parts is avoided, in LCL the lesser the emotions the greater the direct descriptions of thighs, buttocks, loins, bel-

lies, navels, and breasts. (It has been said that Lawrence put the loins into literature.)

Even the physical man in The White Peacock, Annable, is not so frank as Mellors. His account of his first sexual encounter with Lady Crystabel, before they got married, is vague and hazy:

> "... we played a sort of hide and seek with the party. They thought we'd gone, and they went and locked the door. Then she pretended to be frightened and clung to me, and said what would they think, and hid her face in my coat. I took her and kissed her, and we made it up properly."(TWP 176)

This passage is followed by that one paragraph already quoted on page 37 which substituted for the real passage censored by the editor. So the sexual relationships between Annable and Lady Crystabel are obscure because of Lawrence's disguised style.(16) Of course, sometimes in LCL a passage becomes controversial and obscure too because of his bold choice of language. For instance, in Mellors' language, he feels it necessary to use a common person's level of speech. However, some critics think that Mellors' broad dialect is dispensable. I think that Lawrence uses the dialect to reinforce Mellors' tenderness on one hand, and on the other hand the class distinction. He uses the dialect when he speaks of sex and tenderness to Connie or when he argues with Hilda, Connie's conceited sister:

> " 'Not a' that far, I assure you. I've got my own sort o' continuity, back your life. Good as yours, any day. An' if your sister there comes ter me for a bit o' cunt an' tenderness, she knows what she's after. She's been in my bed afore: which you 'aven't, thank the Lord, with your continuity'." (LCL 256)

Lawrence's style is so realistic in LCL that he is able to describe sexual relations without using the four-letter words,

yet convey all the sex thrill of the moment:

> "But then she (Connie) soon learnt to hold him, to keep him there inside her when his crisis was over. And there he was generous and curiously potent; he stayed firm inside her, giving to her, while she was active... Wildly, passionately active, coming to her own crisis. And as he felt the frenzy of her achieving her own orgasmic satisfaction from his hard, erect passivity, he had a curious sense of pride and satisfaction. (LCL 30)

Lawrence does not use the "obscene" words here because this is Connie's point of view of what is going on. Certainly a man cannot "feel" this (and Michaelis, the partner in this passage, reacts against this sort of experience); Lawrence succeeds in being true to woman's psychology, yet less "mystical" than in Women in Love.

When Mellors has his tender meetings with Connie then the clarity of style is complete, and of course he uses all the words without any mild or masked expression:

> " 'Th'art good cunt, though, aren't ter? Best bit o' cunt left on earth. When ter likes! When tha'rt willin'!"(LCL185)

And he goes like this for a long time, talking about how good are cunts, arses, and fucks. The words do not hurt the lady and I do not see how they can be considered pornographic in this context. Try to substitute for each "cunt" a "vagina" (which is not a synonym at all) and for each "fuck" a "copulate", and you'd better throw the book in the waste-paper basket. But the critics' standards have generally been too different from mine, and they have reacted violently against the propriety of Lawrence's choice of vocabulary. They are mostly puritanical. I think that in the sanctuary of the book these words are in the right place.

Maybe they are the truth some critics dare not face. Lawrence himself says that books like LCL are "necessary for us today."

Lawrence not only wants to "purify" these words but also the physical acts in which they are used. He denounces the false puritan morality that considers these acts of the body dirty and shameful, and in this respect he becomes an anti-puritan. He reinstates the necessity of purifying sexual acts as a means of awakening to life. In LCL, through Connie-Mellors' relationships, he tries to give meaning and beauty to the sexual act when it is considered by the puritans only a necessary mechanical function. His method is to describe in detail the different stages of sexuality, from the simple preliminary acts of tenderness to the orgasmic crisis. Examining some passages from page 120 to 185, we can see how difficult it is for Lawrence to overcome the natural inadequacy of words to describe sexual sensations. The orgasm is especially almost indescribable because it really is part of our mysterious and unknown self. The fact is that no other pleasure, no other bit of happiness can be compared to the pleasure of the paroxysm of the final crisis of coition. Freud asserts:

> "The most intense pleasure of which man is capable, (is) the pleasure in the performance of the sexual act." (GIP 365)

One can see how the spirit that animates this part of the novel (pp. 120-185) could be divided in a set of erotic phases, from touching and tenderness to orgasm and "phallic mystery". In the first passage the sexual act is tender and only later on the woman is aware of the man's mysterious stillness:

> "Then with a quiver of exquisite pleasure he touched the warm soft body, and touched her navel for a moment in a

kiss. And he had to come in to her at once, to enter the peace on earth of her soft, quiescent body. It was the moment of pure peace for him, the entry into the body of the woman.

She lay still, in a kind of sleep, always in a kind of sleep. The activity, the orgasm was his, all his, she could strive for herself no more. Even the tightness of his arms round her, even the intense movement of his body, and the springing of his seed in her, was a kind of sleep, from which she did not begin to rouse till he had finished and lay softly panting against her breast."(LCL 120)

Despite the sweet tenderness of the first contact and the peace which is only possible through fulfilment, the vision is that of an unsatisfied female; "the orgasm was his, all his." Her sensations and her reasons are really unutterable. Later on her erotic performance reaches a worse condition:

"And this time the sharp ecstasy of her own passion did not overcome her; she lay with her hands inert on his striving body, and do what she might, her spirit seemed to look on from the top of her head, and the butting of his haunches seemed ridiculous to her, and the sort of anxiety of his penis to come to its little evacuating crisis seemed farcical. Yes, this was love, this ridiculous bouncing of the buttocks, and the wilting of the poor, insignificant, moist little penis. This was the divine love! After all, the moderns were right when they felt contempt for the performance; for it was a performance. It was quite true, as some poets said, that the God who created man must have had a sinister sense of humor, creating him a reasonable being, yet forcing him to take this ridiculous posture, and driving him with blind craving for this ridiculous performance. Even a Maupassant found it a humiliating anti-climax. Men despised the sexual intercourse, and yet did it.

Cold and derisive, her queer female mind stood apart, and though she lay perfectly still, her impulse was to

> heave her loins, and throw the man out, escape his ugly grip, and the butting over-riding of his absurd haunches. His body was a foolish, impudent, imperfect thing, a little disgusting in its unfinished clumsiness. For surely a complete evolution would eliminate this performance, this 'function'." (LCL 178)

This scene is the negation of everything that happens not only in the previous passage but in the whole book. The style is an analogy of the description of the mechanical process. It is Lawrence who is thinking, playing Connie's part in the copulation, for her mind is dissociated from the act. There is no tenderness and no fulfilment. Neither has achieved orgasm, I mean real and complete, for he has only a "little evacuating crisis", an excretory activity. At the end the intercourse becomes "disgusting" and there is a sudden awareness of the "clumsiness" of the "performance". The "springing of the seed" is now an "evacuating crisis", implicitly repulsive and deprived of pleasure. Four times Lawrence says that the act is a "performance" and that performance is "ridiculous", because it implies the mechanization of sex, so contrary to the tender sexuality. Let's note the heavy tone of the adjectives. Instead of the "sheer sensuality" he preaches, Lawrence feels that everything is "farcical, sinister, humiliating, ugly, absurd, foolish, impudent, and disgusting." This distaste which Lawrence attributes to Connie is certainly a sign of his residual puritanism. This is the voice of the old unconscious puritan inside the new Lawrence. Only a puritan can find the sexual act ridiculous and disgusting.

But the sexual acts really belong to our animal nature and when we cannot achieve the orgasm like the couple in the passage

above, it is understandable that we may feel the sense of ridicule and disgust in sex. Freud says about our animal nature:

> "Não devemos ensoberbecer-nos tanto, a ponto de perder completamente de vista nossa natureza animal, nem esquecer tampouco que a felicidade individual não deve ser negada pela civilização."(CLP 50) (17)

Lawrence would have liked what Manuel Bandeira, one of the major Brazilian poets, says about the separateness of the body:

> "Deixa nossos corpos falarem
> e se tocarem;
> somente os corpos se entendem
> porque eles são simples.
> Nossas mentes são muito complicadas,
> portanto, elas não podem se entenderem."(MAB 93)

However, he would have claimed that this division of mind and body is the same as the sense of the body as a machine.

Two pages further in the book Lawrence unfolds a second stage of the same sexual act previously described, when the bodies, free of that stupid mentalization, find themselves in the "primordial tenderness" and in the "mystery of the phallus". The couple achieve a full orgasm together and they know the "sheer sensuality" which is only possible through what Lawrence calls "phallic consciousness".

Lawrence never realized the full power of the phallus and whenever he comes to this "sheer sensuality" there is a "strange darkness." The theme of "darkness" seems related to his dislike for "daylight" sex or self-conscious sex. Freud might say he carries it to an extreme because it represents a temptation. "Darkness" implies an unknown and unutterable temptation for Lawrence. The phallus as a symbol is always a mystery too. Sometimes the

"darkness" is present in his controversial passages about anality. His style becomes obscure and unclear: the "darkness" is a kind of self-censorship. It has already happened in The Rainbow and in Women in Love. In LCL at least twice Lawrence introduces characteristic scenes of anal sex, in a kind of haze, ambiguously unfolded. This is really odd in Lawrence, the contradictory preacher, who is always fighting for clarity and against secrecy. Yet if he finds anal intercourse with woman valid, why doesn't he describe it with the same words which he uses to describe the normal sexual act? We have already seen how he uses an idyllic language in his early period. But in LCL his treatment of sex is always precise and clear, down to his restoration of the four-letter words. Dealing with anality his style is obscure and he says it is necessary "to purify the body into purity with the fire of sheer sensuality".(LCL 258) "Sheer sensuality" here means to go to the last extremes of heterosexuality.

R.E.Pritchard says that anal intercourse in LCL has the same meaning as in the context of Women in Love:

> "... (it) echoes the description of Birkin before his anal intercourse with Ursula: which is what Connie is subjected to by Mellors, to restore his male supremacy."(BOD 193)

In the first scene Mellors and Connie are "running out stark naked in the rain". He is watching her "wet back leaning forward in flight, the rounded buttocks twinkling: a wonderful cowering female nakedness in flight," and after this, he takes hold of her "tail"...:

> "The rain streamed on them till they smoked. He gathered her lovely, heavy posteriors one in each hand and pressed

> them in towards him in a frenzy, quivering motionless in the rain. Then suddenly he tipped her up and fell with her on the path, in the roaring silence of the rain, and short and sharp, he took her, short and sharp and finished, like an animal." (LCL 231)

Of course the passage is ambiguous but I am not forcing on it any conclusion to which critics like Daleski, Ford, and Pritchard have not already come.

Daleski has several objections to the way in which Lawrence presents this sort of buggery in LCL, but he also argues that

> "the experience is overtly presented as a necessary purification: the 'sensual fire', and we note how fire images recur throughout the passage, burns out 'false shames' and smelts out 'the heaviest ore of the body into purity'." (TFF 305)

But where is Connie's participation in the "purification"? Mellors is only interested in her "posteriors" and finishes "like an animal". Odd enough, because given a choice, animals prefer the other opening. I do not see how this passage helps Lawrence in his attempt to purify human relationships through the sex relation. This time Mellors seems to be one of those persons Lawrence so vehemently denounces as a case of "sex in the head". And it is generally agreed that Mellors stands for Lawrence in LCL.

A second passage presents anality less ambiguously though it too is often obscure:

> "It was a night of sensual passion, in which she was a little startled and almost unwilling: yet pierced again with piercing thrills of sensuality, different, sharper, more terrible than the thrills of tenderness, but, at the moment, more desirable. Though a little frightened, she let him have his way, and the reckless, shameless sensua-

> lity shook her to her foundations, stripped her to the very last, and made a different woman of her. It was not really love. It was not voluptuousness. It was sensuality sharp and searing as fire, burning the soul to tinder.
>
> Burning out the shames, the deepest, oldest shames, in the most secret places. It cost her an effort to let him have his way and his will of her. She had to be a passive, consenting thing, like a slave, a physical slave. Yet the passion licked round her, consuming, and when the sensual flame of it pressed to her bowels and breast, she really thought she was dying: yet a poignant, marvellous death." (LCL 258)

I think that here there is ambiguity of expression but not of action. G.Wilson Knight [18] brings another form of justification for this passage when he says:

> "Lawrence is trying to blast through... degradation to a new health... So the deathly is found to be the source of some higher order of being; contact with a basic materiality liberates the person." (TFF 305)

After this sort of sexual practices Connie is musing on "all the stages and refinements of passion... ten thousand years ago! The same thing on the Greek vases..."(LCL 258)

> "The allusions to Abélard and the Greek vases... Clifford's reference (in a letter to Connie) to Mellors' apparent liking for using his wife(Bertha), 'as Benvenuto Cellini says', 'in the Italian way'..."(TFF 304)

Such evidence, Daleski says, is all inconclusive but certainly points to Mellors' sexual practices with his wife Bertha and, in particular, to anal intercourse with Connie.

What happened "ten thousand years ago"? Presumably the destruction of Sodom, whence the term "sodomy", which means "unnatural connection through the anus or between male persons."[19] This is the theme that likewise can be seen in ancient Greek

vases. Allusions to Sodom, G.H.Ford says, are frequent in Women in Love, which treats of a "dissolution" of civilization, that begins with the "dissolution" of the "old shames". It seems to me that Lawrence, in quest of "sheer sensuality" to purify and quicken the mind, admits even anal sex. Maybe this could help to achieve the "phallic consciousness", but not tenderness.

Another indication is that Mellors - Lawrence - overcomes the natural repulsion toward the anus, the excretory canal. Mellors tenderly touches it and calls it a "secret entrance" and "secret opening." (This would be highly significant to any psychoanalyst!) The passage below occurs between the two anality passages just quoted:

> "And in between, folded in the secret warmth, the secret entrances!
>
> ...
>
> And his finger-tips touched the two secret openings to her body, time after time, with a soft little brush of fire." (LCL 232)

According to Freud, the sort of sexual practice Lawrence brings into the open in LCL is not really perversion:

> "No que diz respeito ao anus, torna-se ainda mais claro que é a repugnância que marca esse objetivo sexual como uma perversão. - A repugnância parece ser uma das forças que levaram a uma restrição do objetivo sexual. - Os que condenam as outras práticas (que sem dúvida tem sido comuns na humanidade desde tempos primitivos) como perversões, estão cedendo a um inequívoco sentimento de repugnância, que os protege de aceitar os objetivos sexuais da espécie." (ETS 153)

So neither Freud nor Lawrence are strongly against "the other sexual practices". Yet anality is a "displacement" of sexual aim which if it is a dominant form of behaviour would signify

some kind of "arrest". In all these "ugly" passages the "demon" that is in Lawrence defeats the anti-puritan. But the so-called "pornographic" passages do not cover more than 30 pages (according to many critics who gave evidence in the London trial), and the whole book has 317. No sane author works through more than 300 pages of a book only to set off 30 pages of sexual matter.

All the characters in LCL are in one way or another aware of the importance of the sex relation in their lives, even Clifford, if for nothing else, for the lack of sex, since he is paralysed, physical and emotionally. As Lawrence says, most men today still suffer from a partial paralysis. Running away from sexual frigidity they trust in a frenzied and perverse sexuality, voraciously looking for strong emotions and also for pornography. They do not know what sex really is. They cannot enter "phallic consciousness" because they are muddled by the fake sensuality of the puritan mind.

Lady Chatterley's Lover is an excellent book to reconcile these men with real sexuality at the level of "phallic consciousness". Although Lawrence was already stigmatized as "obscene" by the fate of The Rainbow, and knew that he was going to have troubles with censure because of the publication of the new book, his deep psychological insight into sexual love, or his doctrine of sex, in this last novel is to assert the primacy of the deepest instinctual forces over a superficial physical attraction. He does not overcome all inadequacies but he is courageously deliberate, and profoundly sincere, a "real" puritan, one might say. F.R.Leavis remarks:

"The spirit that animates the book is that strong vital

> instinct of health to which I have just referred as the spirit of Lawrence's genius." (FRL 71)

If it still is necessary to emphasize Lawrence's residual puritanism in his treatment of sex in Lady Chatterley's Lover, let's listen to Mr. Gardiner's closing speech for the defence at the London trial:

> "All the time, this book was the passionately sincere book of a moralist in the puritan tradition, who believed he had a message for us and the society in which we live, whether we agree with this message or not." (TTL 205)

Chapter VII

CONCLUSIONS

Most of the really great works, the masterpieces of literature, become great because they dare to challenge the formulae, the common-places, and the traditions of the community. These books dare to say something new or something in a new manner.[1] These are the works of men like Aristophanes, Copernicus, Newton, Rabelais, Voltaire, Whitman, Darwin, Nietzsche, Marx, Shaw, Freud, Joyce, and D.H.Lawrence. D.H.Lawrence dares to put sex "fully into the open", to elevate the sexual act to a higher position in human relationships and to cleanse the "dirty secret". P.J. Shepherd adds the point that "his art is the art of exposure and the agony of exposure."(SPS 42)

In his "agony of exposure" Lawrence, striving to finish with the "dirty secret" of sex, becomes a very contradictory person, a man of "double measure", as G.H.Ford states. He insists on the "mystery of the phallus" and the "phallic consciousness" is expected to replace "mental consciousness". The "phallic mystery" is really secret, because even for Lawrence it remains unknown and in the "darkness". Neither Lawrence nor anybody knows exactly the secret of this mystery. As a matter of fact, the "phallic consciousness" in Lady Chatterley's Lover finally becomes nothing more than "sex consciousness", that is, the main

characters are striving for sexual fulfilment. This is true regarding Lawrence's own representative, the natural hero Mellors, the "phallus-bearer". It would be better if the secret of sex remained a mystery, but mystery and secrecy are puritanical by-products of the dirty idea of sex, and Lawrence is, paradoxically, an anti-puritan reformer in this respect, because he wants to end the secrecy.

Two reasons prevent Lawrence from entering wholly in the mystery of the "phallic consciousness". One is moral and the other is physical. The first one is his unconscious puritanism that persecutes him from The White Peacock period to his last days. Struggling with his deeply-rooted conservatism in the field of morality, he arrives at a peculiar paradox. Besides the leader and the prophet, Lawrence as a preacher is an anti-puritanical puritan. While he condemns the "grey puritans", he is a puritan himself, not only because he cannot escape from his background, but also because in his doctrine he preaches the "purification" of every human activity through a puritanic honesty, mentally and materially. In Lady Chatterley's Lover he is still the puritanical author of The White Peacock.

Indeed, it is very paradoxical that a puritan becomes a preacher for sexual freedom. Undoubtedly it is because he came to understand the wrong side of puritanism in The White Peacock period. R.Aldington, having been his acquaintance, is the best biographer to talk about Lawrence's strangeness of spirit and his controversial nature, in the light of Lady Chatterley's Lover:

> "Even Lady Chatterley's Lover, so desperate an attempt of his conscious mind to fly from his unconscious puritanism, is lowered by the fact that it was written less for delight

> in a passionate love affair and joy of a woman's body than as a kind of erotic lesson, a sermon on sex. Clearly, it was a case of 'sex in the head', from every point of view, (such as he was always denouncing in others), since there is every reason to suppose that when he wrote the book he was already virtually if not completely impotent."(PGB 317)

Here is the second reason, the physical one. "Lawrence has been impotent since 1926!" Frieda Lawrence confirmed it to H.T. Moore. (TIH 477) So, when Lawrence was writing his "phallic novel" he was already a dying man, because according to his doctors his tuberculosis could not be cured. Certainly his impotence was due to the illness. The phallus itself is used symbolically by the author of Lady Chatterley's Lover, since in physical fact it was drooping. Here lies all the tragedy! Here lies the "mystery of the phallus" that Lawrence could not understand any more.

Coming from an impotent man, the expression "the root of sanity is in the balls" (LCL 227) would seem farcical. But it proves this man's conviction in sexual fulfilment as a remedy for the rottenness of the mechanical civilization. Together with his motto "Blood is basic!" these assertions represent the cornerstone of his doctrine of the primacy of the body over the intellect. Lady Chatterley's Lover contains the real proofs of how deeply-rooted sex is in his head. The gamekeeper Mellors, despite his tenderness and his tentative "phallic consciousness", so glorifies the acts of sex that he is a clear example of the "sex in the head" which Lawrence abominated. Even Connie has more of "sex consciousness" than of "phallic consciousness". After she meets Mellors and his "sheer sensuality" she cannot renounce sex any more.

The early D.H.Lawrence of The White Peacock is a callow novelist, passionately observing the lyricism of nature. My investigation of his ideas of sex in that period, not only through The White Peacock, but also according to many critics and biographers, leads me to the conclusion that he was a romantic puritan, a man fit to live and write in the world of the senses. From the very beginning the physical world held his attention far more than the spiritual world, and his assertion that the body's life is prior to the mind's life follows.

This natural disposition and the peculiarities of his growing-up in a rural environment are the background of his inadequate sexual development. Moreover, in his adolescence his sexual behaviour was conditioned by two other distinct poles. On one side was Jessie Chambers, his first girl-friend, the woman upon whom his literary career was based, but through whom he had his first sexual frustration; on the other, there was his mother, his first actual love, the glory and disgrace behind his hardly admitted Oedipus complex, who stigmatized his sexual formation for a lifetime.

These peculiar conditions, the fact that his father failed as a father and head of the family, and was a drunkard, and the continuous recurrence of a serious illness - pneumonia - (which later on became tuberculosis), were decisive factors in the formation of childhood traumas. These traumas were never accepted by Lawrence, so they remained unconscious and repressed, and could not be overcome.

These traumas produced in Lawrence what Freud calls "polymorphously perverse disposition" in sexual behaviour, which is

distinguished from normal conduct and which I have traced through this work. Lawrence's neuroses appear (let us summarize) in the following ways:

a. in the necessity to keep the stimulus of skoptophilia (gazing) beyond puberty; we can see this in the manifestation of Cyril's "voyeurism" in The White Peacock, as I pointed out on pages 20-31; (20)

b. in the continuation and increasing importance of archaic traits of infantile sexuality, such as the erotogenic mouth zone; this is also seen through the exclusive insistence on kisses in The White Peacock, (pages 30-31);

c. in the transgression of the incest barrier, through the Oedipus complex; in The White Peacock (p. 36), but especially in Sons and Lovers, this trait is evident in Paul Morel's relationships with his mother, as I noted on pages 16-18; (21)

d. in the insensibility to barriers imposed by disgust or repugnance; this one appears in Lawrence's works through another archaic trait of infantile sexuality, such as the satisfaction through the erotogenic anal zone; there is a strong indication that Lawrence admits anality with women in Women in Love (pp. 46-48), in the Birkin-Ursula relationship, and at least twice in Lady Chatterley's Lover (pp. 82-87) in the Mellors-Connie relationship;

e. in homosexuality. Although it is improbable that Lawrence was a practicing, passive homosexual, this trait is evident in two novels examined in this work: The White Peacock (pp. 33-35) in Cyril-George friendship, and through the Birkin-Gerald relationship in Women in Love (pp. 44-46). In the last novel, Lawrence's

idea of blutbrüderschaft plays an important role, (exactly as it did in his private life) but I think it is of secondary importance;

f. in the transference of the part played by the genital organs to other organs or different areas of the body. Through all his novels we find many passages of sado-masochistic flavour, in The White Peacock, for example, as I noted on pages 32-33.

These systematic observations, based on a literary criticism which holds it impossible to separate Lawrence the writer from Lawrence the man, must be joined to the idea that the author has changed between The White Peacock and Lady Chatterley's Lover, although traces of his "polymorphously perverse disposition" remain in the latter.

From this Freudian point of view, Lawrence's sexuality is somewhat perverse in its development, but that is to say it is "normally" neurotic, as Freud himself would say. As artist, Lawrence overcomes this difficulty through sublimation. But since the negative of perversion is neurosis, again according to Freud, and Lawrence is not a complete neurotic, he must really be a gifted artist, for the gifted artist is the result of a balanced combination of efficiency, perversion, and neurosis.

Certainly Lawrence's deviation from normal sexuality was mainly due to the long mother-son love-attachment. Because of this there is an incompleteness in his sex doctrine. Certainly he is almost always positively emphasizing his "perversions", but he says very little about the instinct of procreation, the final biological reason for sex.

R.Aldington regards Lawrence's changes and phases as re-

presentative of most people's experiences:

> "At forty Lawrence in many ways was much the same kind of person he had been at twenty." (PGB 46)

I think that the late Lawrence of Lady Chatterley's Lover is far from the Lawrence of The White Peacock, but not too far. He has never mastered his "polymorphously perverse" circumstances completely, but he is capable of mature sexual behaviour. He has never abandoned the theme of sex as a motive in human conduct, but in Lady Chatterley's Lover there is a definite change in his view of sex, which is not to be seen with horror any more, but with sincerity and opening.

Little by little, in his philosophical maturity, D.H.Lawrence is bitterly giving up his projects and ideals. He does not strive for blutbrüderschaft any longer; he understands that friendship between man and man is impossible. His ideals of education, leadership, and politics are dropped because of their impracticability. "Rananim", his utopian colony of friendship, freedom, and happiness is slowly evanescing in the distant and lost horizon of his complex existence. His marriage with Frieda is not that example of harmony and comprehension it was in the beginning. He cannot wake up his England from the mortal sleep of industrialism and the mechanical mind. Frieda says that the First World War had already cracked his beliefs in the prospects of human civilization.

But Lawrence has never given up his doctrine whose principal stated motive (more than procreative) is creative and religious, and its second motive is sex. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the first motive in Lady Chatterley's Lover is really sex.

Every critic has seen sex as a vital principle in the Lawrentian universe. (22) The much overworked "phallic symbol" appears in his works as high art, hence he creates the touchstone of his doctrine, "phallic consciousness", the philosophical and symbolical basis of Lady Chatterley's Lover, where sex is a sort of religion, but a religion in which sex substitutes for love.

This aura of "religiousness" is Lawrence's lingering puritanism, which he inherited from his puritan mother. Very soon he rejected the religious doctrine of Puritanism, but the residue of this parental background remained in his unconscious forever and came to surface more times than he was aware of. Once in a while Lawrence admits his puritanic roots, and we have seen how he is taken by a religious zeal to "purify" sex from brutality, shame, furtiveness, and the "dirty secret", and even to "purify" the four-letter words. But how can a puritan fight for sexual freedom? It seems a tremendous contradiction. It is indeed a paradox, but not entirely so. Lawrence repudiates his old puritanism because of all its incongruities and falsities and becomes an anti-puritan. But he proposes to purify the sex relation and to cleanse it of all dirt and falsity, and to elevate it to the dignity of any human act. Thus, really, he becomes an anti-puritanical puritan, as I have said, a romantic puritan.

To pursue his contradictory aims is in a sense a form of self-destruction. He wants to destroy the old Lawrence, the product of English culture, the "son of woman". Hence his symbol is the phoenix, who destroys itself and rises again from the burned nest, with everlasting youth.

To what extent Lawrence succeeds in his doctrine it is not

easy to say. I think that he has not succeeded at all, not yet. Maybe in the near future, as he says, the phallus will be the bridge toward a new tenderness and understanding between man and woman.

Why has he not succeeded? Because there is a gap in his sex doctrine. His "sheer sensuality" is basically perverse, i.e., it is directed with exclusiveness to sex for pleasure, sex for self-realization. Self-realization in the sex sphere is only complete when sex meets the highest demand of species' preservation: procreation. Whenever procreation is completely out of question, as it almost always is in Lawrence's works, we have a case of "sex in the head". Lawrence has always been denouncing this in others, including his wife, but I think that it is now clear that he is an outstanding example of "sex in the head". Of course I am not proposing that sex in Lawrence's head or his way of treating it is lustful, a case of "doggy" sex without any consequence. On the contrary, he tries to focus on sex as something religious and mysterious: the "phallic mystery".

However, the phallus is but a symbol and Lawrence is silent now. He has often been compared, as prophet and puritan, to Carlyle, another conservative revolutionary, who said at the end of his life that he had written "fifty volumes on the virtues of silence." (PGB 125) Whatever Lawrence says he is building up a philosophy of salvation based on the body and on sex and, again, this is clearly to put "sex in the head". His own final judgement is:

> "The tragedy is, when you've got sex in your head, instead of down where it belongs, and when you have to go on cop-

ulating with your ears and your nose." (SPS 294) (23)

D.H.Lawrence was, after all, an anti-puritanical puritan, a self-contradictory neurotic in life. But in art he transcends these limitations, fuses them in a new synthesis, and breaks them into a new dimension of writing.

— o —

APPENDIX

NOTES

1 Title of the work by George H.Ford on D.H.Lawrence

2 Title of Richard Aldington's critical biography on D.H.Lawrence

3 H.T.Moore quotes from Father William Tiverton(D.H.Lawrence and Human Existence,1951) in which he points out that "writers on Lawrence have ... much exaggerated his Oedipus complex".

4 From Lynn Croft, Eastwood, on July 30, 1908; cited in SPS 61.

5 R.H.Poole is co-editor of D.H.Lawrence-A Selection with P.J. Shepherd.

6 Anthony Beal quoted from A D.H.Lawrence Miscellany, edited by H.T.Moore.

7 Lawrence preferred the German term for "blood brotherhood".

8 The original version of The White Peacock is not available now. This censored paragraph is quoted from H.T.Moore's The Intelligent Heart, p. 143.

9 Time, magazine, July 8, 1974, New York.

10 Havelock Ellis is quoted by Irving Wallace in The Seven Minutes.

11 Maurice Girordias, ibidem, op.cit.,p.342.

12 According to Bernard Jones the three versions of Lady Chatterley's Lover are really three novels. The critics do not agree with him generally. He points out: "Although Lawrence pruned the second version drastically in making Lady Chatterley's Lover, the latter, like its predecessor, reflects a hardening and harshening of the sympathies, and, indeed, in spite of the shortening, the third version is both the harder and the harsher of the two."(TLC 49).

13 From an undated and unidentified letter cited by Richard Hoggart in his introduction to the Penguin edition of Lady Chatterley's Lover. (LCL XV).

14 A doubtful point, as we will soon see.

15 These are complementary observations of my own to Irving Wallace's informations, op.cit., p. 211.

16 The name "Lady Crystabel" probably derives from Coleridge's unfinished poem "Christabel" whose heroine is bitten by a "lamia" or snake-woman in a quasi-lesbian encounter. Thus, Christabel becomes herself a kind of vampire. The undertone of perversion in this allusion seems clear.

17 Since an authorized German edition of Freud's works is not available, I used different editions in English, Spanish, and Portuguese; the last one (as it can be seen in the following bibliography) is the standard edition translated directly from James Strachey's English edition.

18 Lawrence, Joyce and Powys, Essays in Criticism, p. 11; quoted by H.M.Daleski, op.cit., p. 305.

19 The Concise Oxford Dictionary, 5th. ed., Oxford, 1966.

20 In the following alphabetical order I am referring to pages in this thesis.

21 Although we cannot talk about incestuous sexual acts in Lawrence's own case.

22 Both Lawrence and Freud were "vitalistic" thinkers, that is, they were influenced by a stream of thought which began with Nietzsche and Schopenhauer, called "vitalism" and was later on developed by Bergson in his Élan Vital. This doctrine is based on Nietzsche's dictum "God is dead" and preaches that life originates from a vital principle distinct from chemical and other physical forces.

23 This is from one of his last letters, quoted from The Collected Letters of D.H.Lawrence, edited by H.T.Moore, Heinemann, 1962, vol. II, p. 726.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Aldington, Richard, Portrait of a Genius, But..., London, W. Heinemann Ltd., 1950

Bandeira, Manuel, Estrela da Vida Inteira, Poesias Reunidas, Rio de Janeiro, Liv. José Olympio Editora, 1966

Beal, Anthony, D.H.Lawrence, Writers and Critics Series, translated by Octávio Alves Velho, Rio de Janeiro, Editora Civilização Brasileira, 1966

Chambers, Jessie (E.T.), D.H.Lawrence - A Personal Record by E.T., London, Frank Cass & Co. Ltd.,2nd. ed., 1965

Ford, George H., Double Measure-A Study of the Novels and Stories of D.H.Lawrence, New York, W.W.Norton, 1965

Freud, Sigmund, A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis, New York, Pocket Books, 24th. ed., 1972

- Obras Completas de Freud, (in Spanish), 3 vols., Madrid, Editorial Biblioteca Nueva, translated directly from German and English originals by Luís Lopes Ballesteros Y de Torres, 1948, vols. 1 and 2; and by Ramón Rey Ardid, 1968, vol.3
- Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Completas de Sigmund Freud, 12 vols., translated directly from the standard ed. by James Strachey, London, Rio de Janeiro, Imago Ed.,1972:

vol. 4, A Interpretação de Sonhos, part I

vol. 5, A Interpretação de Sonhos, part II

Sobre os Sonhos

vol. 7, Fragmento da Análise de um Caso de Histeria

Três Ensaios sobre a Teoria da Sexualidade

Freud, Sigmund, (cont.)

vol. 7, Outros Trabalhos sobre a Psicoterapia
A Sexualidade na Etiologia das Neuroses
Tipos Psicopáticos no Palco

vol. 11, Cinco Lições de Psicanálise
Leonardo da Vinci e uma Lembrança de sua Infância
Perspectivas da Terapêutica Psicanalítica
Contribuições à Psicologia do Amor
Psicanálise Silvestre e Outros Trabalhos

García, Eugene Current, and Patrick, Walton R., What is the Short Story?, Glenview, Ill., Scott, Foresman & Co., 1961

Hough, Graham, The Dark Sun-A Study of D.H.Lawrence, London, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1970

Jones, Bernard, "The Three Ladies Chatterley", essay published in "Books and Bookmen", magazine, issue n. 222, March, London, Hanson Books, 1974

Lawrence, D.H., A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, Penguin Books, 1961

- Fantasia of the Unconscious, idem, 1971
- "Introduction to his Paintings", idem, 1961
- "Introduction to Pansies" (poems), idem, 1961
- Lady Chatterley's Lover, idem, 1971
- "Morality and the Novel", essay, published in R.H.Poole and P.J.Shepherd's D.H.Lawrence-A Selection
- Pornography and Obscenity, Penguin Books, 1961
- Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious, idem, 1971
- Sex, Literature, and Censorship, edited by H.T.Moore, New York, Viking Press, 1959
- Sons and Lovers, Penguin Books, 1970

Lawrence, D.H., (cont.)

-"Sun," a story, published in R.H.Poole and P.J.Shepherd's D.H.Lawrence-A Selection

- The Rainbow, Penguin Books, 1972

- The White Peacock, idem, 1971

-"Two Blue Birds," a short story, published in Eugene Current-García and Walton R. Patrick's What is the Short Story?

- Women in Love, Penguin Books, 1970

Leavis, F.R., D.H.Lawrence-Novelist, London, Chatto & Windus, 1967

Moore, Harry T., The Intelligent Heart-The Story of D.H.Lawrence, Penguin Books, 1960

- Edition, Introduction, and Preface of Sex, Literature, and Censorship, by D.H.Lawrence, New York, Viking Press, 1959

Patrick, Walton R., and García, Eugene Current, What is the Short Story?, Glenview, Ill., Scott, Foresman & Co., 1961

Poole, R.H., and Shepherd, P.J., D.H.Lawrence-A Selection, London, Heinemann, 1970

Pritchard, R.E., D.H.Lawrence: Body of Darkness, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1971

Rolph, C.H., The Trial of Lady Chatterley (the transcript of the trial of London), Penguin Books, 1961

Schorer, Mark, "Introduction to Lady Chatterley's Lover," in A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover, Penguin Books, 1961

Shepherd, P.J., and Poole, R.H., D.H.Lawrence-A Selection, London, Heinemann, 1970

Wallace, Irving, Os Sete Minutos (The Seven Minutes), translated by Milton Persson, Rio de Janeiro, Editora Nova Fronteira, 11th. ed., 1973

Welty, Eudora,"The Reading and Writing of Short Stories", published in Eugene Current-García and Walton R. Patrick's What is the Short Story? , Glenview, Ill., Scott, Foresman & Co., 1961

Wilson, John Burgess, English Literature-A Survey for Students, London, Longmans, 1969

- The Encyclopaedia Britannica
- The Concise Oxford Dictionary, 5th. ed., with corrections,1966
- Pequeno Dicionário Escolar Latino-Português, Pe. H. Koehler