

**CHARACTERIZATION OF CREATIVITY AND ORIGINALITY WITH  
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO D.H. LAWRENCE****Jyoti Gupta <sup>1</sup>, Dr. Babina Bohra <sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, Department of English, Sri Satya Sai University of Technology & Medical Sciences, Sehore, M.P.

<sup>2</sup> Research Guide, Department of English, Sri Satya Sai University of Technology & Medical Sciences, Sehore, M.P.

**Abstract:**

In *The Rainbow* the same moral concern is highlighted, this time not with one but three generations of Brangwens. *The Rainbow* is the saga of a midland family, through three generations, from inarticulate farmer to rootless schoolteachers. Though Lawrence presents a view of the development of English society in the period approximately 1840-1905, from a dream of pastoral community where industrialism is literally only on the horizon, to a nightmare of industrialism, capitalism and competitive individualism, his concern is with three couples engagement in what he sees as the essential struggle for a satisfactory relationship, both between the man and the woman, and between the male principle (physical -intuitive-unitive) and the female principle (idealistic -rational-individualistic). The end of *The Rainbow* marks the beginning of *Women in Love* where Ursula and Birkin determine to carry the dignity and richness found in nature back into the society. One may deny that *Women in Love* is a sequel to *The Rainbow*, but it is, because the third generation of Brangwen's that is Ursula's life spills over in *Women in Love*. This takes up the middle phase of Lawrence's creative career from 1914 to 1920. In this article, characterization of creativity and originality with special reference to D.H. Lawrence has been highlighted.

**Keywords:** Characterization, Creativity, Originality, D.H. Lawrence

**INTRODUCTION:**

Sons and Lovers ended with the lovers parting and the question of life and death. Both were not prepared to deny life, while both feared extinction of their respective life if they remain together. He felt, in leaving her, that he was defrauding her of life. But he knew that in staying instilling the inner, desperate man, he was denying his own life. And he did not hope to give life to her by denying his own. As Lawrence writes in his essay "Why the Novels Matters": "Nothing is important but life. And for him, I can see life nowhere but in the living. Life with a capital 'L' is only man live. All things that are alive are amazing and all things that are dead are subsidiary to the living." (P 532) It is for this reason that although Paul does not achieve wholeness in life he has at least realized the need for it and starts in search of it towards the "city's gold phosphorescence." Instead of the drift towards death he goes in search of life.

As Keith Sagar writes: "It seems that the writing of Sons and Lovers emancipated Lawrence not only from the now restricting influence of the mother, but also from the preoccupation with autobiographical material." (The Art 35) Lawrence continues to explore his personal problems in his fiction, but there is from now on a highly developed awareness of, for example, the social implications of the sexual lives of individuals.

Women in Love, therefore, does depend upon to the knowledge arising out of her frustrations in love with Skrebensky. The Rainbow is therefore not closed in the ending. F.R. Leavis also praises Lawrence's rendering of the continuity and rhythm of life. The continuity of The Rainbow in Women in Love is seen in the first chapter itself and also the earlier title of the novel The Sisters, for Ursula and Gudrun occupy the centre-stage or Brangwen sisters. The novel begins with a discussion on the possibility of marriage, and ends with one on the possibility of a further relationship beyond marriage, a relationship between men. In each case, the relationship is more than a private one, and has implications for society as a whole. The individual consciousness needs to be in harmonious relationship with the "other" — the sensual being, the other person, society at large.

**THE RAINBOW:**

The novel begins with a beautiful sensuous lyricism, establishing Lawrence's male and female duality. It is the man who has the physical intuitive blood-intimacy with nature that leaves their

intellect inert, while it is the woman, looking up to the church and city beyond, who aspire to the development of mind and individualism. The first Brangwen couples are in a harmonious relationship with each other. The Rainbow begins with the history of Brangwen generations, but this archetypal pattern is only used to emphasize the “basic and opposite impulses within all people and relationships: the impulse to be one with all created nature through the body and the senses and the opposite impulse to become individual, to know, to act upon the ‘other,’ in separateness and differentiation.”(Weekes, Interpretation of The Rainbow 131) The Brangwens lived in “blood -intimacy” with the changing seasons, the soil, the vegetation and the animals. It is the flow of vitality, the whole “man alive” in subtle interrelatedness with the cosmos. And this subtle interrelatedness, one becomes aware of earth enacting a human process and of the human being enacting earthly process, fulfilling itself within and in vital connection with the impersonal natural forces. It was virtually unconscious and mindless life rhythmically uniting man with the wider universe in oneness. The Brangwen content themselves in unconscious communion with teeming life. But Brangwen women make us aware of the opposite impulse towards a different kind of life. While sharing “the drowse of blood intimacy” (R 42) with their men, the Brangwen women crave for the mind -knowledge and experience of the wider world beyond the intimate and restricted life of the Marsh farm. It was something that threatens to break up the timeless intimacy between man and nature. The blood knowledge a scribed to the earlier generations of Brangwen men is broken by the steady encroachment of expanding industrialism—the high canal embankment, the railway and the colliery. It is a byproduct of the world of beyond which appeals to the women. The death of Tom Brangwen in the flood that swallows up the Marsh farm signifies the end of the natural connection to the earth, of the non -mental “blood-intimacy” with the primal sources. The integration of the everyday life and the cosmos in the creative balance is never again achieved in this novel. The narrative maintains the dialectical polarity between the instinctual and the conscious requirements for life and the struggle toward a synthesis of perfectly integrated human -being continues for three generations. David Cavitch writes: “Pairs of lovers marry and find their psychological differences heal o r aggravate the internal conflict that afflicts them as separate persons.” (New World 39) The Rainbow , is a family chronicle novel which assumes not only that generations are generated, but that the relationship between husband and wife is the central fact of human existence, that the living nucleus of this relationship is the act of sexual union, that the fact of sexual union is infinitely serious complex

and difficult, and that act of such radiant significance must be fairly treated by the honest novelist as Lawrence does.

Easily the most encompassing of Lawrence's works, the novel traces, to begin with the history of Alfred Brangwen. He had married a woman from Heanor, the daughter of the "Black Horse." She was a slim, pretty dark woman. She was oddly a thing to herself rather querulous in her manner. So that when she raised her voice against her husband in particular and again everybody else after him, only made those who heard her wonder and feel affectionately towards her, even while they were irritated she always railed long and loud about her husband, though her husband would laugh what she said away. He calmly did as he liked, laughed of her railing, excused himself in a teasing tone that she loved him. As Lawrence writes: "they were two very separate beings, vitally connected, knowing nothing of each other, yet living in their separate ways from one root." (R 48)

They had four sons and two daughters. But while she railed, Alfred mostly, unlike Walter Morel took it lightly. The eldest of Alfred couple, a boy ran away early to sea, and did not come back. This was like the death of William in *Sons and Lovers*. The second boy Alfred, whom the mother admired most, was the most reserved. But he could not pull himself along in his schooling but somehow became draughtsman. Frank, the third son, refused from the first to have anything to do with learning. The last child, Tom was considerably younger than his brothers, so had belonged rather to the company of his sisters. Indeed he was like Paul. He went to school but unwillingly. Keith Sagar states that: "Tom, the youngest child of a large family was his mother's favorite and carried the burden of her hopes." (*The Art of Lawrence* 47) At twelve, she sent him away to grammar school; but he could not force his unintellectual nature to fit her conception. Therefore, he was glad to leave school and to get back to the farm where he felt that he was in his own.

Tom Brangwen, at nineteen, was a youth fresh like a plant, rooted in his mother and in his sisters. But he started mixing up with prostitutes, quite early in his life and though he felt shocked over his sexual contacts, he wanted to find in a woman the embodiment of all his inarticulate, innate desires.

Lawrence equates sex with life, not that it is the source of present life but also of individuals. His first affair with a woman in a common public house did not much matter but the business of love

for him was the most serious in terrifying of all his experiences so far. Sex now tormented him. What prevented his returning to a loose woman was not much his inhibition but the experience gave him the sense of nothing.

Tom felt the risk of repetition of it. Nevertheless, the desire to have sex would not leave him alone. He always thought of woman, day in and day out and that infuriated him. He remained dissatisfied. His association with a girl at this stage was equally frustrating. Lawrence shows simultaneously Tom's attraction and repulsion for sex. The *Rainbow* discloses itself poignantly and most crucially in the sexual histories of individuals. The revolutionary nature of *The Rainbow* is, then, twofold: "It is the first English novel to record, normality and significance of physical passion, and it is the only English novel to record with a prophetic awareness of consequences, the social revolution whereby Western man lost his sense of community and men — more especially woman - learned, if they could, that there's no help any longer except in the individual and in his capacity for a passional life." (Quoted Spilka, *Essays* 34)

He had innate desire to find a woman embodying all his "inarticulate, powerful religious impulse" (R 54) at the same time "desiring the satisfaction of a voluptuous woman." (R 60) He was spontaneously drawn toward, Lydia. The mere sight of the stranger transported him a far off world "beyond reality." It was something natural as Lawrence called it "Holy Ghost," that this spontaneous attraction was magnetic rather than a deliberate and mental liking. He was pleased with her strangeness, mystery and self-possession which set "Tom's imprisoned self-free." (R 71) Tom and Lydia were utter strangers and yet they seemed drawn towards each other like the opposite poles by the unknown forces. Lawrence puts: "A daze had come over his mind; he had another centre of consciousness. Sometimes in his body another activity had started which he was unable to know except that this transfiguration burned between him and her, connecting them like a secret power." (R 74) Lawrence explains the organic growth of consciousness towards full individuality. The unconscious is the soul from which all life springs. For Lawrence unconscious is the active, self-evolving soul bringing forth its own incarnation and self-manifestation which is the whole good of life and consciousness is like a web woven finally in the mind from the various silken strands spun forth from the prime centre of consciousness. So attraction between Tom and Lydia was not the common attraction of a man for a woman. It was a more primitive theory. Lawrence takes us beneath the surface of their personalities where the

unconscious self was slowly emerging to form connection without the knowledge of the character. Instinctively both wanted to come closer to arrive at a new form of life, completing each other. This was what brought them together in marriage. In the fullness of their passion they were able to abandon their personalities. They met not as personalities, but as essential selves. The sacredness of these encounters was conveyed by a timeless silence and stillness surrounding them.

But Lawrence writes in his essay that balance is always flickering. Tom gradually became desperate and obviously lost his understanding. David Cavitch writes: "After their marriage Lydia's firm and mysterious separateness that so used him, and which he still values, continues intermittently to irritate him." (New World 43) She loses herself in thought about her past or she becomes fully absorbed with maternal cares, while Tom waits, sometimes bitterly, to be admitted again to her life. His blood stirred to life as and when she opens towards him. But these moments were few and far between. She belonged elsewhere and he lost his peace of mind. She might go away. Then she was with the child and he had to learn to contain himself. He was deposed as Gertrude deposed Walter, he was cast out. This followed a battle. He hated her that she was not there for him. But Tom was impatient, cold; he also called her selfish, only caring about herself. He put a lot of other abuses on her, that she was a foreign with a bad nature, caring really about nothing, having no proper feeling at the bottom of her heart and no proper niceness. He fumed and fretted. But he was equally afraid of her; primarily because she was great with his child and that it was his turn to submit.

There was a slight contraction of pain at his heart, a slight tension in his brows. Something he wanted to grasp and could not. While she lives with him, giving him her weight and her strange confidence, she seemed so absent. Tom did not know the mystery. So close on him she lay and yet she answered him from so far away. His first experience was none too happy; she appeared drifting away from him. They were such strangers. Lawrence underlines here and elsewhere that love between sexes should be more awakened more responsive, to be lived and enjoyed, not by the force of metaphysics but in full awareness that it is a meeting of two bodies and souls, beyond any end and purpose. The essential of sexual meeting should be the reciprocation of love on both sides. During the last month of her pregnancy, Tom felt all the more miserable because she did not want him at all, she did not want even to be made aware of him. He then started

enjoying the company of Anna. So much so that even after the birth of his own son he loved Anna. He was happy that she was the mother of his son. As Lawrence states in his essay "Morality and the Novel" that:

A new relation, a new relatedness hurts somewhat in the attaining, and will always hurt... each time we strive to a new relation which anyone or anything, it is bound to hurt somewhat. Because it means the struggle with and the displacing of old connections and this is never pleasant. (P 531)

But when Lydia opened her soul to him, Tom realized her otherness. Gradually he learnt to accept "the non-human, dread evoking quality of Lydia which is nothing but her otherness." (Adamowski 60) In the "Study of Thomas Hardy," Lawrence writes: "Every individual must be born to the knowledge that other things exist beside himself, and utterly apart from all, and before he can exist himself, as a separate identity, he must allow and recognize their distinct existence." (P 453) Lawrence believed that when one has a complete and finished mental concept of the other person, "it is the end of all relationships, for the nearer mental conception comes towards finality, the 'dynamic flow' out of which the relationship emerges draws to a close." (FU 71 -72) There is an inviolable gap between the known self and the other which must forever remain unknown. "This known self-personality is a mask" (P 379) which is nothing but the self-conscious ego. The contact with otherness can only be had when one is able to tear the mask, to abandon the conscious self or ego and tries to establish a direct rapport. And this is what Tom came to realize, after some flickering of balance in their relationship. The conflict in their married life was superficial and did not involve victory or defeat, dominance or sub-servience of one by the other. Lawrence describes success of their marriage in religious terms using words like "transfiguration, baptism, an accession to higher plane of being." (R 133) The birth of new impersonal selves takes place by "leaping off into the unknown." (P 441) In this regard Graham Hough remarks that "the intense polarity is never a fixed relation, but rather a matter of momentary revelations." (Dark Sun 228) The fulfillment achieved by Tom and Lydia was complete as both were reborn in their personal selves. Perfectly polarized they felt connected with the greater mystery of their natural surroundings. Although this complete confirmation is preceded by a long process of exploration and experimentation, insecurity and apprehension, the transfiguration. Lydia tried to build the relationship on the stable soil of

equality: “She waited for him to meet her, not to bow before her, serve her. She wanted his active participation and not his submission.”( R 132) Gradually he began to flow spontaneously to her and their two potent presences sustain their family. Anna felt that her father had “a strong, dark bond with her mother, a potent intimacy that existed inarticulate and wild, following its own course and savage if interrupted uncovered.” ( R 143) When they are old the quality of separate relatedness that shines in their married relationship gets sprinkled over the whole Brangwen family: “His wife was there with him, a different being from himself, yet somewhere vitally connected with him... His two sons were... men distinct from himself. It was all adventures and puzzling. Yet one remained vital within one’s own existence, whatever the off shoots.” (R 285) As Lawrence, again and again emphasized, morality lies in this separate relatedness among individuals. “After this acceptance of wholeness, independence of each other’s flesh, Tom and Lydia can relate to each other, forming a protective arch over Anna who is now released from their emotional demands to fulfill herself.” (Pritchard 69)

### **WOMEN IN LOVE:**

At the end of *Sons and Lovers* a man is born, at the end of *The Rainbow* a woman, and in *Women in Love* a man and a woman and their marriage. Here is a simple formula, too simple perhaps to execute for the complex structures of the novels at hand, yet suitable enough for the conscious attempt on Lawrence’s part, to work out the conditions of manhood, womanhood and marriage, as he experienced or understood them in his own life. There is no doubt, that Rupert Birkin in *Women in Love* is a further projection of Paul Morel in *Sons and Lovers*. Birkin is a man who wrestles with his own soul; like Paul Morel, he strives to understand what happens inside as well as around himself. It is not superimposition of a theory. “It is a passionate struggle into conscious being.” (Spilka, *Love Ethic* 121)

The theme is established early. Gudrun sees Gerald Crich, young colliery owner, in the first scene of the book and knows at once that she is to be deeply involved with him. Ursula meets Birkin, the inspector of schools, in her class room not long after and the rest of the book works out relationship of two couples. Like many other novels, *Women in Love* takes two couples and develops their relationships, and the affair of one goes wrong and those of other go right. As Graham Hough writes: “Power is the right word here, for Lawrence is extremely concerned about dominance and submission in love and the relation between men and women is more like



fight than a friendship.”(Dark Sun 77) We have already noticed the growing strain of violence in *The Rainbow*. It appears more nakedly in *Women in Love*, because the characters are no longer rooted in any settled ground. In *The Rainbow* the farm and the church, the twin cycles of the agricultural and Christian year provide an element of permanence and therefore of rest. Marriage until Ursula begins to grow up means a family and children; but the chief actors of *Women in Love* are both professionally emancipated and spiritually uprooted. And a correspondingly great strain is thrown on their private relations. All are aware of this, all are in search of something and the leader is Birkin, the representative of Lawrence himself. Alastair remarks that in *The Rainbow*, Ursula struggles “to take her place within the social world.” The fact, however, is that the Ursula of *Women in Love* “no longer sees herself as a social being.” She is focused exclusively on her own being. (Leavis, *Novelist* 113) *Women in Love* examines the unconscious roots of bitterness and immorality in relations,

more analytically than *The Rainbow*, for in contrast to the preceding saga of Bmagwen life. *Women in Love* treats experience that is individual rather than familial.

The analysis of individual consciousness, however, is the principle intent of the novel, and the sense that grave troubles infect us is established in the first chapter. Ursula and Gudrun sitting in the window bay of their parent’s substantial house in Beldover, where Ursula recuperated at the end of *The Rainbow*, discuss love and the prospect of marriage. They are afraid that all married men are bores and that married life will not sustain the sense of heightened significance, the romantic vividness that they require in life. Ursula complains that marriage is more than likely to be “the end of experience.”

However, Lawrence believed as Cavitch put it that: “though marriage offers the only opportunity for profound self -fulfillment, it paradoxically makes the severest attack upon one’s separate identity.” (New World 63) As an aid to maintaining “equilibrium” Birkin recommends another bond outside of marriage. He looks to manly love as a necessary support to marriage and as a liberating extension of our unconscious life into a revived civilization. Quite early in the book, in the conversation with Ursula and Hermione in the classroom, Birkin makes his position if not clear, at least definite:

“But do you really want sensuality?” she asked puzzled Birkin looked at her, and became intent in his explanation. “Yes,” he said, “that and nothing else, at this point. It is a fulfillment the great

dark knowledge you can't have in your head —the dark involuntary thing. It is a death to one's self but it is coming into being of another." "But how? How can you have knowledge not in your head?" she asked quite unable to interpret his phrases.

"In the blood": he answered; "when the mind and known world is drowned into darkness everything must go there must the deluge. Then you find yourself a palpable body of darkness, a demon..." (WL 43)

And it is apparent; this is not Birkin, but Lawrence himself talking. When Birkin share the mystic desire for the dissolution of the ego, the daily conscious

self, he looks for it, not in any of the traditional disciplines but in man -woman relationship alone.

What are the conditions of a perfected relation between man and woman, which Birkin struggles to define in *Women in Love*? Its first instance lies in the early chapters, when Birkin tries to rid himself of his former mistress Hermione Roddice. Like so many Laurentian figures, Hermione depends too heavily upon one or two elements of being: will, spirit and intellect are fused within this woman, into a single passion for final abstract knowledge. Such knowledge means power to Hermione, power to hold all life within the scope of her conscious intellect, to reduce them to finite particles of thought and to reduce even Birkin to his abstract spiritual essence and it is here with reference to Hermione's lust for knowledge that Lawrence strikes most deeply into the problem of diseased intellectualism. As Hermione cries that: "there can be no reason, no excuse for education, excepts the joy and beauty of knowledge in itself... nothing has meant so much to me in all life, as certain knowledge... yes it is the greatest thing in life to know. It is really to be happy, to be free." (WL 20) But Birkin, the Laurentian hero, argues that knowledge is a finite, bottled sort of attainment, and that true liberty or spontaneity, can never be known, in the strictest sense of the world, but only experienced by the emotional self, and then treated with proper reverence by mind.

Hermione like a typical wasterlander, fears the deeper realities and prefers to live merely from the upper centers of her being. She is " a woman of the new school full of intellectuality, and heavy, nerve worn with consciousness.. She was a man's woman; it was the manly world that held her." (WL 15-16) Charles Rossman rightly observes: "behind her veneer of culture, she is as

hollow as Skreb ensky.”(You are The Call 274-75) She is willful and believes in the one up — one down kind of relationship. It may be deduced from her treatment of the stag in her park. She looks at and talks to it “as it too was a boy, she wanted to wheedle and fondle. He was male so she must exert some kind of power over him.” (WL 88) She again displays her will to possess another being like a mere object when she prevents her male cat from drinking the cream she herself has put before it: “It was always the same, the joy in power she manifested, peculiarly in power over any male being.” (WL 30) She believes: “If only we could learn how to use our will... we could do anything.” (WL 139) She tries to make Birkin also the victim of her wicked will. It is Hermione who turns out to be the real culprit. But Birkin, like Ursula feels himself tied up “possessed by her as it were his fate, without question.” (WL 22) So he opposes her will to possess him as a love object: “you want to clutch things and have them in your power. You have no sensuality. You have only your will and your conceit of consciousness and your lust for power, to know.”( WL 41-42) Her love for Birkin is not a passion, but a bullying will to have liar in her power.

Hermione, despite all her material possessions, feels defenseless because she has no intrinsic confidence: “It was a lack of robust self, she had no natural sufficiency, and there was a terrible void, a lack, a deficiency of being within her.”( WL 16) She wants Birkin to “close up this deficiency to close it forever.”( WL 16) This shirking of life responsibility on her part irks Birkin. He hates her and tries “to break away from her finally to be free.”( WL 17) She vainly believes in her power to keep him but “underneath she know the split was coming and her hatred of him was subconscious and intense.”( WL 98)

Birkin himself is somewhat “perverse,” but his redeeming features like that of Ursula, is his spontaneity and his intrinsic faith in his deeper self. Hermione hates him “for his irresponsible gaiety; because of his power to escape, to exist, other than she did.”( WL 92) Birkin, on the other hand, believes in the intrinsic uniqueness of a being “as a separate as one star is from another, as different in quality and quantity. One man isn’t any better than another, not because they are intrinsically other, that there is no term of comparison.”(WL103-04) This unwavering faith in the uniqueness of individuals is strictly foreign to Hermione’s willful mind. She is full of “violent waves of hatred and loathing of all he said.” (WL 104) But he is going to be cowed down no more by her egoistic tricks. He has already begun to recede back from her deathly contact. What

Characterizes Birkin's action throughout the novel is a search for transcendent states of being, and that search draws him away from women, not toward them? When Hermione realizes that he is trying to get rid of her, she starts hating him: "her whole mind was a chaos... herself struggling to gain control with her will." (WL 104) She even attacks him with a paper weight out of her desperation. As cannot put up any more with Hermione and her ruthless will, he thinks it better to drift away from her finally and forever. In this way "a complete estrangement" (WL 104) sets in between them. He seeks solace in the lap of nature, and finds the desired relief there: "Birkin feels tired and weak, but relieved and, in a strangely Dantesque manner purged of the fast remnants of his diseased love for Hermione." (Spilka, Love Ethic 133) The epiphanic experience he has immediately after Hermione's attack absolves him of his past relations, releases his primal being in its pure nakedness and prepares the meeting ground with Ursula.

As Mark Spilka comments that, in the relation between man and woman, Lawrence called for balance or "polarity," as if between "two oppositely charged entities," (Love Ethic 10) or he placed the marriage unit itself in balance with the world of purposive activity —so that the protagonists of his novels must also be in tune, as it were, with the world around them. In other words, they must achieve infinity of pure relations with the living universe: first with each other, through love then with other men and women through friendship and creative labor; and finally even with birds, beasts and flowers, which play a vital role in all the novels. And here lies seeds of Laurentian morality not in any religion or sect.

And morality lies in what Birkin calls "star -equilibrium" and he sets it forth in opposition to Ursula's belief that love surpasses the individual, and to Hermione's belief in spiritual and abstract communion. Such forms of love involve the loss of self - hood, they depend upon the ancient theory that men and women are but broken fragments of one whole, while Birkin insists that men and women have been singled out from an original mixture into pure individuality; they must polarize rather than merge in love—hence "star - equilibrium": a pure balance of two single being, as the stars balance each other. Birkin believes that love is not an "absolute," but only "a part of human relationship." As Lawrence writes in Aaron's Rod:

Two eagles in the mid air, grappling, whirling, coming to their intensification of love oneness there in midair. In midair the love consummation but all the time each lifted on its own wings:

each bearing itself up on its own wings at every moment of the mid air love consummation. That is the splendid love way. (AR 196)

It is through these symbols of love and sex that Lawrence brings home his moral point that if love is egoism and sex is propagation of the species which, of course, is an extension of egoism, then love is nothing. It is not that love is and cannot be a perfect consummation of two egoless persons. Indeed, Birkin knows that his life rested with Ursula. But he does not want that type of love which she offers. Lawrence always points out the old ways of loving in having the other in possession, is vulgarization of love. In the chapter "Man to Man," Lawrence writes in this context: "the old way of love seemed a dreadful bondage, a sort of conscription. What was in him, he did not know, but the thought of love, marriage and children and a life lived together, in the horrible privacy of domestic and connubial satisfaction, was repulsive."( WL 223) Further Birkin wants something clearer, more open, and cooler as it is. The hot narrow intimacy between man and wife is abhorrent. The way they shut their doors, these married people and shut themselves into their own exclusive alliance with each other, even in love, disgusts him. According to Birkin it is a whole community of mistrustful couples insulated in private houses or private rooms, always in couples, and no further life. The charge against Lawrence is that he propagates promiscuity and even homosexuality appears. This is placed in the context of Birkin's view on narrow coupling, for even when joined together in their love and domesticity they remain separate suspicious of each other. The morality that Lawrence states or proffers is opposite to this old conception of love and marriage. Birkin hates promiscuity as Lawrence writes,

specifying his point, even worse than marriage and "a liaison was only another kind of coupling, reactionary from the legal marriage. Reaction was another bore than action."( WL 223)

This makes it very clear that Lawrence is not propagator of promiscuity. For him love and sex can be pure. If Birkin hates sex, as does Lawrence, it is because of its limitations. It is sex that turns a man into a broken half of a couple, "the woman into the other broken half. And he wanted to be single in himself, the woman single in her. He wants sex to revert to the novel of other appetites to be regarded as a functional process not as a fulfillment."( WL 223) It is a very significant statement first because Birkin wants man and woman not to compromise their individuality one for the sake of the other and as they should remain their whole selves alive; in

that case sex is functional, and not a fulfillment. He believes in sex -marriage. There is, in his opinion, nothing wrong when the two sexes as pure beings, constitute each other's freedom, balancing each -other like two poles of one force, like two angels or like to demons.

This is the clearest statement, ever in Lawrence whole corpse. In "Morality and the Novel" Lawrence holds the same view. He sees the danger of fusion, of one into the other. So he through the images of two poles holding the balance together seems more act than that of fusion. Tom remained frustrated because he wanted too much of Lydia. Lawrence thinks that when it comes to loving, one can satisfy the desire without being conscious, provided it is a simple thrust in a world of plenty of water. One should not only focus oneself on one person, as he has earlier said in terms of exclusive relationship; there are many people and relations, capable of loving and being loved. Tom for example diverted his attention to the child and thus satisfied his access of desires for Lydia. Then he tended his feet. That is how the intensity of love for one person can be deluded into many. Gerald dies because he cannot see Gudrun in relationship with Loerke. There is the whole world for human love, sympathy and joy. Birkin wants to be with Ursula, as free as with him, single out, clear and cool, yet balanced, polarized with her. This is the morality of love. The merging, the clutching, the mingling of love, becomes madly abhorrent to him.

It is in this regard that he thinks woman to be horrible and clutching, because she has such a lust for possession, "a greed of self-importance in love." (WL 224) A woman according to him wants to have to own, to control, to be dominant. Everything must be referred back to her, to the woman as he put it, the great mother of everything, out of whom she does everything and to whom everything must finally be rendered up.

Birkin thus emerges as a mouthpiece of Lawrence, regarding the novelist's morality of love. Here Lawrence's rejection of the women must not be misunderstood. As already pointed out, she is Mother Nature. She is therefore more in the clutches of nature's design to possess the man and to propagate the species. In this context feminists too have taken exception to Lawrence's rejection of women. Some of the most developed and influential political critiques of Lawrence are the product of feminist literary criticism. Under scrutiny have been the representation of women in Lawrence's writing, and the specific implications of his sexual politics. This emphasis gave rise influential arguments in the early 1970's which sought to unmask his misogyny, and to draw attention to the oppressive operations on patriarchy. In his work, feminist literary and

cultural criticism is diverse and draws on a number of traditions. Within feminism, of course, a range of views co -exist. Since the early 1970's feminists have been attacking Lawrence as the epitome of sexism and his theories of sexuality, as male -centered and insensitive, dismissive towards women. It has scarcely been able to find a woman in the 1980's who has a good word to say to him.

The feminist case was first put against Lawrence by Murry who construed Lawrence's attitude towards women as the assertion of his "hypersensitive masculinity," which is highlighted by creating the sexual mystery wherein "he is the lord."(Son of Woman 72) About Lawrence's treatment of female Helen Corke says that although "these women are fully drawn," Lawrence was not interested in them as "individuals" and saw them "only in relation to their man"(Croydon Years 98) Kate Millett reading of Lawrence in *Sexual Politics* , sounded a new role which created a stir in the literary world. She saw Lawrence as a "sexual politician leading a counter revolution against all form of female emancipation." (Millett, *Sexual Politics*) But on the other hand of the spectrum, feminist appreciation of Lawrence has not been lacking. Defending Lawrence against Murry's criticism, Anais Nin affirmed that Lawrence had "a complete realization of feeling of women. In fact, very often he wrote as a woman could write. It is the first time a man has so wholly and completely expressed women accurately." (Unprofessional Study 57-58)

Kate Millett is highly off the mark. As Lawrence points out, woman is not only nature's instrument but also, for that matter always anxious to keep the nail in her hold because in her comparison, her opposite sex is less loyal to the progeny. That is why she is always anxious to possess the nail, making him often put off by her insistence that he must love her. This is almost refraining, like that of Ursula. This often fills Birkin with almost insane fury, as he regards her, also quoted earlier, the "Magna Mater," (WL 224) that all is hers, because she has borne it, including men; having borne him, she claims him, with all his soul and body. This is what horrifies the nail. Ursula is that arrogant queen of life.

Lawrence is not against women, nor is he against men. He wants them to be pure, perfectly polarized, neither dominating nor being dominated. The problem Birkin wrestles with throughout the novel: "what must the individual do to be saved when he finds himself living in an age of renewed chaos, age of dissolution?" (The Art 78)

However, the relation between Ursula and Birkin can be termed as the touchstone for perfected relationships. Here, once again, the novelist is able to impart a practical authenticity to his, possibly, the most controversial theory. Through their experiences of earlier affairs, both Ursula and Birkin learn to relinquish their corresponding willful social identities and let their essential beings come to the ground. Having fulfilled this pre-requisite, they strike the ultimate union devoid of all fear of separation. Their relation becomes as perfect as that between two self-illuminating stars. Ursula's sexual exploits with Skrebensky and then her school mistress in *The Rainbow* (if one takes *Women in Love* as a sequel to *The Rainbow*) engender in her hopelessness. No doubt, now she lives a good deal by herself still, she is "trying to lay hand on life, to grasp it in her own understanding; still she has a prescience and intimation of something yet to come." (WL 9) Likewise, Birkin's nature is clever and would prefer them to "like the purely individual things in themselves, which makes them act in singleness." (WL 37) He wishes: "one must throw everything away, everything — let everything go, to get one last thing one wants — freedom together." (WL 132) Mark Spilka observes: "he sloughs off past encumbrances, as Ursula Brangwen did before him in *The Rainbow*." (Love Ethic 114) In this way both Birkin and Ursula are prepared to try once more, their luck to achieve a balance in relations.

When Birkin and Ursula meet for the first time, they become aware of each other's presence. Birkin attacks as well as annoys Ursula. She thinks that "he seemed to acknowledge some kinship between her and him, a natural tacit understanding, and a using of same language." (WL 20) When he suddenly enters her class, she gets started "All her suppressed, subconscious fear sprang into being; with anguish...she looked like one who is suddenly awakened." (WL 36) He is also waiting for her to be aware of his existence. He is "unconsciously drawn to her, she is his future." (WL 92) He wants the regeneration of "the dark involuntary being' through 'sensuality' that could be 'death to oneself but it is coming into being of another.'" (WL 43) Birkin believes that one has to be "lapse out before one knows what sexual reality is, lapse into unknowingness; one has to learn not -to-be before coming into being." (WL 44) It can happen only "when the mind and the known world is drowned in darkness. Everything must go — there must be deluge. Then you find yourself a palpable body of darkness a demon." (WL 43) As Terry Eagleton points out: "Birkin's search is for a relationship, which has passed beyond relationship: for a rooted and permanent settlement which offers at the same time the ground of a limitless personal



autonomy.”( Exiles and Emigres 217) Ursula, who is aware of her own needs, thinks of her own problems in the light of Birkin’s words and there comes into existence a “beam of understanding between them.”( WL 130)

The affair between Ursula and Birkin passes through many ordeals. In the early stage, the relationship between Birkin and Ursula is marked by conflicts reactions attraction and revulsions. They know that it is “a fight to the death between them—or a new life.”( WL 143) She knows that Birkin wants to establish with her a relationship that is “final and infallible; more impersonal and harder and rarer” whose “root is beyond love, a naked kind of isolation, and an isolated me that does not meet or mingle and never can. ”(WL 146) Birkin wants the final me, a spark an impersonal being to meet the final you beyond all responsibility and expectation. “What I want is a strange conjunction with you... not meeting and mingling but equilibrium, a pure balance of two single is being as the stars balance each other.”( WL 148) He believes: “If you admit unison, you forfeit all possibilities of chaos. If you enter into the pure unison, it is irrevocable. And when it is irrevocable, it is one way, like the path of a star. It is the law of creation.”( WL 148) One is committed. One must commit oneself to a conjunction with the other—forever. But it is “the time to relinquish, not to resist any more.”( WL 103) However, such an ultimate unison cannot be achieved so easily.

But this sort of ultimate marriage is not a matter of love — it is something beyond love. Birkin tells Ursula that the point about love is that we hate the world because we have vulgarized it. It ought to be proscribed, tabooed from utterance, for many years, till we get a new, better idea. The new, better idea is soon forthcoming: as Birkin calls it “star -equilibrium” Ursula at first feels like an ordinary girl and wants love. She sees Birkin’s desire for something more as a mere lust for bullying and domination, and the fight between them begins because she will not accept his notions. He says that he does not want a meeting and mingling, but equilibrium, a balance of opposites. Where Ursula remains convinced that Birkin is trying to bully her, till at one points he comes to hate him. They reach the stage where they both know that they are irrevocable bound together, but he would rather die than accept the kind of love she offers. It would be too long to follow the whole course of their feeling for each other. When Ursula does not want to submit to such a superfine stability, Birkin does not force or persuade her; rather he calls her a free agent and advises her to follow her own instincts.

**CONCLUSION:**

It is a misreading not only of the entire novel but also of its supreme ending which is, of course, suggestive. Lawrence introduces battle of sexes in all love relationships, battles which often result in death, departure or destruction. He seems to ask: Why should not love be without the battle? That is why he desires a new kind of relationship. This is what, he thinks is the business of art to reveal the relation between man and woman, together with their relationship to the circumambient universe. When man and woman are related in themselves and also with their whole universe, with the whole organic and inorganic world, they are more alive. But mankind unfortunately, according to him, is struggling in the toils, as we have earlier referred to the old relationships — the relationship of mutual domination. That is where his morality takes its life, which is when a painter like Van achieves a vivid relation with sun flowers. His painting does not represent the sun flowers in itself, an utterly in tangible and in explicable relationship — a revelation of perfect relations, at a certain moment between a man and a sunflower. It is not a mimetic picture, something in the camera. There is a fourth dimension of this relationship that is a man related to the sunflower, the sunflower related to the man and together their relation to the universe. And this fourth dimension relationship man and the sun flower, as Lawrence says in “Morality and the Novel”; “both pass away from the moment, in the process of forming a new relationship.” The same can possibly be the relationship between sexes that in loving they must ideally pass away become will less. Though this relationship can’t be pinned down once for all, Lawrence allows for changes from day to day, in this relationship. Hence art, as Lawrence’s own, reveals or attains to, or at least aspires for perfect relationships, which he calls forever new relationships.

A woman is one bank of the river of my life, and the world is the other, without the two shores, my life would be a marsh. It is the relationship to woman and to my fellow men, which makes me myself, a river of life. But the relationship of man to woman is central fact in actual human life. Next comes the relationship of man to man. A long way after, all the other relationships fatherhood, motherhood, sister, brother, friend. (P 192-193)

**REFERENCES:**

**PRIMARY SOURCES**

*Lawrence, D.H.*

— *The Rainbow*, 1915; Harmondsworth: Penguin English Library, 1995.

— *Women in Love*, 1920; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1995.

**SECONDARY SOURCES**

**Books:**

Andrews, W.T. *Critics on D.H. Lawrence*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1971.

Black Michael. *D.H. Lawrence: The Early Fiction*. London: The Macmillan Press, 1987.

Clarke, Colin.— ed. *The Rainbow and Women in Love: A Selection of Critical Essays*. London: The Macmillan Press, 1969.

Robson, W.W. "D.H. Lawrence and *Women in Love*." *Critical Essays*. London: Routledge and Kegan, 1966.

**Periodicals and Journals:**

Adamowski, T.H. "The *Rainbow* and 'Otherness.'" *The D.H. Lawrence Review*. 7, No.1, Spring, 1974.

Ansari, A.A. "Women in Love: Search for Integrated Being." *Aligarh Journal of English Studies*. 10, No.2, 1985.