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PREFACE

Since this thesis is based primarily upon the collation of internal and external evidence, it will be necessary to incorporate quotations at frequent intervals in the text of the paper. Unless otherwise indicated the spelling, punctuation, and italics found in quoted material is herein reproduced as it appears in the sources cited. Since much of the commentary contained in this paper concerns passages cited from Lawrence's work, British spelling variants will be observed in the text of the paper whenever the American variants would conflict with the quoted material.

The three sources with which this paper is primarily concerned are The Rainbow, Women in Love, and Lawrence's essay entitled "Love." Since the essay "Love" is fewer than six pages long, page number references will not accompany quotations from "Love." The page number references accompanying quotations from The Rainbow and from Women in Love will conform to the pagination of the Heinemann Phoenix, Viking, and Viking Compass editions.
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INTRODUCTION: LAWRENCE'S POLLYANALYTICS

In the Foreword to Fantasia of the Unconscious (1922), Lawrence made the following statement:

This pseudo-philosophy of mine—"pollyanalytics," as one of my respected critics might say—is deduced from the novels and poems, not the reverse. The novels and poems come unwatched out of one's pen. And then the absolute need which one has for some sort of satisfactory attitude towards oneself and things in general makes one try to abstract some definite conclusions from one's experiences as a writer and as a man. The novels and poems are pure passionate experience. These "pollyanalytics" are inferences made afterwards, from the experience.

Lawrence placed a high value on experience, and the experience of writing was as real to him as the experience of life. However, experience, either in life or in writing, was not complete within itself; experience must produce knowledge, and knowledge is produced by reflecting upon experience. Yet, knowledge is not the goal of experience; Lawrence stated in Fantasia of the Unconscious that "the final aim is not to know, but to be. There never was a more risky motto than that: Know thyself. You've got to know yourself as far as possible. But not just for the sake of knowing. You've got to know yourself so that you can at last be yourself. 'Be yourself' is the last motto."\(^1\)

It was to this end that Lawrence reflected upon his experiences, both "as a writer and as a man," and from these reflections abstracted the ideas which had been dramatized in his writings and in his own life. This was Lawrence's "passionate struggle into conscious being."

Since the passage quoted above from the Foreword to Fantasia of the Unconscious is his own definition, it may be taken as the most authoritative and, therefore, the most valid definition of Lawrence's "pollyanalytics." On the other hand, the extent of the pollyanalytic writings is inversely proportionate to the length of Lawrence's definition; the pollyanalytics may be found within a spectrum of Lawrence's work which ranges from "Art and the Individual" (1908) to Apocalypse (1930) and which includes many of his letters and almost all of his non-fiction prose. The most integral pollyanalytic writings are: "Study of Thomas Hardy," Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine (which includes the "Crown" essays), the "Reality of Peace" essays, Studies in Classic American Literature, Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious, Apocalypse, and the essays on "Love, Sex, Men, and Women" and on "Ethics, Psychology, and Philosophy" found in Phoenix: the Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence, and the "Assorted Articles" and "A Propos of Lady Chatterly's Lover" found in Phoenix II.

One question that has arisen among Lawrence's present-day critics concerns the degree of validity contained in Lawrence's definition of his pollyanalytics; that is, can Lawrence's
definition be taken at face value, and, if it can, how contiguous is the relation between the pollyanalytic writings and the novels and poetry?\(^2\) The answer to this question may be found in Lawrence's letters: for example, the third version of The Rainbow, then entitled The Wedding Ring, was begun during February, 1914, and completed in May of the same year; a letter dated July 15, 1914, indicates that the "Study of Thomas Hardy" was conceived sometime immediately subsequent to completion of The Wedding Ring;\(^3\) the Hardy essays were begun by September 5, 1914, and completed approximately two months later; the fourth and final version of The Rainbow was begun on December 4, 1914, and was completed by March 2, 1915, on which date Lawrence writes Bertrand Russell: "I have finished my novel so am very glad. ... Also I feel very profound about my book The Signal ... which I am re-beginning. It is my revolutionary utterance" (Collected Letters, p. 327). "The Signal" eventually became "The Crown," a series of six essays which appeared during the autumn of 1915 in the short-lived Signature. During January, 1916, Lawrence was energetically writing "a little book of

\(^2\)H. M. Daleski, for example, argues that the pollyanalytics are a priori rather than a posteriori, being "signposts on a road which is finally travelled only in art" rather than "laboratory reports on experiments successfully completed." The Forked Flame (Evanston: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1965), p. 19

philosophy," probably "Goats and Compasses," part of Lawrence's scheme with Philip Heseltine to get the suppressed Rainbow published in a private edition. When it became apparent to Lawrence that his and Heseltine's publishing scheme would not work, Lawrence returned to fiction, beginning Women in Love, at this point entitled The Sisters, during mid-April, 1916, completing it during the latter part of June, revising and expanding the novel during the next five months, and finally sending the typescript to J. B. Pinker, his literary agent, during the third week in November, 1916. Two months earlier, on September 5, 1916, Lawrence had asked Dollie Radford to lend him John Burnett's Early Greek Philosophers (Collected Letters, pp. 473-74); on March 7, 1917, three months after completing the final version of Women in Love, Lawrence writes Catherine Carswell that he has completed "seven short articles—little essays—called The Reality of Peace." In May he writes John Middleton Murry that "philosophy interests me now—not novels or stories" (Collected Letters, p.514). From this evidence it is apparent that Lawrence's description of the pollyanalytics as a posteriori is a faithful statement of his "pseudo-philosophical" procedure. Moreover, these letters, and others, indicate how immediately the urge to philosophize, "to abstract some definite conclusions from one's experiences as a writer and as a man," followed the completion of fictional

efforts; indeed, it seems almost as if the two, the fiction and the philosophy, were one continuous effort, a sort of rhythmical alternation between phenomena and noumena.

Since the pollyanalytics are, in a large sense, philosophical or metaphysical, a summary of Lawrence's "pseudo-philosophy" can include little more than a general description of the most consistent and most recurrent characteristics of the major pollyanalytic writings, such as the "Crown" or the "Reality of Peace" essays. One of the pollyanalytics' main features is a primacy of the individual and "being": "Be Thyself! does not mean Assert thy ego! It means, be true to your own integrity, as man, as woman . . . ." A key word here is "integrity," denoting recognition of individuality both within one's own self and in others. Another main feature of the pollyanalytics is dynamic motion, or what Philip Rieff had called Lawrence's "ethics of action." Lawrence's treatment of man-woman relationships is an illustration of his "ethics of action": marriage, for example, is rarely a finality in Lawrence's novels; it is usually a stage which serves as a new beginning. Central to Lawrence's "ethics of action" is his notion of balanced opposites

---


in continual conflict; this notion is especially prominent in
the "Crown" essays and in the following passage from the "Reality
of Peace": "There is in me the desire of creation and the desire
of dissolution. Shall I deny either? Then neither is fulfilled.
If there is no autumn and winter corruption, there is no spring
and summer. All the time I must dissolve from my old being."\(^8\)

Lawrence's notion of balanced opposites in an equipoise of con-
tinual conflict occupies the chief position in his attempts to
formulate an ideal of personal and social relations,\(^9\) a preoc-
cupation which was intensified for Lawrence during and after
World War I. Moreover, this theory of dynamically balanced
opposites became central to Lawrence's notion of the creative
impulse, of the life force, and of "being" itself; it was the
correlating of being and non-being, of life and death, of "the
great desire of creation and the great desire of destruction,
"the systole-diastole of the physical universe."\(^10\) The rela-
tionship resulting from the continual counterpoising of balanced
opposites is a dynamic union which constitutes the "whole," or
what Lawrence called the "two-in-one":

It is that which comes when night clashes on day, the
rainbow, the yellow and rose and blue and purple of dawn
and sunset, which leaps out of the breaking of light upon
darkness, of darkness upon light, absolute beyond day or

\(^8\) "Reality of Peace," Phoenix: the Posthumous Papers of
D. H. Lawrence, ed. Edward D. McDonald (London: Heinemann,

\(^9\) Ford, p. 122.

\(^10\) "Reality of Peace," p. 678.
night; the rainbow, the iridescence which is darkness at once and light, the two-in-one; the crown that binds them both.

... all formed things that come from perfect union in opposition, all beauty and all truth and being, all perfection, these are the be-all and the end-all, absolute, timeless, beyond time or eternity, beyond the Limit or the Infinite.

The crown is upon the perfect balance of the fight, it is not the fruit of either victory. The crown is not prize of either combatant. It is the raison d'être of both. It is the absolute within the fight.

In Lawrence's "ethics of action" the act of love is the "via media to being," that is, the best vehicle for coming into being; yet, the love act is also a duality, a two-in-one: "it is not of love that we are fulfilled, but of love in such intimate equipoise with hate that the transcendence takes place."¹²

Sex becomes, to a great extent, "the whole relationship between man and woman," a relationship which Lawrence frequently describes in metaphoric terms of rivers, streams, and oceans: "... a woman is a flow, a river of life, quite different from a man's river of life: and that each river must flow in its own way, though without breaking its bounds: and that the relation of man to woman is the flowing of two rivers side by side, sometimes even mingling, then separating again, and travelling on."¹³


¹³"We Need One Another," Phoenix, p. 194. An example of Lawrence's fictional use of this metaphor may be found in Kangaroo, Ch. IX, "Harriet and Lovat at Sea in Marriage."
Since the man-woman relationship is, to Lawrence, a "life-long travelling," and since life-long sexuality is a biological improbability, Lawrence differentiated between "living sex," which is the life-long, primary force in the man-woman relationship, and "sex-desire," which is only the most vivid manifestation of "living sex." Thus, what Philip Rieff designates as Lawrence's "ethics of action" finds its most frequent and most consistent objectification in what Mark Spilka calls Lawrence's "love ethic." Lawrence underscored the importance of the "love ethic" in his first major pollyanalytic work, the "Study of Thomas Hardy": "the via media to being, for man or woman, is love, and love alone. Having achieved and accomplished love, then the man passes into the unknown. He has become himself, his tale is told. Of anything that is complete there is no more tale to tell. The tale is about becoming complete, or about the failure to become complete." Love, through the man-woman relationship, is the via media to being; yet being is not complete unless, or until, the individual (usually the man) goes outside the man-woman relationship and establishes a relationship with his fellow-man and, ultimately, a relationship with the universe, what Philip Rieff calls "the possibility of living in continuity with the universe" (p. xvi). The relationship with a woman and the

---


15 In Phoenix, p. 410.
relationship with his fellow-men give the individual a "soul" which in turn makes him one with the universe; the attainment of a "soul" is the prime requisite for becoming part of the whole, the universe. The establishment of relationships with a woman and with other men, both individually and collectively, is the only means of attaining a "soul," for "a man who has never had a vital relationship to any other human being doesn't really have a soul."¹⁶ When he attains a "soul," the individual transcends life and death, being and non-being, and becomes an absolute being at one with the eternal and infinite universe:

For there are ultimately only two desires, the desire of life and the desire of death. Beyond these is pure being, where I am absolved from desire and made perfect. This is when I am like a rose, when I balance for a space in pure adjustment and pure understanding. The timeless quality of being is understanding; when I understand fully, flesh and blood and bone, and mind and soul and spirit one rose of unison, then I am. Then I am related and perfect. In true understanding I am always perfect and timeless. ("Reality of Peace," p. 680)

Lawrence often referred to this transcendent state of timeless, absolute being as the "third ground" or as the "holy ground," and many of his statements concerning this notion, such as the paragraph just quoted, are analogous to large portions of Christian theology, especially to the doctrine of the Trinity. Lawrence's relentless attempts to fulfill his own need for a "satisfactory mental attitude" toward himself and toward the universe gave rise to his pollyanalytics, the "pseudo-philosophy" which, as George Panichas observes, "ultimately reveals

¹⁶"We Need One Another," p. 192.
him to be one of the greatest and most intense religious seekers of the twentieth century."\(^{17}\)

Whatever Lawrence's theological status may be, his present estate is the novel; according to his own comments, he wanted to be received as a novelist, not as a philosopher nor as a religious seeker. Therefore, Lawrence the religious seeker and Lawrence the philosopher become important not in themselves but as they relate to Lawrence the novelist, an interrelation which is readily detected in his novels. Just as certain recurring words in Lawrence's fiction take on significant value and begin to function as images or as symbols within a particular novel or even among several novels,\(^ {18}\) certain recurring ideas, images, and symbols from the pollyanalytic writings may appear in the novels. The appearance of a pollyanalytic image or symbol in the fiction can instantly amplify the meaning of a passage by connoting vast portions of Lawrence's philosophy; it is almost as if Lawrence's novels contain a cross index to his "pseudo-philosophy." Moreover, the appearance and reiteration of pollyanalytic ideas, images, and symbols in the novels is a constituent part of the artistic construct, not a superimposition of external elements upon an artifact.


The most important pollyanalytic ideas, images, and symbols, which recur both in the novels and in the pollyanalytic writings themselves, may be grouped as follows: ideas and images related to "being," especially when "being" is related to experience or knowledge; ideas and images related to individuality or to the individual in the isolation of "unique otherness"; ideas, images, and symbols of duality or the notion of "two-in-one"; dynamic images and symbols of motion, of continual flux, of flow, and of travelling; the notion of liberty and freedom, often occurring simultaneously with images of constraint and bondage; the notion of spiritual rebirth in terms of transcendence, new heavens (especially a new heaven on earth), and the infinite and the eternal; accompanying the notion of spiritual rebirth are images and symbols of communion, of purity, and of wholeness, completeness, or unity. Some of the most prominent symbols and symbol-related images are: the rose, the rainbow, sun-set and sun-rise, the currents of rivers, streams, and oceans, symbols of balanced opposites, such as the lion and the unicorn, and symbols of transcendence and rebirth often borrowed from both pagan and Christian mythology, of which the most significant and most reiterated is the phoenix symbol.

Even if a reader is well versed in the pollyanalytics, the multifarious nature of many key passages in Lawrence's novels may obscure the pollyanalytic connotations. In fact, many passages in the novels which superficially seem to afford opportunities for philosophical oration are devoid of pollyanalytic
content. This deceptive quality is present particularly when philosophical, political, or sociological conversation arises among a large group of characters, a group which may or may not include the protagonist (viz., the Laurentian spokesman-protagonist); the quasi-socio-political conversation during the luncheon scene at Hermione Roddice's estate in Chapter VIII of *Women in Love* and Struthers' Bolshevistic speech in Chapter XVI of *Kangaroo* are examples of passages which are philosophic in appearance but non-pollyanalytic in content. The salient instances of pollyanalytic connotation occur in the novels most frequently during intimate conversations, either between two protagonists, one of whom is a Laurentian spokesman-protagonist (e.g., Birkin and Ursula in *Women in Love*, Rawdon Lilly and Aaron Sisson in *Aaron's Rod*, Lovat and Harriet Somers in *Kangaroo*), or between a spokesman-protagonist and an antagonist (e.g., Birkin and Gerald or Lovat Somers and Benjamin Cooley). If a spokesman-protagonist is not clearly defined or is not present at all, as is the case during most of *The Rainbow*, then the pollyanalytics are usually implied through the language, images, or symbols of passages which describe either psychological responses of main characters or emotional interactions between main characters. Obviously passages which focus upon the Laurentian spokesman-protagonists contain the greatest amount of "pseudo-philosophy"; nevertheless, those passages which lack a spokesman-protagonist and which imply the pollyanalytics through language, image, or symbol often occupy an integral position in the aesthetic design of a novel.
Lawrence's definition of the pollyanalytics and the qualities of the pollyanalytics thus far explored in this paper indicate the importance of the relation between Lawrence's novels and his pollyanalytic writings; however, critical examination of this facet of Lawrence's work is noticeably deficient. Although most critics concur with the observation that the bulk of Lawrence's work is in some way interrelated, the tenuous investigations of the interrelation seem to place its existence somewhere in the mysterious realm of a Laurentian nebula. The following chapters will demonstrate that the interrelation is neither nebulous nor mysterious but that it is as simple and as concrete as Lawrence's Foreword to Fantasia of the Unconscious has implied. The method employed here will retrace Lawrence's pollyanalytic procedure by critically approaching two novels through the "pseudo-philosophy" of one pollyanalytic essay. The two novels are The Rainbow and Women in Love, and the essay is "Love." The analysis of The Rainbow will concentrate on the novel's three principal man-woman relationships, whereas the analysis of Women in Love, while including the major man-woman relationships, will be expanded to include an examination of individual character depictions and some observations on the structural development of the novel.

In addition to the general acknowledgment that The Rainbow and Women in Love are Lawrence's best artistic efforts, the reasons here for selecting these two novels is germane to the relation between Lawrence's novels and his pollyanalytic writings:
The Rainbow does not contain a definite Laurentian spokesman-protagonist, whereas Women in Love does; therefore both types of pollyanalytic expression may be observed in these two novels: salient connotation through the spokesman-protagonist and implied connotation through language, image, and symbol. "Love" was selected for several reasons: love is the "via media to being," and one of the principal considerations in both novels is the protagonists' coming into being—Ursula in The Rainbow and Birkin in Women in Love; moreover, the dates of "Love" are consistent with Lawrence's pollyanalytic principle;¹⁹ "Love" is of a length which readily lends itself to brief analysis, and, finally, the essay contains in a concise form the same basic notions of love and of the man-woman relationship that are contained in "Study of Thomas Hardy," "Crown," and "Reality of Peace," including much of the longer works' language, imagery, and symbolism.

It should be remembered that this paper is not an interpretation of either The Rainbow or of Women in Love, nor is it an explication of the novels' themes, symbols, imagery, etc.; this is merely an application of one of Lawrence's pollyanalytic writings to two of his earlier novels in an effort to determine the value of the pollyanalytics in relation to the novels. One final word of caution: because Chapters ii, iii, and iv are

¹⁹"Love" was probably written during the late summer of 1917; see note below, p. 16, and Appendix below, p. 84.
concerned primarily with the pollyanalytics of "Love," the term "pollyanalytics" in the text of these three chapters will refer chiefly to the ideas, images, and symbols of "Love" as outlined in Chapter ii, and not to any previous or subsequent portions of Lawrence's "pseudo-philosophy." However, in Chapter v the term "pollyanalytics" will again refer to all of Lawrence's "pseudo-philosophy," as it has in this chapter. The reason for a broad and a narrow use of the term is that Chapters i and v are, in effect, a major premise and a conclusion, with Chapters ii, iii, and iv constituting the minor premise.
CHAPTER II

"LOVE": A POLLYANALYTIC ESSAY

In the essay "Love" Lawrence divides love into two basic types: sacred love and profane love. Sacred love is perhaps most easily associated with the notion of spiritual love, a love which incorporates minimum sexuality; it is the love of giving rather than the love of receiving. "Sacred love is selfless, seeking not its own. The lover serves his beloved and seeks perfect communion of oneness with her." Sacred love may be exercised in many ways outside the man-woman relationship; Lawrence uses Christian love as an example of pure sacred love. The second type of love, profane love, is most easily associated with bodily love or the notion of sensual love, a love which incorporates maximum sexuality; it is the love of receiving or of taking rather than the love of giving. "Profane love seeks its own... [The lovers] must be two complete in opposition, neither one partaking of the other, but each single in


2In his essay on Edgar Allan Poe, Ch. vi, Studies in Classic American Literature (1923; rpt. New York: Viking, 1964), Lawrence applies this notion of sacred and profane love to his analysis of Ligeia and Fall of the House of Usher, both of which Lawrence claims are "love stories."
its own stead." Profane love is associated with images of separateness, individuality, singleness, and isolation, contrasting with the images of communion, oneness, and unity associated with sacred love.

What Lawrence calls absolute love is the simultaneous occurrence of sacred love and profane love, a simultaneous occurrence which takes place only in the man-woman relationship. Images, and symbols, associated with absolute love connote wholeness, completeness, balance, perfection, and fulfillment, all of which are related to Lawrence's notion of the "two-in-one." Half love occurs when emphasis is upon one type of love over the other, either an emphasis on sacred love or an emphasis on profane love. For example, the Christian notion of brotherly love, which emphasizes sacred love (the love of giving), is a half love which fails to vouchsafe the integrity of the individual:

... I love my neighbour as myself. What then? I am enlarged, I surpass myself, I become whole in mankind. In the whole of perfect humanity I am whole. I am the microcosm, the epitome of the great microcosm. ...

Then I shall hate the self that I am, powerfully and profoundly shall I hate this microcosm that I have become, this epitome of mankind. I shall hate myself with madness the more I persist in adhering to my achieved self of brotherly love. Still I shall persist in representing a whole loving humanity, until the unfulfilled passion of singleness drives me into action. Then I shall hate my neighbour as I hate myself.

Yet even in the man-woman relationship the emphasis may be upon sacred love: "But not all love between man and woman is whole. ... There may be no separateness discovered, no singleness won, no unique otherness admitted. This is a half love, what
is called sacred love." On the other hand, an emphasis on profane love which excludes sacred love can only result in tragedy: "... the love may be all a lovely battle of sensual gratification, the beautiful but deadly counterposing [sic] of male against female. . . . This is the profane love, that ends in flamboyant and lacerating tragedy when the two which are so singled out are torn finally apart by death."³

One of the most important aspects of the man-woman relationship is the integrity of the individual, and each participant, the man and the woman must be aware of his or her own individuality before being able to even attempt a relationship with another individual. The self-awareness of one's own individuality is commonly referred to as the attainment of self or the recognition of self. The two participants who are aware of their own individuality must then mutually acknowledge each other's individuality and must accept and respect that individuality, an experience most often referred to as the recognition of self in others. When sacred love, which provides communion and unity, occurs simultaneously with profane love, which provides separate selves and insures the retention of individuality, then there is absolute love, which is at once a duality and a wholeness. The love between man and woman which is a balance of

³As it is used here, "death" may mean not only physical death but also spiritual death, or it may even suggest the climax of the sex act, a trope found especially in seventeenth-century metaphysical poetry. Lawrence uses just such a trope in Aaron's Rod: "She who did die with him, many terrible and magnificent connubial deaths in his arms, her husband." (rpt. New York: Viking, 1961), p. 156(Ch. XIII).
sacred and profane love is the "greatest and most complete passion the world will ever see, because it is dual, because it is of two opposing kinds. It is the perfect heart-beat of life, systole, diastole." This is the notion of "two-in-one" in the man-woman relationship: "There must be two in one, always two in one—the sweet love of communion and the fierce, proud love of sensual fulfilment, both together."

Lawrence's notions of sacred and profane love, of the individual's attainment and recognition of self, first in himself and then in others, and of the duality and wholeness of absolute love are the compositional elements of love; however, as important as its composition is the role of love, a role which Lawrence designates as that of a "unifying force." A force, as Lawrence notes in his essay, is instrumental and functional and therefore connotes a means rather than an end; if love is a force, which Lawrence claims it is, it too is a means and not an end. To reinforce this point, Lawrence notes that love is often associated with that which is infinite and eternal, but the terms infinite and eternal are never associated with an end or as having an end—the very nature of the words infinite and eternal preclude the idea of an end; rather, they connote a ceaseless progression through space, what Lawrence calls a "travelling." Love, then, is a travelling, a ceaseless quest, and as a travelling force, it is not an end in itself. Moreover, it must never arrive at an end. If infinity were to arrive at an end, it would no longer be infinity; if a force,
which is a means, produced an end, there would no longer be a need for the force—the force would cease to exist. Love, then, is a dynamic unifying force which is not an end in itself and which must continue to be dynamic, for it cannot exist in a static state. Belief in absolute love is "strictly a belief in force, for love is a unifying force."

Although love itself is not an end and does not have an end, it does have a goal. Lawrence calls this goal "the realm of calm delight" and "the other kingdom of bliss": it is the transcendent qualities of balance and perfection in love's absolute state; it is the rhythmical cycle of coming together and going asunder—a balanced flux in ceaseless motion.

... Love is a coming together. But there can be no coming together without an equivalent going asunder. In love, all things unite in a oneness of joy and praise. But they could not unite unless they were previously apart. And, having united in a whole circle of unity, they can go no further in love. The motion of love, like a tide, is fulfilled in this instance; there must be an ebb.

So that the coming together depends on the going apart; the systole depends on the diastole; the flow depends upon the ebb. There can never be love universal and unbroken. The sea can never rise to high tide over all the globe at once. The undisputed reign of love can never be.

Moreover, the participants in the man-woman relationship must avoid engendering a love which enters a static state, a state that Lawrence describes as the "bond of love": "The bond of love! What worse bondage can we conceive than the bond of love? It is an attempt to wall in the high tide; it is a will to arrest the spring, never to let May dissolve into June, never to let the hawthorn petal fall for the berrying."
The key images in "Love" may be arranged in five main groups: (1) images of motion, flux, cycles, and travelling; (2) images of unity, oneness, wholeness, and completeness; (3) images of separateness, individuality, and isolation; (4) images of duality and balance and of the notion of the "two-in-one"; (5) images of freedom, constraint, and bondage. Images associated with absolute love, "the realm of calm delight" and "the other kingdom of bliss," generally connote purity and consummation, balance and perfection: "pure centrality," "pure absolved equilibrium," "pure transcendence," "the realm of the absolute." Finally, the related image-symbols are the sea, the rose, space (or the heavens), eternity, and infinity.
CHAPTER III

THE POLLYANALYTICS OF "LOVE"

AND THE RAINBOW

The task now is to apply the abstract ideas of the a posteriori pollyanalytics to the experience of the novel and, in so doing, to illustrate Lawrence's pollyanalytic procedure, thereby determining the relation between his "pseudo-philosophy" and his novels. This chapter will consider each of The Rainbow's three major man-woman relationships in their chronological order: Tom-Lydia, Anna-Will, Ursula-Skrebensky. As was noted earlier, The Rainbow does not contain a definite Laurentian spokesman-protagonist; therefore, in this chapter the application of pollyanalytics to novel will be achieved predominantly through language, image, and symbol rather than through direct character verbalization of "Love's" pollyanalytics.

First encounters between Lawrence's major male and female characters are, with few exceptions, important to ensuing man-woman relationships; this observation is supported by Joseph Warren Beach's pronouncement that "it is not the situations in which [the characters] find themselves which primarily concern [Lawrence], but the feelings they have toward one another; and not so much the feelings on one side or the other as the
interplay of feelings." The significance of the initial contact between male and female characters may be observed in the description of Tom and Lydia's first encounter, an encounter which is described in language and imagery that establish Tom's and Lydia's individuality, their separateness, and even their isolation. "The mother had stood watching impassive, looking not at the child, but at Brangwen. He became aware of the woman looking at him, standing there isolated yet for him dominant in her foreign existence" (p. 28). Tom and Lydia are presented as separate, distinct individuals, literally staring at each other in their separate isolation.

The next development in the Tom-Lydia relation is their courtship. Several months have passed since their first encounter, and as their wedding date draws closer, Lydia's sexual desire for Tom becomes aroused; Tom's and Lydia's mental states during the final days of their courtship are described in a passage which echoes the images of flux, of the coming together and going asunder rhythm:

... He was the man who had come nearest to her for her awakening.

Always, however, between-whiles she lapsed into the old unconsciousness, indifference and there was a will in her to save herself from living any more. . . .

... But one blind instinct led her, to take him, to leave him, and then to relinquish herself to him. . . .

Then she lapsed again to stupor and indifference. This, however, was bound to pass. The warmth flowed through her,

1 The Twentieth Century Novel (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1932), pp. 370-71. Italics are Professor Beach's.
she felt herself opening, unfolding, asking . . . . And unfolded she turned to him, straight to him. And he came, slowly, afraid, held back by uncouth fear, and driven by a desire bigger than himself.

She remained attentive and instinctively expectant before him, unfolded, ready to receive him. He could not act, because of self-fear and because of his conception of honour towards her. So he remained in a state of chaos.

And after a few days, gradually she closed again, away from him, was sheathed over, impervious to him, oblivious.

Inarticulate, he moved with her at the Marsh in violent, gloomy, wordless passion, almost in hatred of her. Till gradually she became aware of him, aware of herself with regard to him, her blood stirred to life, she began to open towards him, to flow towards him again. . . .

The duality of the motion of love is implicit in this passage, and although the only related image in the passage is "flowed," the feeling, the arrière-pensée of the passage embodies the notion of cyclical flux.

Although the dual motion of love is present in the Tom-Lydia relationship, the coming together and going asunder cycle is not yet rhythmically balanced, for neither Tom nor Lydia recognizes the other's individuality, his "unique otherness."

At first it seems that it is Lydia who will not acknowledge Tom's individual being: "And he remained wrathful and distinct from her, unchanged outwardly to her, but underneath a solid power of antagonism to her. Of which she became gradually aware. And it irritated her to be made aware of him as a separated power" (p. 57). Yet this passage implies that, although she is reluctant, Lydia is recognizing Tom's individuality, a recognition
which Tom avidly and even desperately craves: "He felt he wanted to break her into acknowledgment of him, into awareness of him. It was insufferable that she had so obliterated him. He would smash her into regarding him. He had a raging agony of desire to do so" (p. 59). Believing that Lydia has absolutely refused to acknowledge his integrity as an individual and as a man, Tom forms "another centre of love in her child, Anna"; he does not realize that Lydia could still give him "fulfilment" but that he "must control himself, measure himself to her" (p. 78) before he can establish a rhythmical love motion with his wife. When Tom is tempted to seek fulfilment by taking a mistress, Lydia finally confronts him with his own failure to accept her individuality:

"Why should you want to find a woman who is more to you than me?" she said.

The turbulence raged in his breast.

"I don't," he said.

"Why do you?" she repeated. "Why do you want to deny me?"

Suddenly, in a flash, he saw she might be lonely, isolated, unsure. She had seemed to him the utterly certain, satisfied, absolute, excluding him. Could she need anything?

"Why aren't you satisfied with me?—I'm not satisfied with you. Paul used to come to me and take me like a man does. You only leave me alone or take me like your cattle, quickly, to forget me again—so that you can forget me again."

"What am I to remember about you?" said Brangwen.

"I want you to know there is somebody there besides yourself."

"Well, don't I know it?"
"You come to me as if it was for nothing, as if I was nothing there. When Paul came to me, I was something to him—a woman, I was. To you I am nothing—it is like cattle—or nothing—"

Lydia has, since their courtship, been ready to acknowledge Tom's individuality and has withheld her acknowledgment only because Tom has not moved toward accepting her "unique otherness," her "unknown foreign quality" which he has feared since their first encounter. Lydia has previously refrained from provoking Tom's acceptance of her individuality because she wanted the act initiated by her husband: "She wanted his active participation, not his submission" (p. 90). Lydia has now provided the catalyst which hastens Tom toward an acceptance of Lydia's "otherness," an acceptance which in turn brings his own individual self into being: "... he let go his hold on himself ... and knew the subterranean force of his desire to come to her, to be with her, to mingle with her, losing himself to find her, to find himself in her. He began to approach her to draw near" (p. 90). Tom, emerging as an individual being, can now meet the individual who has been waiting to join him in mutual recognition and acceptance.

Blind and destroyed, he pressed forward, nearer, nearer, to receive the consummation of himself, he received within the darkness which should swallow him and yield him up to himself. If he could come really within the blazing kernel of darkness, if really he could be destroyed, burnt away till he lit with her in one consummation, that were supreme. (pp. 90-91)
The "one consummation" brings the balanced cyclical motion of love to the Tom-Lydia relationship.²

An important passage incorporating many of the ideas and images of "Love" follows the consummation of the Tom-Lydia relationship and signals the end of the novel's first section. The pollyanalytics of the passage deserve special attention:

Their coming together now, after two years of married life, was much more wonderful to them than it had been before. It was the entry into another circle of existence, it was the baptism to another life, it was the complete confirmation. Their feet trod strange ground of knowledge, their footsteps were lit-up with discovery. Wherever they walked, it was well, the world re-echoed round them in discovery. They went gladly and forgetful. Everything was lost, and everything was found. The new world was discovered, it remained to be explored.

They had passed through the doorway into the further space, where movement was so big, that it contained bonds and constraints and labours, and still was complete liberty. She was the doorway to him, he to her. At last they had thrown open the doors, each to the other, and had stood in the doorways facing each other, whilst the light flooded out from behind on to each of their faces, it was the transfiguration, glorification, the admission.

... He went his way, as before, she went her way, to the rest of the world there seemed no change. But to the two of them, there was the perpetual wonder of the transfiguration.

²Mark Spilka has also recognized this aspect of Lydia's role in the Tom-Lydia relationship: "And it is Lydia's 'otherness' which makes this consummation possible—which forces Brangwen to assert and then establish his own identity, his essential separateness of being." The Love Ethic of D. H. Lawrence, p. 97. George Ford also credits the success of Tom and Lydia's marital relationship to "their mutual recognition of separateness in union." Double Measure, p. 141. It is also interesting to note that Tom and Lydia have been married for well over a year and have a child of their own before their marriage is "consummated" in Laurentian terms.
... What was Paul Lensky to her, but an unfulfilled possibility to which he, Brangwen, was the reality and the fulfilment? What did it matter, that Anna Lensky was born of Lydia and Paul? God was her father and her mother. He had passed through the married pair without fully making Himself known to them.

Now He was declared to Brangwen and to Lydia Brangwen, as they stood together. When at last they had joined hands, the house was finished, and the Lord took up his abode. And they were glad.

The days went on as before, Brangwen went out to his work, his wife nursed her child and attended in some measure to the farm. They did not think of each other—why should they? Only when she touched him, he knew her instantly, that she was with him, near him, that she was the gateway and the way out, that she was beyond, and that he was travelling in her through the beyond. Whither?—What does it matter? . . .

Anna's soul was put at peace between them. She looked from one to the other, and she saw them established to her safety, and she was free. . . . She was no longer called upon to uphold with her childish might the broken end of the arch. Her father and her mother now met to the span of the heavens, and she, the child, was free to play in the space beneath, between.

(pp. 91-92, italics mine)

Especially prominent in the first and second paragraphs of this passage are images of motion, particularly images of travelling: "coming together" (1. 1), "feet trod" (1. 5), "Wherever they walked" (1. 6), "They went" (1. 8), "They had passed through the doorway" (1. 11), and "movement" (1. 12). Images of duality, one of the most important aspects of Lawrence's absolute love, are found in lines nine and ten, "Everything was lost, and everything was found," and in lines twelve and thirteen, "it contained bonds and constraints and labours, and still was complete liberty." Images of separateness which connote individuality appear in the repetition of "each" in lines fifteen, sixteen, and seventeen,
"each to the other," "each other," "each of their faces," and in line nineteen, "He went his way, as before, she went her way . . . ." Images of wholeness and completeness, which connote the "other kingdom of bliss" and "the realm of calm delight," are found in lines twenty-nine through thirty-two: "Now He [God] was declared to Brangwen and to Lydia Brangwen, as they stood together. When at last they had joined hands, the house was finished . . . ." The sixth paragraph contains images of eternity, infinity, and the ceaseless travelling in love: "she was the beyond," "travelling . . . through the beyond," "Whither? — What did it matter?"

This passage is especially important to the novel's structure because it culminates in one of the two prominent appearances of the rainbow symbol before Ursula sees it on the last page of the novel. The major difference between the rainbow symbol here and Ursula's vision of the rainbow is that Tom and Lydia, and even Anna, do not see the rainbow: they experience it. Ursula's experiences produce a knowledge which enables her to see the rainbow; she not only apprehends the rainbow, but she also comprehends it. Because their consummation was forced rather than natural, Tom and Lydia have achieved a partially successful man-woman relationship and are allowed only a limited access to the "other kingdom of bliss." However, Lydia has become the chief actuating force in the novel, a point which is reiterated immediately prior to Tom's death in Chapter IX, "The Marsh and the Flood": "She caused the separateness of all the Marsh
inmates, the friability of the household" (p. 239). Neverthe-
less, Tom and Lydia's portion of the novel ends essentially with
Chapter III; Tom "has become himself, his tale is told. Of any-
thing that is complete there is no more to tell. The tale is
about becoming complete, or about the failure to become complete."\(^3\)
Now Anna moves into the spotlight, and the novel becomes the
tale of Anna and Will's becoming complete, or their failure to
become complete.

The first encounter of major significance between Anna and
Will is the corn harvest scene beginning on page 116. The entire
passage echoes with images of separateness, "For they were sepa-
rate, single . . . " (p. 117), and with images of coming together
and going asunder, "They worked together, coming and going, in a
rhythm, which carried their feet and their bodies in tune," (p.118).
However, the rhythmical cycle here is dissonant rather then
consonant: "As he came, she drew away, as he drew away, she came.
Were they never to meet?" (p. 118). When they do meet, Anna
must wait for Will, thereby symbolically establishing dominance
over her future husband. The corn harvest scene contains many
sexual images and symbols and, not surprisingly, ends with the
first sexual contact between Anna and Will. The importance of
the first sexual contact between Lawrence's characters is even
greater in most instances than the importance of their first
encounter, which was discussed earlier (p. 22, above); there-
fore, many of the ideas and images of "Love" may be expected

\(^3\) "Study of Thomas Hardy," *Phoenix*, p. 410.
to appear in scenes describing initial sexual contacts. In considering initial sexual contacts it should be remembered that these contacts may or may not involve sexual intercourse, although those scenes which are most remembered usually culminate in a Paphian celebration.

Anna and Will briefly approach a wholeness, or oneness, during their honeymoon; however, the images in a passage at the beginning of Chapter VI, "Anna Victrix," clearly indicate that the wholeness will not be maintained nor will it ever return.

... They found themselves there, and they lay still, in each other's arms; for their moment they were at the heart of eternity, whilst time roared far off, for ever far off, towards the rim.

Then gradually they were passed away from the supreme centre, down the circles of praise and joy and gladness, further and further out, towards the noise and the friction. But their hearts had burned and were tempered by the inner reality, they were unalterably glad.

Gradually they began to wake up, the noises outside became more real. They understood and answered the call outside. They counted the strokes of the bell. And when they counted midday, they understood that it was midday, in the world, and for themselves also.

(pp. 141-42)

The flux of the marital situation is described in a passage which occurs several weeks after the honeymoon when Anna and Will have begun their regular marital routine:

So it went on continually, the recurrence of love and conflict between them. One day it seemed as if everything was shattered, all life spoiled, ruined, desolate and laid waste. The next day it was all marvellous again, just marvellous. One day she thought she would go mad from his very presence, the sound of his drinking was detestable to her. The next day she loved and rejoiced in the way he crossed the floor, he was sun, moon and stars in one.

(pp. 163-64)
Recalling the courtship scene of Tom and Lydia in which the flux of the man-woman relationship was observed (p. 23, above), a difference may be noted in Lawrence's treatment of the earlier passage and his treatment of the passage just quoted. In the earlier passage the flux was associated with both Tom and Lydia; however, in the passage just quoted only Anna's flux is present—Will seems to be constant.

The ultimate reason for Anna and Will's failure to establish a rhythmical coming together and going asunder cycle, and thus to achieve absolute love, is revealed in a passage occurring almost immediately prior to the birth of their first child, Ursula:

He could sleep with her, and let her be. He could be alone now. He had just learned what it was to be able to be alone. It was right and peaceful. She had given him a new, deeper freedom. The world might be a welter of uncertainty, but he was himself now. He had come into his own existence. He was born for a second time, born at last unto himself, out of the vast body of humanity. Now at last he had a separate identity, he existed alone, even if he were not quite alone. Before he had existed in so far as he had relations with another being. Now he had an absolute self—as well as a relative self.

(p. 187)

The love relationship requires that both participants be individuals: Will was not an individual; Anna's "flux" had forced him to become an individual, as this passage indicates. However, what is revealed in Will when he becomes an individual is a self in which the emphasis is upon sacred love; moreover, Anna's self is now revealed as one in which the emphasis is on profane love. A prominent confrontation of these two opposing selves occurs in the chapter entitled "The Cathedral." Recalling that Lydia, whose predominantly sacred nature accepted Tom's
predominantly profane nature, and Tom, whose profane self accepted
Lydia's sacred self, achieved a unity by acknowledging each
other's individual integrity, it becomes apparent that, unlike
Tom and Lydia, Anna and Will reject each other's individuality
and become isolated selves, Anna submerging herself in the pro-
fane task of procreation and Will throwing himself into the
sacred work of the Church and society. The complete isolation
of selves occurs only in a symbolic sense in "The Cathedral";
the actual isolation began on pages 141 and 142 when Anna and
Will reached their "moment," their "midday," the high tide of
their relationship. Will held the Church as his "absolute"
long before the Cathedral scene, and Anna became symbolically
profane during her pregnancy when she performed a ritualistic
pagan dance, naked before a blazing fire in the bedroom. The
relationship between the couple has become a battle of unequal
opposites, and since Anna is the dominant figure, the conflict
takes place on her terms—the battleground of profane love:

. . . There was no tenderness, no love between them
any more, only the maddening, sensuous lust for discovery
and the insatiable, exorbitant gratification in the sensual
beauties of her body. And she was a store, a store of abso-
lute beauties that it drove him to contemplate. . . .

He lived in a passion of sensual discovery with her for
some time—it was a duel: no love, no words, no kisses even,
only the maddening perception of beauty consummate, absolute
through touch. . . .

(p. 233)

Although Anna is indeed a "Victrix," in her victory she is
as vanquished as Will is in his defeat:
... Yet still she was not quite fulfilled. She had a slight expectant feeling, as of a door half opened. ... And from her Pisgah mount, which she had attained, what could she see? A faint, gleaming horizon, a long way off, and a rainbow like an archway, a shadow-door with faintly coloured coping above it. Must she be moving thither?

... But why must she start on the journey? She stood so safely on the Pisgah mountain.

... Anna lapsed into vague content. If she were not the wayfarer to the unknown, if she were arrived now, settled in her builded house, a rich woman, still her doors opened under the arch of the rainbow, her threshold reflected the passing of the sun and moon, the great travellers, her house was full of the echo of journeying.

She was a door and a threshold, she herself. Through her another soul was coming, to stand upon her as upon the threshold, looking out, shading its eyes for the direction to take.

(p. 192)

Anna has now lost the ability to travel, to continue the journey of discovery—the Laurentian quest for "being":

... Anna lapsed into vague content. If she were not the wayfarer to the unknown, if she were arrived now, settled in her builded house, a rich woman, still her doors opened under the arch of the rainbow, her threshold reflected the passing of the sun and moon, the great travellers, her house was full of the echo of journeying.

She was a door and a threshold, she herself. Through her another soul was coming, to stand upon her as upon the threshold, looking out, shading its eyes for the direction to take.

(p. 193)

The journey requires courage, and this passage reveals Anna as lacking the particular brand of Laurentian fortitude needed to maintain the quest. Anna has failed to "become complete"; her tale has ended, but "through her another soul was coming," Ursula, whose tale of becoming now begins.

Although nearly two thirds of the novel is devoted to Ursula, the task here must necessarily be confined to the man-woman relationship between Ursula and Anton Skrebensky. During their first encounter, the imagination of the young, quixotic Ursula is
aroused by the handsome young officer just as Emma Roualt's romantic fantasies had been aroused by Charles Bovary nearly a century before. Ursula sees Skrebensky as one of the "Sons of God who saw the daughters of men" (p. 290), a demanding role for a man who joined the Engineers to "get the credit of other people's brains" (p. 288). Their first sexual contact, in this case a kiss, is described with images which seem to promise a successful man-woman relationship:

At the touch of her hand on his arm, his consciousness melted away from him. He took her into his arms, as if into the sure, subtle power of his will, and they became one movement, one dual movement, dancing on the slippery grass. It would be endless, this movement, it would continue for ever. It was his will and her will locked in a trance of motion, yet never fusing, never yielding one to the other. It was a glaucous, intertwining, delicious flux and contest in flux.

(p. 316)

However, this passage is almost immediately succeeded by a passage in which the new lovers walk through the same corn field where Anna and Will experienced their first sexual encounter.

They went towards the stackyard. There he saw, with something like terror, the great new stacks of corn glistening and gleaming transfigured . . . . She, like glimmering gossamer, seemed to burn among them, as they rose like cold fires to the silvery-bluish air. . . . He was afraid of the great moon-conflagration of the cornstacks rising above him. His heart grew smaller, it began to fuse like a bead. He knew he would die.

(p. 319)

While Skrebensky is "enduring what he had to endure" in the Boer War, Ursula is accumulating experiences which transform the quixotic dreamer into an embodiment of Laurentian ideals and which produce her first real bit of self-knowledge. In a passage occurring shortly before Skrebensky's return, Ursula realizes
that Maggie Schofield's brother, Anthony (who bears a striking resemblance to the youthful Tom Brangwen), is not a traveller:

... But she was a traveller on the face of the earth, and he was an isolated creature living in the fulfilment of his own senses.

She could not help it, that she was a traveller. She knew Anthony, that he was not one. But oh, ultimately and finally, she must go on and on, seeking the goal that she knew she did draw nearer to.

(p. 417)

At almost the precise moment that Skrebensky returns, Ursula's experiences produce a new knowledge which will ultimately result in a realization of her own individuality. She is in the botany laboratory studying the "unicellular shadow" of a plant animal under a microscope:

Suddenly she had passed away into an intensely-gleaming light of knowledge. She could not understand what it all was. She only knew that it was not limited mechanical energy, not mere purpose of self-preservation and self-assertion. It was a consummation, a being infinite. Self was a oneness with the infinite. To be oneself was a supreme, gleaming triumph of infinity.

(p. 441)

Ursula now has an intuitive knowledge of her own individuality that is preparing her to meet Skrebensky and expose his inadequacies. However, another "pollyanalytic" step is needed before the dissolution of the Ursula-Skrebensky relationship can begin; the final step is the establishment of love as a means and not an end, a step which Ursula intuited before her rejection of Anthony Schofield, several months before Antony Skrebensky's return:

... She thought she still loved Anton Skrebensky. But she did not forgive him that he had not been strong enough
to acknowledge her. He had denied her. How then could she love him? How then was love so absolute? She did not believe it. She believed that love was a way, a means, not an end in itself, as Maggie seemed to think. And always the way of love would be found. But whither did it lead?

"I believe there are many men in the world one might love—there is not only one man," said Ursula.

"But you must distinguish between love and passion," said Maggie, adding, with a touch of contempt: "Men will easily have a passion for you, but they won't love you."

"Yes," said Ursula, vehemently, the look of suffering, almost of fanaticism, on her face. "Passion is only part of love. And it seems so much because it can't last. That is why passion is never happy."

(pp. 411-12)

But Ursula cannot actually comprehend the significance of this notion until she begins to realize her own individuality in the botany laboratory. After her experiences on the continent with Skrebensky, Ursula attains a more nearly complete realization of her individuality: "Her soul began to run by itself. He did not realise, nor did she. Yet in Rouen he had the first deadly anguish, the first sense of the death towards which they were wandering" (p. 456). Ursula is moving closer to her realization as an individual being and is now able to assert the notion of love as a means rather than apprehending it as an abstract idea. Again the scene is one in which Ursula's and Dorothy Russell's notions of love and marriage are contrasted:

"... Love—love—love—what does it mean—what does it amount to? So much personal gratification. It doesn't lead anywhere."

"It isn't supposed to lead anywhere, is it?" said Dorothy, satirically. "I thought it was the one thing which is an end in itself."
"Then what does it matter to me?" cried Ursula. "As an end in itself, I could love a hundred men, one after the other. Why should I end with a Skrebensky? Why should I not go on, and love all the types I fancy, one after another, if love is an end in itself? There are plenty of men who aren't Anton, whom I could love—whom I would like to love." (p. 475)

Although she knows love is a means, Ursula does not yet know that love is also a duality—she only intuits it. Her conscious mind is urging her to marry Skrebensky "out of fear of herself," while her subconscious psyche is impelling her toward the annihilation of her relationship with Skrebensky:

"They were to sail for India on September the fifth. One thing she knew in her subconsciousness, and that was, she would never sail for India" (p. 476). Ursula's mental struggle reaches its climax a few days later during the week-long prenuptial party on the Lincolnshire coast:

Then a yearning for something unknown came over her, a passion for something she knew not what. She would walk the foreshore alone after dusk, expecting, expecting something, as if she had gone to a rendezvous. The salt, bitter passion of the sea, its indifference to the earth, its swinging, definite notion, its strength, its attack, and its salt burning, seemed to provoke her to a pitch of madness, tantalizing her with vast suggestions of fulfilment.  

(p. 477)

As she sees Skrebensky coming for their "rendezvous" on the beach, Ursula finally attains a conscious notion of the balanced duality of love, and she sees that Skrebensky cannot fulfill the role of her opposite: "Skrebensky, whom she knew, whom she was fond of, who was attractive, but whose soul could not contain her in its waves of strength, nor his breast compel her in burning, salty passion" (p. 477). Now follows the beach scene
in which the well equipped Ursula annihilates the non-being, death-in-life Skrebensky, exposing his inadequate courage and lack of individual integrity in a passage which abounds with images of flux and eternal motion and which is dominated by the major symbols of the moon and the sea.

The sands were as ground silver, the sea moved in solid brightness, coming towards them, and she went to meet the advance of the flashing, buoyant water. He stood behind, encompassed, a shadow ever dissolving.

She stood on the edge of the water, at the edge of the solid, flashing body of the sea, and the wave rushed over her feet.

"I want to go," she cried, in a strong, dominant voice. "I want to go."

She prowled, ranging on the edge of the water like a possessed creature, and he followed her. He saw the froth of the wave followed by the hard, bright water swirl over her feet and her ankles, she swung out her arms, to balance, he expected every moment to see her walk into the sea, dressed as she was, and be carried swimming out.

"I want to go," she cried again, in the high, hard voice, like the scream of gulls.

"Where?" he asked.

"I don't know."

(p. 478)

Skrebensky cannot enter the quest with Ursula ("He had no soul, no background" p. 482); like Anthony Schofield, Skrebensky is not a traveller.

Ursula's individuality, her knowledge of her own integrity that qualifies her as a traveller, is subjected to a final test when she discovers she is pregnant:
What did the self, the form of life matter? Only the living from day to day mattered, the beloved existence in the body, rich, peaceful, complete, with no beyond, no further trouble, no further complication. She had been wrong, she had been arrogant and wicked, wanting that other thing, that fantastic freedom, that illusory, conceited fulfilment which she had imagined she could not have with Skrebensky. Who was she to be wanting some fantastic fulfilment in her life? 

A great mood of humility came over her, and in this humility a bondage sort of peace. She gave her limbs to the bondage, she loved the bondage, she called it peace. In this state she sat down to write to Skrebensky.

(pp. 483-84)

However, she rejects the bondage of security and continues the voyage of discovery as a free and individual being whose experiences have resulted in knowledge, a knowledge which enables her to see the rainbow, "the strangeness and rainbow-change of ever-renewed creative civilization."  

The three major man-woman relationships in The Rainbow have been conducted according to the same basic pollyanalytic principles, and each of the three produced different results. The Tom-Lydia relationship achieved limited success because both Tom and Lydia acknowledged each other's individual integrity. The Anna-Will relationship resulted in isolation and alienation when the imbalance of unequal opposites was combined with each partner's refusal to accept the other's individual integrity. The Ursula-Skrenbensky relationship was dissolved when Ursula's experiences produced a knowledge which enabled

---

4 Fantasia of the Unconscious, p. 56.
her to expose Skrebensky's inadequacies and his lack of individual integrity, resulting in his rejection as a potential partner for the voyage through the unknown, the quest in the ceaseless motion of absolute love for the "other kingdom of bliss."
CHAPTER IV

THE POLLYANALYTICS OF "LOVE"

AND WOMEN IN LOVE

As was indicated earlier, "Love" was written sometime during the late-summer of 1917, approximately a year after Women in Love was completed in its final form and three years before the novel's first edition appeared; therefore, it hardly needs mentioning that Women in Love, being chronologically closer to "Love," would reveal more direct evidence of the "pollyanalytics" of the 1917 essay than would The Rainbow and that Lawrence's ideas would be more prominent in the later novel than in the earlier. While not greatly different from the task presented by The Rainbow, the task of relating the pollyanalytics of "Love" to Women in Love is more extensive and, in many ways, more difficult. Since Lawrence's ideas have had more time to develop, the pollyanalytics have been woven more intricately into the fabric of the novel. In The Rainbow the images of "Love" echo in the background of the three major man-woman relationships; some of these images are present in Women in Love, but they are fewer and are of less significance than they were in The Rainbow. It is the ideas of "Love" which become increasingly important in Women in Love; the ideas culminate in the later novel and become embodied in an explicit quest for the "other kingdom of bliss," finally
progressing beyond the pollyanalytics of "Love," presaging the pollyanalytics of Fantasia of the Unconscious, and leading ultimately to The Plumed Serpent. Again, it should be remembered that the task here is a limited one; consequently, many major aspects of Women in Love will be purposely ignored in an effort to concentrate on the pollyanalytics of the major character depictions and on the pollyanalytic principles governing the development of the two central man-woman relationships.

Because the primary subject of Women in Love is the evolution of two man-woman relationships, the descriptions of the participants in those relationships are not only important to the comprehension of the forces operating within each character, but the descriptions also reveal many of the pollyanalytic principles inherent in the characters' make-up, which, when carefully noted, anticipate their ultimate fates. The descriptions of the four major characters are largely dependent upon a development of contrasts in pairs: Gudrun is contrasted to Ursula, Gerald is contrasted to Birkin, and the Gerald-Gudrun relationship is contrasted to the Birkin-Ursula relationship. Lawrence begins the novel with a discussion between the two Brangwen sisters, Ursula and Gudrun; the discussion centers around their contrasting views of marriage.¹

¹In The Rainbow, Ursula's ideas of love and marriage were presented in a similar manner during her conversations with Maggie Schofield and Dorothy Russell (Rainbow, p. 411 and p. 475). It might also be of interest to note that this is the only one of Lawrence's major novels that begins with almost pure dialogue.
"Ursula," said Gudrun, "don't you really want to get married?" Ursula laid her embroidery in her lap and looked up. Her face was calm and considerate.

"I don't know," she replied. "It depends how you mean."

Gudrun was slightly taken aback. She watched her sister for some moments.

"Well," she said, ironically, "it usually means one thing! But don't you think, anyhow, you'd be—" she darkened slightly—" in a better position than you are in now."

A shadow came over Ursula's face.

"I might be," she said. "But I'm not sure."

Again Gudrun paused, slightly irritated. She wanted to be quite definite.

"You don't think one needs the experience of having been married?" she asked.

"Do you think it need be an experience?" replied Ursula.

"Bound to be, in some way or other," said Gudrun, coolly. "Possibly undesirable, but bound to be an experience of some sort."

"Not really," said Ursula. "More likely to be the end of experience."

(p. 1)

Ursula is clearly unconventional, an individual, and does not think of marriage in terms of conventional amenities. Gudrun is traditionalistic, but her conventionality is not as clearly revealed as is Ursula's unconventionality; at this point in the novel Gudrun wants a Gerald Crich, "'a highly attractive individual of sufficient means'" (p. 2). An unseasoned Lawrence reader would be hard pressed at this point to grasp the distinct dissimilitude in the two Brangwen sisters; a veteran Lawrence reader, however, would remember other characters in Lawrence's novels and recall that those characters who either clung to traditional values or
finally succumbed to convention invariably lacked individuality and usually became tragic or demonic figures, whereas those characters who sought their own values rather than accept without question conventional values were invariably Byronic protagonists. Therefore, in the opening dialogue between Ursula and Gudrun, Lawrence has subtly pointed toward the sisters' ultimate fates while indicating one of their essential differences.

The ability to "travel," to enter upon and to continue the quest, is another important aspect of Lawrence's characters. That Ursula is a traveller is known from The Rainbow and is confirmed in Women in Love at the beginning of Chapter XV, "Sunday Evening." Gudrun, however, is just beginning to encounter the challenge of the "voyage through the unknown":

She clung to Ursula, who, through long usage, was inured to this violation of a dark, uncreated, hostile world. But all the time her heart was crying, as if in the midst of some ordeal: "I want to go back, I want to go away, I want not to know it, not to know that this exists." Yet she must go forward.

Ursula could feel her suffering.

"You hate this, don't you?" she asked.

"It bewilders me," stammered Gudrun.

"You won't stay long," replied Ursula. (p. 6)

Gudrun may enter upon the quest, but she is reluctant, a diffident traveller who will not bring a full-fledged spirit to the quest; as Ursula, the eager and experienced traveller of The Rainbow, predicts, Gudrun "won't stay long" on the Laurentian quest for absolute being. Birkin, Ursula's companion traveller, intuitively
perceives Gudrun's conventionality and her inadequacies as a traveller; Birkin and Gerald are discussing Gudrun's capabilities as an artist (the quest, it should be remembered, is basically one of discovery; art is, in the Laurentian sense, always a process of discovery):

"She might be a well-known artist one day?" mused Gerald.

to which Birkin replies:

"She might. But I think she won't. She drops her art if anything else catches her. Her contrariness prevents her taking it seriously—she must never be too serious, she feels she might give herself away. And she won't give herself away—she's always on the defensive. That's what I can't stand about her type. . . ."

(p. 87)

When a person is "defensive" he is either directly or indirectly defending some sort of security, and as was illustrated in the comment on Ursula's pregnancy in the final chapter of The Rainbow (see above, p. 39), security is not part of the quest; in fact, the quest demands an abjuration of security.

The Ursula-Gudrun contrast reaches its climax with a discussion between the two sister's in which their major differences are clearly revealed:

"I think," [Ursula] said at length, involuntarily, "that Rupert is right—one wants a new space to be in and one falls away from the old."

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

"One wants a new space to be in, I quite agree," [Gudrun] said. "But I think that a new world is a development from this world, and that to isolate oneself with one other person, isn't to find a new world at all, but only to secure oneself in one's illusions."

"Perhaps," [Ursula] said, full of mistrust, of herself
and everybody. "But," she added, "I do think that one can't have anything new whilst one cares for the old—do you know what I mean—even fighting the old is belonging to it. I know, one is tempted to stop with the world, just to fight it. But then it isn't worth it."

"Yes," [Gudrun] said. "In a way, one is of the world if one lives in it. But isn't it really an illusion to think you can get out of it? After all, a cottage in the Abruzzi, or wherever it may be, isn't a new world. No, the only thing to do with the world is to see it through."

"But there can be something else, can't there?" [Ursula] said. "One can see it through in one's soul, long enough before it sees itself through in actuality, And then, when one has seen one's soul, one is something else."

"Can one see it through in one's soul?" asked Gudrun. "If you mean that you can see to the end of what will happen, I don't agree. I really can't agree. And anyhow, you can't suddenly fly off on to a new planet, because you think you can see to the end of this."

Ursula suddenly straightened herself.

"Yes," she said. "Yes—one knows. One has no more connections here. One has a sort of other self, that belongs to a new planet, not to this. You've got to hop off."

(pp. 428-29)

Ursula has abnegated the old world and its conventional values and has joined Birkin in a quest for the new world. Gudrun, however licentious her future life may become, will maintain her ties with the old world (the Midlands, Cossethay, Beldover, Breadalby, Shortlands, et al.) and will defer to its values and precepts; in a sense, Gudrun would be like the prostitute who confesses her professional sins on Sunday and returns to work on Monday.
Although the characters of Birkin and Gerald also evolve through a development of contrasts, the first physical descriptions of the two men convey one of their most essential differences. Gerald appears first (p. 8), arriving at his sister's wedding "punctually at eleven o'clock" and escorting his mother; he is described as "well-made," his demeanor and his attire are comme il faut, and, most importantly, he is immediately associated with the ice symbol. Birkin and the groom arrive at the wedding late—a breach of convention. Birkin's physical appearance is sharply contrasted to the "almost exaggeratedly well-dressed" Gerald:

Although [Birkin] was dressed correctly for his part, yet there was an innate incongruity which caused a slight ridiculousness in his appearance. His nature was clever and separate, he did not fit at all in the conventional occasion. Yet he subordinated himself to the common idea, travestied himself.

(p. 14, italics mine)

Birkin's unconventional aura sets him apart from the wedding crowd and is directly contrasted to Gerald's punctilious perfection. The most important contrast, however, is illustrated a few pages later in a discussion between Birkin and Gerald, a conversation which sprang from the breech of convention that occurred with Birkin's and the groom's late arrival at the wedding:

"You don't believe in having any standard of behaviour at all, do you?" he challenged Birkin, censoriously.

"Standard—no. I hate standards. But they're necessary for the common ruck. Anybody who is anything can just be himself and do as he likes."

"But what do you mean by being himself?" said Gerald. "Is that an aphorism or a cliche?"
"I mean just doing what you want to do. . . . It's the hardest thing in the world to act spontaneously on one's impulses—and it's the only really gentlemanly thing to do—provided you're fit to do it."

"You don't expect me to take you seriously do you?" asked Gerald.

"Yes, Gerald, you're one of the very few people I do expect that of."

"Then I'm afraid I can't come up to your expectations here, at any rate. You think people should just do as they like."

"I think they always do. But I should like them to like the purely individual thing in themselves, which makes them act in singleness. And they only like to do the collective thing."

(pp. 26-27)

Birkin advocates individual integrity, spontaneity, and the unique otherness of self, all of which he himself embodies. Gerald is diametrically opposed to these qualities, being entrenched in an ethos of traditional standards. The contrast between Birkin and Gerald reaches its climax at precisely the same moment as does the climax of the contrast between Ursula and Gudrun.

"You will go south?" said Gerald, a little ting of uneasiness in his voice.

"Yes," said Birkin, turning away. There was a queer, indefinable hostility between the two men, lately. Birkin was on the whole dim and indifferent, drifting along in a dim, easy flow, unnoticing and patient, since he came abroad, whilst Gerald on the other hand, was intense and gripped into white light, agonistes. The two men revoked one another.

(p. 427)

Birkin is a traveller who leaves the old behind in his quest for the new; he, and Ursula, travel toward the symbolic south. Gerald is not a traveller; although Birkin has invited him several times to enter upon the quest, Gerald cannot release himself
from the grip of tradition, the world of machine consciousness symbolized by the north and the ice and snow which are his executioners.

Hermione Roddice and Loerke merit some attention in the analysis of the character depictions, since they are both involved in a man-woman relationship with two of the major characters. Two important characteristics of Hermione are revealed during the first chapter of the novel: the fixity of her nature, "she drifted along with a peculiar fixity of the hips, a strange unwilling motion" (p. 9), which eliminates her as a potential traveller; and her lack of self, "she had no natural sufficiency, there was a terrible void, a lack, a deficiency of being within her" (p. 11), which eliminates her as a rival with Ursula for Birkin. Hermione is of interest in yet another respect: she represents a unique corruption of sacred love. Birkin tells Hermione that she does not have any sensuality, "any real body, and dark sensual body of life" (p. 35); she has only her "will" and her "conceit of conscious." Lacking sensuality, Hermione perverts her sacred self and attempts to make sacred love perform both in its own capacity and in the capacity of profane love.

Lawrence has indicated the abnormalities which result when emphasis is placed upon one type of love at the exclusion of the other type, but he did not indicate what would be the result when one type of love is made to function in both capacities. From Birkin's statement in Chapter III the result may be considered a type of voyeuristic masturbation: "As it is, what you want is
pornography—looking at yourself in mirrors, watching your naked animal actions in mirrors, so that you can have it all in your consciousness, make it all mental" (p. 36).

Loerke is a more perplexing character than Hermione in that he displays several marked traits of individuality, but he is not a traveller: the "movement" of his voice "had the flexibility of essential energy, and of mocking penetrating understanding. . . . He must be an artist, nobody else could have such fine adjustment and singleness" (p. 396). He has "an uncanny singleness, a quality of being by himself, not in contact with anybody else, that marked out an artist . . ." (p. 412). It is perhaps Loerke's strange, almost grotesque separateness that attracts Gudrun during the final chapters of the novel: "She knew that Loerke, in his innermost soul, was detached from everything, for him there was neither heaven nor earth nor hell. He admitted no allegiance, he gave no adherence anywhere. He was single and, by abstraction from the rest, absolute in himself" (p. 443). Loerke's twisted individuality does not qualify him for the quest; in fact, rather than pursuing discovery in a voyage through the unknown, Loerke retreats into the known regions of the past: "They [Gudrun and Loerke] praised bygone things, they took a sentimental, childish delight in the achieved perfections of the past. . . . They played with the past. . . . As for the future, that they never mentioned . . ." (p. 444). Loerke and Hermione are indeed two of Lawrence's more perplexing minor characters; pity they never met—it would have been a frightfully interesting relationship.
There remains one last point of interest in the analysis of the character depictions—Gerald's parents; Mr. and Mrs. Crich are of interest in this study because of their amazing similarity to Anna and Will Brangwen, Ursula and Gudrun's parents. Mr. Crich's biography in Chapter XVIII, "The Industrial Magnate," reveals his predominantly sacred nature, "he had loved his neighbors even better than himself—which is going one further than the commandment" (p. 207), which recalls Will Brangwen's throwing himself into the sacred work of the Church and society in The Rainbow (see above, p. 32). Mrs. Crich, like Anna Brangwen in the earlier novel, isolates herself in the profane task of bearing "many children" (p. 209). Mr. and Mrs. Crich are isolated in much the same way that Anna and Will were isolated in The Rainbow. The parallel between the elder Criches and the elder Brangwens is only slightly interesting in itself; what is more interesting is that two of the products from these parallel man-woman relationships form a second generation man-woman relationship which is, in a highly magnified form, amazingly similar to their parents' relationships. Gerald is a vitiated combination of his father's asexual, mechanistic humanism (is the "Industrial Magnate" Gerald or his father?) and his mother's bitter sensualism (Gerald's "'totem is the wolf . . . . His mother is an old, unbroken wolf.'" p. 9). Gudrun is her parents' daughter: Ursula cannot return to her parents' home after she has entered upon the quest with Birkin, whereas Gerald and Gudrun copulate in her parents' house; moreover, Gudrun clings to the old world of her parents just as
Gerald remains in the grip of his parentage. Early in the novel Gudrun looks upon Gerald as "her escape from the heavy slough of the pale, underworld, automatic colliers" (p. 12), reminding one of Anna's use of Will as a means of "escape" from the Marsh. Thus, the Gerald-Gudrun relationship is even hereditarily fated to end in a tragic battle of wills and the resulting alienation of sensuality.

As the foregoing analysis of the character depictions has illustrated, the pollyanalytic principles of "Love" are more deeply ingrained in *Women in Love* than in *The Rainbow*. Paradoxically there are numerous passages in the later-published novel which express the pollyanalytics of "Love" more perspicuously than any passage found in *The Rainbow*; in fact, some of Birkin's statements correlate so unequivocally with the pollyanalytic writings that entire paragraphs could be lifted from the novel and integrated into "Love," "The Crown," "The Reality of Peace," or even into *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. In the novel the ideas of sacred and profane love and the need for the "unique otherness" of individuals are implicitly stated in several passages. For example, Gerald, the mechanical sensualist, has "only three things left that would rouse him, make him live. One was to drink or smoke hashish, the other was to be soothed by Birkin, and the third was women" (p. 259). However, women gradually lose their effect on Gerald as his lack of intellectual integrity (sacred love) becomes more pronounced. In the chapter entitled "The Industrial Magnate," Gerald begins to sense his sterility:
He found his most satisfactory relief in women. After a debauch with some desperate woman, he went on quite easy and forgetful. The devil of it was, it was so hard to keep up his interest in women nowadays. He didn't care about them any more. . . . No, women, in that sense, were useless to him any more. He felt that his mind needed acute stimulation, before he could be physically roused. (p. 225)

However, most of the more explicit occurrences of pollyanalytic ideas are either directly or indirectly related to the Laurentian spokesman-protagonist, Birkin. Early in the novel Birkin criticizes the emphasis on sacred love which prevents integrity of the individual:

"Can't you see," said Birkin, "that to help my neighbor to eat is no more than eating myself. 'I eat, thou eatest, he eats, we eat, you eat, they eat'—and what then? Why should every man decline the whole verb. First person singular is enough for me."

(p. 48)

When Minette (Pussum), the courtesan of the "crème de menthe crowd," asks Birkin if he is afraid of anything, he replies: "Yes, I'm afraid of some things—of being shut up, locked up anywhere—or being fastened. I am afraid of being bound hand and foot" (p. 59). In the earliest stages of his relationship with Ursula, Birkin creates a duality and flux in her emotional

2Compare this passage from "Love": "How can there be liberty when I am not free to be other than fraternal and equal? I must be free to be separate and unequal in the first sense, if I am to be free. Fraternité and égalité, these are tyranny of tyrannies." Many passages in Women in Love are concerned with the ideas of democratic equality and consequently are directly related not only to the notions of sacred love and of the non-individual but also to larger portions of Lawrence's philosophy which would require too much space to deal with here and which would not, for the most part, be congruous with the pollyanalytics of The Rainbow.
state which foreshadows the later achievement of absolute love in their man-woman relationship:

And it was this duality in feeling which he created in her, that made a fine hate of him quicken in her bowels. There was his wonderful, desirable life-rapidity, the rare quality of an utterly desirable man: and there was at the same time this ridiculous, mean effacement into a Salvator Mundi and a Sunday school teacher, a prig of the stiffest type.

(p. 122)

The pollyanalytic principle most consistently displayed in Birkin's statements and in passages directly related to Birkin is his quest for the "other kingdom of bliss." Birkin is speaking to Ursula:

"... At the very last, one is alone, beyond the influence of love. There is a real impersonal me, that is beyond love, beyond any emotional relationship. So it is with you. But we want to delude ourselves that love is the root. It isn't. It is only the branches. The root is beyond love."

(p. 137)

Love is a means to a goal which is beyond love—the "other kingdom of bliss." As the Birkin-Ursula relationship progresses, Birkin's desire to seek the "other kingdom" becomes more intense and is expressed in increasingly more explicit terms.

He knew that Ursula was referred back to him. He knew his life rested with her. But he would rather not live than accept the love she proffered. The old way of love seemed a dreadful bondage, a sort of conscription. ... the thought of love, marriage, and children, and a life lived together ... was repulsive. He wanted something clearer, more open ... The hot narrow intimacy between man and wife was abhorrent. ... It was a whole community of mistrustful couples insulated in private houses or private rooms, always in couples, and no further in life, no further immediate, no disinterested relationship admitted ... .

On the whole, he hated sex, it was such a limitation. It was sex that turned 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 herself. ... He believed in sex marriage. But beyond this, he wanted a
further conjunction, where man had being and woman had being, two pure beings, each constituting the freedom of the other, balancing each other like two poles of one force, like two angels, or two demons.

He wanted so much to be free, not under the compulsion of any need for unification . . . . And he wanted to be with Ursula as free as with himself, single and clear and cool, yet balanced, polarised with her. The merging, the clutching, the mingling of love was become madly abhorrent to him.

(p. 191)

... The process of singling into individuality resulted in a great polarisation of sex. The womanly drew to one side, the manly to the other. But the separation was imperfect even then. And so our world cycle passes. . . . There is only the pure duality of polarisation, each one free from any contamination of the other. In each, the individual is primal, sex is subordinate, but perfectly polarised. Each has a single, separate being, with its own laws. The man has his pure freedom, the woman hers. Each acknowledges the perfection of the polarised sex-circuit. Each admits the different nature in the other.

(p. 193)

Even the pollyanalytics in "Love," which is the abstraction of the experience, is not as explicit as is this passage from Chapter XVI, "Man to Man." Birkin's quest for the "other kingdom" is not only clear to Birkin himself but it is also perceived by those around him: Gudrun in particular senses Birkin's preoccupation with his idea of "ultimate marriage" and conveys her feelings about it to Gerald:

"... He seems to think that if you marry you can get through marriage into a third heaven, or something—all very vague."

"... he says he believes that a man and wife can go further than any other two beings—but where, is not explained. They can know each other, heavenly and hellish, but particularly hellish, so perfectly that they go beyond
heaven and hell—into—there it all breaks down—into nowhere.

"He says," she added, with a grimace of irony, "that you can find an eternal equilibrium in marriage, if you accept the unison, and still leave yourself separate, don't try to fuse."

"Yet he wants marriage! Marriage—et puis?" [Gerald]

"Le paradis!" mocked Gudrun.

Significantly, the above conversation takes place in the back seat of Birkin's car, a vehicle for travelling; Birkin is driving while Gerald and Gudrun are mocking his quest for a "third heaven," "Le paradis"—"the other kingdom of bliss."

The passage which is perhaps most illustrative of Birkin's notion of the "other kingdom" and which is also one of the passages that contains the pollyanalytic images of "Love" occurs in Chapter XIII, "Mino," during a conversation between Birkin and Ursula. In the conversation Birkin uses such phrases as "pure stable equilibrium," and "two single equal stars balanced in conjunction" (p. 142). Further in the conversation, Birkin and Ursula speak of bondage and freedom in love:

"I do think," he said, "that the world is only held together by the mystic conjunction, the ultimate unison between people—a bond. And the immediate bond is between man and woman."

"But it's such old hat," said Ursula. "Why should love be a bond? No, I'm not having any."

"If you are walking westward," he said, "you forfeit the northern and eastward and southern direction. If you admit a unison, you forfeit all the possibilities of chaos."
"But love is freedom," she declared.

"Don't cant to me," he replied. "Love is a direction which excludes all other directions. It's freedom together, if you like."

"No," she said, "love includes everything."

"Sentimental cant," he replied. "You want the state of chaos, that's all. It is ultimate nihilism, this freedom-in-love business, this freedom which is love and love which is freedom. As a matter of fact, if you enter into a pure unison, it is irrevocable, and it is never pure till it is irrevocable. And when it is irrevocable, it is one way, like the path of a star."

"Ha!" she cried bitterly. "It is the old dead morality."

"No," he said, "it is the law of creation. One is committed. One must commit oneself to a conjunction with the other—for ever. But it is not selfless—it is a maintaining of the self in mystic balance and integrity—like a star balanced with another star."

This conversation between Birkin and Ursula, their second extended conversation in the novel, is Birkin's second attempt to convey to Ursula his notion of absolute love, an intuitive idea which, ultimately, is never clear in his own mind. Birkin's attempts to convey this notion occupy an important role in the development of their man-woman relationship; in a sense, the Birkin-Ursula "courtship" is a conversion of Ursula, and the further development of their relationship is a struggle to achieve the "other kingdom." Recalling Chapter I, "Sisters," a duality can be detected in Ursula's initial reaction to Birkin: "Ursula was left thinking about Birkin. He piqued her, attracted her, and annoyed her." "... Something kept her from him, as well as attracted her to him. There was a certain hostility, a hidden ultimate reserve in him, cold and inaccessible." "Yet she wanted
to know him" (p. 15). The duality and flux appear again during their first isolated encounter, which occurs in Chapter XI, "An Island" (see above, p. 54), and still persists when Birkin has gone to the south of France:

It seemed to Ursula as if Birkin had gone out of her for the time, he had lost his significance, he scarcely mattered in her world. She had her own friends, her own activities, her own life. She turned back to the old ways with zest, away from him.

(p. 202)

Birkin, like Ursula of Women in Love and The Rainbow, has long been a potential partner for the cyclical, dualistic man-woman relationship: "He moved about a great deal, his life seemed uncertain, without any definite rhythm, any organic meaning" (p. 45). Birkin is clearly a capable traveller who is attracted to the quest, but he lacks a partner in the enterprise, a partner who will give it "definite rhythm" and "organic meaning." Ursula is a traveller, as she was in The Rainbow and as is reaffirmed in Women in Love:

She sat crushed and obliterated in a darkness that was the border of death. She realised how all her life she had been drawing nearer and nearer to this brink, where there was no beyond, from which one had to leap like Sappho into the unknown. . . . She had travelled all her life along the line of fulfilment, and it was nearly concluded. . . . one must fulfil one's development to the end, must carry the adventure to its conclusion.

(p. 183)

More than a mere traveller, Ursula is on the threshold of becoming a partner with Birkin in a quest for the beyond. Birkin's quest for the beyond is a search for the "other kingdom," but Ursula does not as yet possess the intuitive, conceptual knowledge of the "other kingdom" that Birkin possesses. Therefore, Ursula's
impulse to pursue discovery in the "voyage through the unknown" is couched in the guise of a death wish, because death is the only beyond of which she can at this point conceive:

... But better to die than to live a mechanical life that is a repetition of repetitions. To die is to move on with the invisible. To die is also a joy, a joy of submitting to that which is greater than the known; namely, the pure unknown. That is a joy. But to live mechanised and cut off within the motion of the will, to live as an entity absolved from the unknown, that is shameful and ignominious. There is no ignominy in death. There is complete ignominy in an unreplenished, mechanised life. Life indeed may be ignominious, shameful to the soul. But death is never a shame. Death itself, like the illimitable space, is beyond our sullying.

To-morrow was Monday. Monday, the beginning of another school-week! ... mere routine and mechanical activity. Was not the adventure of death infinitely preferable? Was not death infinitely more lovely and noble than such a life? A life of barren routine, without inner meaning, without any real significance.

(p. 184-85)

During Birkin's absence to the south of France, Ursula is further prepared to join her future husband in the Laurentian quest for absolute being through absolute love: through the catharsis of isolation described at the beginning of Chapter XIX, "Moony," she is readied to enter a man-woman relationship with Birkin, a relationship which is a ceaseless voyage of discovery. However, Birkin must still coax her (pp. 241-44) before the inevitability of the absolute love is indicated in an explicitly pollyanalytic passage:

There was the way of freedom. There was the paradisal entry into pure, single being, the individual soul taking precedence over love and desire for union, stronger than any pangs of emotion, a lovely state of free proud singleness, which accepted the obligation of the permanent connection with others, and with the other, submits to the
yoke and lease of love, but never forfeits its own proud
individual singleness, even while it loves and yields.

... He must go to her at once. He must ask her to
marry him. They must marry at once, and so make a definite
pledge, enter into a definite communion.

(p. 247)

The consummation of the Birkin-Ursula relationship, the "definite
communion," occurs in Chapter XXIII, "Excurse"; the "travelling"
begins on the second page of "Excurse" when Ursula asks Birkin,
"'And where are we going?'" Birkin answers: "'Anywhere.' It was
the answer she liked" (p. 295). However, it is not a smooth
road that they travel during the early part of the chapter, and
there is a struggle to coordinate the rhythmical motion of their
separate selves. Birkin remains fearful of a complete fusion:
"Fusion, fusion, this horrible fusion of two beings, which every
woman and most men insist on, was it not nauseous and horrible
work anyhow, whether it was a fusion of the spirit or of the
emotional body?" (p. 301). Birkin's anxieties are removed when
the consummation turns out to be the palingenesis he had hoped
for rather than the fusion he had feared: "He drove on in a
strange new wakefulness, the tension of his consciousness broken.
He seemed to be conscious all over, all his body awake with a
simple, glimmering awareness, as if he had just come awake, like
a thing that is born, like a bird when it comes out of an egg,
into a new universe" (p. 303). For Ursula the consummation, the
definite communion of their relationship is a metamorphosis from
the embryonic Ursula of The Rainbow:
... She recalled again the old magic of the Book of
Genesis, where the sons of God saw the daughters of men,
that they were fair. And he was one of these strange crea-
tures from the beyond, looking down at her, and seeing she
was fair.

(p. 304)

... This was release at last. She had had lovers, she had
known passion. But this was neither love nor passion. It
was the daughters of men coming back to the sons of God,
the strange inhuman sons of God who are in the beginning.

(p. 305)

By entering the quest with Birkin, Ursula has found a son of
God and has achieved fulfilment. Birkin, however, was not
seeking fulfilment in the daughters of men, although a rela-
tionship with a woman is important to his quest; Birkin is
seeking fulfilment in the "other kingdom of bliss," his "third
heaven." Birkin and Ursula are now travelling together in the
love relationship, and the first dialogue after their communion
concerns "wandering":

"But where—?" she sighed.

"Somewhere—anywhere. Let's wander off. That's the
thing to do—let's wander off."

"Yes—" she said, thrilled at the thought of travel. But
to her it was only travel.

"To be free," he said. "To be free, in a free place,
with a few other people!"

"Yes," she said wistfully. Those "few other people"
depressed her.
"It isn't really a locality, though," he said. "It's a perfect relation between you and me, and others—the perfect relation—so that we are free together."

"It is, my love, isn't it," she said. "It's you and me. It's you and me, isn't it."

(p. 308)

Four chapters later, in an almost parenthetical anticlimax, Lawrence austerely states that "they were married by law" (p. 362).

The evolution of the Gerald-Gudrun relationship has been neglected in the foregoing analysis for a simple reason: their relationship is a dissolution rather than an evolution. At only one point is there even the faintest "pollyanalytic" indication that the Gerald-Gudrun relationship will evolve, and that moment comes during Chapter XIV, "The Water-Party," the same chapter in which the Birkin-Ursula relationship begins to actively evolve. The glimmer of hope for the Gerald-Gudrun relationship is in the images of isolation and balance which surround the two lovers while they are in a rowboat on Willey Water, the Crich family's private lake:

"There is a space between us," he said in the same low, unconscious voice, as if something were speaking out of him. And she was as if magically aware of their being balanced in separation, in the boat. She swooned with acute comprehension and pleasure.

"But I'm very near," she said caressively, gaily.

"Yet distant, distant," he said. (pp. 168-69)

... His mind was almost submerged, he was almost transfused, lapsed out for the first time in his life, into the things about him. For he always kept such a keen attentiveness, concentrated and unyielding in himself. Now he
had let go, imperceptibly he was melting into oneness with the whole. It was like pure, perfect sleep, his first great sleep of life. He had been so insistent, so guarded, all his life. But here was sleep, and peace, and perfect lapsing out. (p. 170)

The faint glimmer of hope is immediately obliterated with the drowning of Gerald's sister; he becomes "himself again," "as if he belonged naturally to the dread and catastrophe" (p. 171). The isolation noted before is now reinterpreted: "It was not a good isolation, it was a terrible, cold separation of suspense" (p. 174). At this point the Gerald-Gudrun relationship, in effect, enters a state of suspended animation; they are each greatly expanded as individual characters, but their man-woman relationship, except in a few isolated instances when it is briefly contrasted to the development of the Birkin-Ursula relationship, is held in abeyance until Chapter XXIV, "Death and Love." The chapter contains the Gerald-Gudrun copulation scene and immediately succeeds the Birkin-Ursula sex scene at the end of "Excurse"; the juxtaposition of the two priapic scenes clearly reveals the sharp contrast between the two man-woman relationships. The Birkin-Ursula scene:

... They threw off their clothes, and he gathered her to him, and found her, found the pure lambent reality of her for ever invisible flesh. Quenched, inhuman, his fingers upon her unrevealed nudity were the fingers of silence upon silence, the body of mysterious night upon the body of mysterious night, the night masculine and feminine, never to be seen with the eye, or known with the mind, only known as a palpable revelation of living otherness.

... She had her desire fulfilled. He had his desire fulfilled. For she was to him what he was to her, the immemorial magnificence of mystic, palpable, real otherness.
They slept the chilly night through under the hood of the car, a night of unbroken sleep. It was already high day when he awoke. They looked at each other and laughed, then looked away, filled with darkness and secrecy. Then they kissed and remembered the magnificence of the night. It was so magnificent, such an inheritance of a universe of dark reality, that they were afraid to seem to remember. They hid away the remembrance and the knowledge.

(pp. 312-13)

The Gerald-Gudrun scene:

He had come for vindication. She let him hold her in his arms, clasp her close against him. He found in her an infinite relief. Into her he poured all his pent-up darkness and corrosive death, and he was whole again.

As he drew nearer to her, he plunged deeper into her enveloping soft warmth, a wonderful creative heat that penetrated his veins and gave him life again. He felt himself dissolving and sinking to rest in the bath of her living strength.

And she, she was the great bath of life, he worshipped her. Mother and substance of all life she was. And he, child and man, received of her and was made whole.

(p. 337)

He was infinitely grateful, as to God, or as an infant is at its mother's breast. He was glad and grateful like a delirium, as he felt his own wholeness come over him again, as he felt the full, unutterable sleep coming over him, the sleep of complete exhaustion and restoration.

But Gudrun lay wide awake, destroyed into perfect consciousness. She lay motionless, with wide eyes staring motionless into darkness, whilst he was sunk away in sleep, his arms round her.

The endless breaking of slow, sullen waves of fate held her life a possession, whilst she lay with dark, wide eyes looking into the darkness. She could see so far, as far as eternity—but she saw nothing. She was suspended in perfect consciousness—and of what was she conscious?

She had lain so long motionless. She moved, she became self-conscious. She wanted to look at him, to see him.
But she dared not make a light, because she knew he would wake, and she did not want to break his perfect sleep, that she knew he had got of her.

(p. 338)

Clearly, the sexual intercourse of Birkin and Ursula is a duality and a oneness, "a love which is the motion of melting, fusing together into oneness, and a love which is the intense, frictional, and sensual gratification of being burnt down, burnt apart into separate clarity of being . . ." ("Love"); whereas, the Gerald-Gudrun copulation is a "battle of sensual gratification, the beautiful but deadly counterposing [sic] of male against female . . ." (see above, p. 18). Birkin and Ursula sleep "a night of unbroken sleep"; Gudrun is "destroyed into perfect consciousness" and passes a sleepless night while Gerald is "sunk away in sleep" which "he had got of her." When Birkin and Ursula awake they meet the new day in the joy and well-being of communion; yet, it is an entirely different scene in Gudrun's bedroom:

But the time was drawing near when she could wake him. It was like a release. The clock had struck four, outside in the night. Thank God the night had passed almost away. At five he must go, and she would be released. Then she could relax and fill her own place. Now she was driven up against his perfect sleeping motion like a knife white-hot on a grindstone. There was something monstrous about him, about his juxtaposition against her.

The last hour was the longest. And yet, at last it passed. Her heart leapt with relief—yes, there was the slow, strong stroke of the church clock—at last, after this night of eternity. She waited to catch each slow, fatal reverberation. 'Three——four——five!' There it was finished. A weight rolled off her.
There was a certain coldness in her voice that made him release her, and she broke away, rose and lit the candle. That then was the end.

(pp. 339-40)

The two sex scenes are juxtaposed in a contrast which marks the major turning point in the novel: the sexual conjunction between Birkin and Ursula is symbolic of their communion and further evolution in the quest for the "other kingdom of bliss"; the Gerald-Gudrun copulation is symbolic of their dissolution which now begins to hasten toward its final degenerative state.

Up to this point in the novel, the pollyanalytics of the man-woman relationship concentrated chiefly on the development and consummation of the Birkin-Ursula relationship; now the dissolution of the Gerald-Gudrun relationship will share, if not at times dominate, the pollyanalytics of the remaining seven chapters. The first direct pollyanalytic indication that the Gerald-Gudrun relationship is doomed occurs in Chapter XXVIII, "Gudrun in the Pompadour." Whenever she visits London, Gudrun is mysteriously drawn to the "hated Café": "It was as if she had to return to this small, slow central whirlpool, of disintegration and dissolution . . ." (p. 327). While Gerald and Gudrun are seated in the Café, the "crème de menthe" crowd is maliciously ridiculing Birkin's marriage and sardonically laughing at Halliday's reading of a letter which he had received from Birkin several months earlier. The following paragraph of the letter has a strange effect on Gudrun:

"'Surely there will come an end in us to this desire——for the constant going apart—the passion for putting asunder—all of everything—ourselves, reducing ourselves part from
part—reacting in intimacy only for destruction—using sex as a great reducing agent, reducing the two great elements of male and female from their highly complex unity—reducing the old ideas, going back to the savages for our sensations—always seeking to lose ourselves in some ultimate black sensation, mindless and infinite—burning only with destructive fires, ranging on with the hope of being burnt out utterly—'" (p. 376)

Gudrun asks to see the letter, seizes it, and leaves the Café, waiting outside momentarily for Gerald. Gudrun's causes for seizing Birkin's letter are not entirely clear; since she and Birkin have never been depicted as being on amiable terms with each other, it is doubtful that her action was prompted by her sense of loyalty to him. It must have been some intuitive agent that impelled Gudrun to seize the letter which had struck a responsive or sensitive cord.

The next scene in which Gerald and Gudrun are alone occurs at the mountain resort; it is the second Gerald-Gudrun copulation scene and culminates, after the completion of the sex act, in Gerald's statement: "My God, what next?" (p. 392). Gerald is, by even his own admission, a sensualist, and now that the Gerald-Gudrun relationship is clearly a profane one, the answer to "what next?" is, in the pollyanalytic implications, clear: a "flamboyant and lacerating tragedy when the two which are so singled out are torn finally apart by death."³

³"Assert sex as the predominant fulfilment, and you get the collapse of living purpose in man. You get anarchy. Assert purposiveness as the one supreme and pure activity of life, and you drift into barren sterility, like our business life of today, and our political life." Fantasia of the Unconscious, p. 145.
But between two particular people, any two particular people on earth, the range of pure sensational experience is limited. The climax of sensual reaction, once reached in any direction, is reached finally, there is no going on. There is only repetition possible, or the going apart of two protagonists, or the subjugating of the one will to the other, or death.

(p. 443)

The answer, then, to Gerald's question "what next?" is death. In the next paragraph on the same page Gudrun becomes aware of her fate: "In Gerald she knew the world, and had done with it. Knowing him finally she was the Alexander seeking new worlds. But there were no new worlds, there were no more men, there were only creatures, little, ultimate creatures like Loerke."

Gerald's fate is ultimately less ignoble than Gudrun's destiny with Loerke and the "creatures like Loerke" who will follow. In his death scene (pp. 464-66) Gerald becomes a traveller, but only in a limited sense, because he is travelling in order to arrive at an end, death. His desire for death is entirely different from Ursula's death wish earlier in the novel (see above, pp. 58-59): hers was a desire to continue the voyage of discovery through the unknown, the unceasing quest beyond the limits of her experience; Gerald's is a suicidal desire to end all experience: "He was weak, but he did not want to rest, he wanted to go on and on, to the end. Never again to stay, till he came to the end, that was all the desire that remained to him" (p. 464). "He wanted so to come to the end—he had enough." "He only wanted to go on, to go on whilst he could, to move, to keep going, until it was finished" (p. 465).
The profane love relationship between Gerald and Gudrun ends in lacerating alienation and death, while the Birkin-Ursula relationship evolves into consummation and fulfillment which even Gudrun has recognized and envied: "She always envied, almost with resentment, the strange positive fullness that subsisted in the atmosphere around Ursula and Birkin" (p. 369). There is a positive atmosphere in the quest upon which Birkin and Ursula have entered; yet, for Birkin the sense of fulfillment is only partial in comparison with Ursula's "positive fullness." Ursula had found one of the "sons of God" and has achieved fulfillment by entering with Birkin upon the quest for the "third heaven," the "other kingdom"; Ursula's "other kingdom" is Birkin, and since Birkin is on a voyage through the unknown, she must join him in that voyage in order to gain her "other kingdom."

Birkin needs a partner in order to enter the quest for the "other kingdom" because the motion of the quest is absolute love between a man and a woman. However, the "other kingdom of bliss" is more than absolute love; it has now become a social ideal of communal commitment simultaneously balanced with complete individual freedom and spontaneity, a Laurentian utopia that Gudrun at one point calls "Rupert's Blessed Isles." Birkin tells Gerald: "You've got to take down the love-and-marriage ideal from its pedestal. We want something broader. I believe in the additional perfect relationship between man and man——additional to marriage." "Not the same—but equally important, equally creative, equally sacred, if you like" (p. 345); yet, Birkin
admits that he is not certain about this additional relationship and tells Ursula that:

"It's the problem I can't solve. I know I want a perfect and complete relationship with you: and we've nearly got it—we really have. But beyond that. Do I want a final, almost extra-human relationship with [Gerald]—a relationship in the ultimate of me and him—or don't I?"

(p. 355)

This "equally important" relationship with another man is beyond Ursula's comprehension. She senses the impact Gerald's death has had upon Birkin and asks:

"Did you need Gerald?" she asked one evening.

"Yes," he said.

"Aren't I enough for you?" she asked.

"No," he said. "You are enough for me, as far as a woman is concerned. You are all women to me. But I wanted a man friend, as eternal as you and I are eternal."

"Why aren't I enough?" she said. "You are enough for me. I don't want anybody else but you. Why isn't it the same with you?"

"Having you, I can live all my life without anybody else, any other sheer intimacy. But to make it complete, really happy, I wanted eternal union with a man too: another kind of love," he said.

... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ...

"You can't have two kinds of love. Why should you!"

"It seems as if I can't," he said. "Yet I wanted it."

"You can't have it, because it's false, impossible," she said.

"I don't believe that," he answered. (pp. 472-73)

At this point Birkin has moved beyond the pollyanalytics of
"Love," closing the novel with an open-ended question and continuing the quest for the "other kingdom of bliss," the voyage of discovery which became the experience of both Lawrence's writings and his own life during the decade which succeeded *Women in Love* and "Love."
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION: THE CRITICAL PROBLEM
OF THE POLLYANALYTICS

The most persistent critical issue concerning the pollyanalytic content of Lawrence's novels is the question of whether the appearance of the pollyanalytics within the context of a novel produces an artistic flaw in Lawrence's fiction, or whether the pollyanalytic content is an integral part of the artistic construct, enhancing rather than diminishing the aesthetic validity of Lawrence's novels. Representative of the former view, that the pollyanalytics produce an artistic flaw in Lawrence's work, is F. H. Langman's contention that a complex artistic structure, such as found in Women in Love, demands "an embodiment of the writer's imagination [which Lawrence] is not always able to figure forth. Where his imagination fails, the design is eked out by intellect and will."1 From adherents of the opposing view, that the pollyanalytics do not weaken the structure of a novel, come pronouncements like Joseph Warren Beach's, that Lawrence "appears very little in the rôle of discursive philosopher."2 To approach even a provisional opinion concerning

---

2Twentieth Century Novel, p. 369.
this critical controversy, it will be necessary to briefly observe the ways in which a knowledge of the pollyanalytics has assisted some Laurentian critics and how a lack of that knowledge has partially thwarted others.

H. M. Daleski, in his book *The Forked Flame*, is one of the few critics to approach Lawrence's novels with the assistance of the pollyanalytic writings; however, as noted previously, Daleski maintains that the pollyanalytic writings were, for the most part, a priori and not, as Lawrence indicated, a posteriori. At first glance, the "Study of Thomas Hardy" (1914) seems to support Daleski's contention: for example, in one of the "Hardy" essays Lawrence's notion concerning the desire to break away from convention seems relevant both to *The Rainbow* and to *Women in Love*; Lawrence observes that when a man's desire compels him to break the bonds of convention, the man says one of two things to himself, either he says, "'I was right, my desire was real and inevitable; if I was to be myself I must fulfil it, convention or no convention,' or else, [he stands there] alone, doubting, and saying: 'Was I right, was I wrong? If I was wrong, oh, let me die!'——in which case he courts death." This passage may

---

3 Although his references to the pollyanalytics are limited, Daleski reveals an acquaintance with at least several pollyanalytic writings in his introductory chapter and consistently refers to the pollyanalytics throughout his analysis of Lawrence's novels.

4 See Foreward to Fantasia of the Unconscious quoted above, p. 1, and the note on p. 2 above; also see *The Forked Flame*, pp. 18ff.

5 *Phoenix*, pp. 411-12.
apply to Gerald Crich, but it may also apply to William Morel in *Sons and Lovers*; William, like Gerald, dies after stepping outside convention. Another passage from one of the "Hardy" essays seems applicable to Ursula in *The Rainbow*: "That she bear children is not a woman's significance. But that she bear herself, that is her supreme and risky fate: that she drive on to the edge of the unknown and beyond" (p. 441). Since Lawrence's female protagonists are first, last, and always women and are mothers only coincidentally, this passage may apply to Ursula Brangwen, Alvina Houghton, Harriet Somers, Kate Leslie, or even to "She-who-was-Cynthia"; yet, when the passage just quoted is placed beside a passage from a more mature pollyanalytic essay, such as "The Real Thing," an important feature of Lawrence's pollyanalytics becomes apparent.

We know now that our fathers were fought and beaten by our mothers, not because our mothers really knew what was "better," but because our fathers had lost their instinctive hold on the life-flow and the life-reality, that therefore the female had to fight them at any cost, blind, and doomed. 6

Although "The Real Thing" was written during the last years of Lawrence's life, the essay's pollyanalytic roots extend as far back as Walter and Gertrude Morel in *Sons and Lovers* and encompass every significant father-mother relationship in Lawrence's novels, including Tom and Lydia and Anna and Will in *The Rainbow* and Mr. and Mrs. Crich in *Women in Love*.

It is apparent that Lawrence's "pseudo-philosophy" is so consistent that to attempt a pollyanalytic approach to any single

---

novel demands a familiarity with practically all of Lawrence's pollyanalytic writings, not just those written during or immediately after the particular work in question. The pollyanalytics are, as Daleski states, signposts, but they mark a road already travelled more often than a road to be travelled. As Jarrett-Kerr ("Father William Tiverton") noted, "It is clear that, like all great imaginative artists, the living organism of the novel came first to Lawrence, and only later came its significance, its 'purpose'."

The ubiquity of Lawrence's thought is such that his philosophical tenets will appear almost everywhere and at once in all his writings—novels, essays, poetry, tales, dramas, travel books, and letters. Any careful reading of the bulk of Lawrence's work cannot fail to reveal the consistent organic development of his artistic genius. However, any evaluation of one of Lawrence's works or of a group of his works made without a conscious knowledge of the main mass of his writings and of the consistency of his development will either contain critical pitfalls ranging from hastily drawn conclusion and asinine misinterpretation, or will, as George Ford observes, "lead the critic into exposing himself (or herself) rather than to providing a helpful account of the fiction under consideration."

---


8 Double Measure, p. 4.
Horace Gregory's evaluation of Lawrence's novels is an example of how an only partial knowledge of Lawrence's works and an incomplete understanding of his "pseudo-philosophy" can lead from one critical pitfall to another. An instance of hastily drawn conclusion in Gregory's book is his statement concerning the four main characters in Women in Love: "We must accept, I think, the fact that none of the human characters in Women in Love is clearly defined, nor do I think that Lawrence found them interesting as individuals." That the characters are clearly defined is evident through even an exiguous understanding of the pollyanalytics. To claim that Birkin and Ursula, and Gerald and Gudrun did not interest Lawrence as individuals is tantamount to claiming that Adam and Eve did not interest Milton and that Shakespeare was not interested in the human qualities of Antony and Cleopatra. Gregory clearly reveals his inadequate knowledge of the pollyanalytic writings by claiming that Birkin "comes closest to being Lawrence's advocate, but nowhere is he as close to being his spokesman as Ursula in The Rainbow, as Paul Morel in Sons and Lovers, or as Mellors in Lady Chatterly." As any close reading of these three novels reveals, the instances of dialogue in which Ursula, Paul Morel, and Mellors serve as vehicles for explicit verbalization of Lawrence's thoughts are

9D. H. Lawrence: Pilgrim of the Apocalypse (1933; rpt. New York: Grove Press, and London: Evergreen Books, 1957). Gregory's book was selected as an example for two basic reasons: it was the earliest attempt by a critic who had not personally known Lawrence to evaluate his major works; it was written before Phoenix appeared in 1936.

10p. 45. 11p. 48.
extremely infrequent. On the other hand, as illustrated previously (see above pp. 53ff), the frequency of instances in which Birkin almost blatantly voices Laurentian precepts is surpassed only by that of Rawdon Lilly in *Aaron's Rod* and Lovat Somers in *Kangaroo*. The inadequacies of Gregory's interpretation culminate in his gross misconception that *Women in Love* is important chiefly as a "transition between *The Rainbow* and *Aaron's Rod*." ¹²

The availability of Lawrence's more obscure pollyanalytic writings, especially since the appearance of *Phoenix* in 1936, and the recognition of Lawrence as a major literary figure, due largely to F. R. Leavis's book and to Harry T. Moore's various biographical and critical contributions, has eliminated many critical mistakes in the articles and books of the past two decades. Although infrequent instances of critical miscarriage still occur, present-day Laurentian critics are more likely to encounter interpretive impasses which often cause the critics either to offer incomplete views or to admit the existence of "unanswerable" questions. For example, Julean Moynahan's neglect of pollyanalytic connotations in *The Rainbow* causes him to present an incomplete analysis of Will Brangwen; commenting on Will's inability to become a fulfilled being, Moynahan claims that "if a character is gripped in the inhuman will of life, the reader is in the hands of a narrator who keeps secret some of..."

¹²p. 50. Gregory amended this assessment in his Introduction to the 1957 reprint by calling *Women in Love* "one of the half dozen best novels of this century." (p. xv).
the ultimate issues of life and death his characters face." Lawrence the narrator may keep secrets from his readers, but Lawrence the novelist offers situations calling for reader response, situations which may demand that a reader be specially equipped in order to respond but not situations in which "ultimate issues" are kept secret. As Lawrence himself stated: "I don't intend my books for the generality of readers. I count it a mistake of our mistaken democracy, that every man who can read is allowed to believe that he can read all that is printed." Lawrence demanded more of his readers than the ability to read: he demanded the ability to read D. H. Lawrence, meaning a reader with especial equipment, a large portion of which is a empathic cognition of his "pseudo-philosophy." If a reader, or a critic, approaches a novel without the proper prerequisites, he will leave the novel with an incomplete understanding of his experience.

Many critics claim that Lawrence's novels contain questions which are simply unanswerable: for example, Moynahan asks why some characters in The Rainbow "succeed in saving themselves while others fail?" claiming that "this question is virtually impossible to answer." Such critical comments often imply that the "unanswerable" questions are an artistic flaw in the novels; few critics admit or imply, as George Ford does, that

---

14 Foreward to Fantasia of the Unconscious, p. 53.
15 p. 47.
it is their own inabilities rather than Lawrence's which leave such questions unanswered. Some critics even see it as a gross failure of Lawrence's artistic genius as a whole rather than as a lack of knowledge or understanding on their own part. Those who criticize Lawrence, as Gregory does, for leaving too many problems unsolved in his novels fail to see that "Lawrence's failure . . . to 'solve' the problems . . . may have been the world's loss but it was his novel's gain." The pollyanalytic writings do not "solve" the problems, but they can define them in a manner which will allow the reader to experience the problems as Lawrence experienced them.

On the other hand, an over dependence upon the pollyanalytic writings may result in a too limited view of Lawrence's work; this danger is especially present when one relies upon one particular pollyanalytic writing, as is the case of Daleski's use of the "Hardy" essays or Miroslav Beker's use of the "Crown" and "Reality of Peace" essays. Beker is certainly correct when he says that through the pollyanalytic essays "we gain a new perspective on the characters in [Women in Love] and see their relations in a different light. We also learn that the images of corruption and decay in Women in Love are not limited to the novel alone but belong to a wider framework of Lawrence's imagery, and we can speak of their connotations and suggestive power with much more certainty than we would be able to do without the

16 Ford, Double Measure, p. 218.
knowledge of Lawrence's two non-fictional writings ["Crown" and "Reality of Peace"])." But Lawrence's "wider framework" must not be confined to the "Crown" nor to the "Reality of Peace" but rather must include the entire "living organism" of his art. All too often critics who have attempted to ascend the mountain of Lawrence's art have neglected the beauty and panoramic splendor of the view while looking for footholes and hand holds on the sheer granite face of a printed page.

Yet the "persistent critical issue" concerning the poly-analytic content of Lawrence's novels remains unsolved. Although most critical studies of Lawrence's novels encounter the problem, few critics have attempted to define its specific nature. Eliseo Vivas attempts such a definition when he observes that "the central question is not the admissibility of Lawrence's 'love ethic' — a problem which mature individuals ought to decide for themselves, if they are interested in it. The central question is that Lawrence employs the novel to teach us a 'love ethic': And by doing so he abandons the task of the artist and undertakes that of the propagandist." As Eugene Goodheart has noted, Vivas may be correct when applying his statement to Aaron's Rod or to Kangaroo, but The Rainbow or Women in Love may be considered "propagandistic" only to the extent that Paradise Lost or


The Divine Comedy may be deemed homiletic didacticism. Lawrence himself had, as it were, answered Vivas's charge in a polly-analytic essay, "The Novel":

In a novel, everything is relative to every thing else, if that novel is art at all. There may be didactic bits, but they aren't the novel. And the author may have didactic "purpose" up his sleeve. Indeed most great novelists have . . . . But even a didactic purpose . . . cannot put to death the novel.

You can tell me, Flaubert had a "philosophy", not "purpose". But what is a novelist's philosophy but a purpose on a rather higher level? And since every novelist who amounts to anything has a philosophy—even Balzac—any novel of importance has a purpose. If only the "purpose" be large enough, and not at odds with the passional inspiration.\(^{20}\)

Miroslav Beker comes closer to defining the nature of the "central question" when he refers to T. S. Eliot's statement that "the first danger[ of literary interpretation] is that of assuming that there must be just one interpretation of a poem as a whole that must be right," juxtaposing this critical view with Helen Gardners's that "a poem is not whatever I choose to make it. It is something which its author made with deliberation . . . ."\(^{21}\) The difference between these two views is aesthetic; applying this difference to the relation between the pollyanalytics and Lawrence's novels, the problem is now properly defined as an aesthetic controversy. It is the difference between the aesthetic act of creating and the aesthetic act of


perceiving; it is the argument over which is the proper critical pursuit—investigation of the act of artistic creation or analysis of the act of audience perception. The pollyanalytics can assist the critic or the reader in approaching a novel as Lawrence approached it, thereby helping to reconstruct the artistic act of creation. On the other hand, whether the pollyanalytics are an aid or a hindrance to examining the act of audience perception or whether they enhance or diminish the audience's perceptive powers is a Gordian knot whose subjective nature defies unravelment.

Although the pollyanalytics may establish some semidiaphanous interpretive boundaries, Lawrence has not interpreted his novels through his "psuedo-philosophy." For reader and critic alike the pollyanalytics are an essential part of the "living organism" of Lawrence's art, no portion of which can be neglected: for with Lawrence, the meaning lies in the whole which is the sum of constituent parts, not in the parts which constitute the whole. To Lawrence himself, the pollyanalytics were the ideas abstracted from his experiences "as a writer and as a man"—the nucleus of his own "passionate struggle into conscious being."
APPENDIX

"Love" first appeared in the January, 1918, issue of the English Review and has since been reprinted in Phoenix (1936) and in Sex, Literature, and Censorship (1953), but the precise dates of the essay's composition are difficult to determine.

Harry T. Moore places the essay's composition sometime during 1917, "before [Lawrence's] expulsion from Cornwall in October."¹ Keith Sagar claims that "Love" and a companion essay, "Life" (English Review, February, 1918), were sent to Lawrence's literary agent, J. B. Pinker, during the autumn of 1917.² "Love" had undoubtedly been written sometime prior to the autumn of 1917, as both Moore and Sagar suggest, but that Lawrence had sent the essay to Pinker seems doubtful, for in a letter to Pinker dated December 18, 1917, Lawrence informs Pinker that "Harrison [the editor of the English Review] is publishing two essays of mine next month—I suppose you knew" (Collected Letters, p. 535). That Lawrence probably bypassed Pinker and sent the two essays directly to Harrison is further evidenced by a letter dated October 8, 1917, in which Lawrence tells Catherine Carswell of two essays, probably "Love" and "Life":

"Here are the two essays you asked for. I had forgotten about them. I shall send them on to the English Review: no doubt Harrison will print them . . . ." If the two essays referred to are "Love" and "Life," the letter to Catherine Carswell establishes the fact that the essays were written prior to October, 1917; moreover, Lawrence's admission that he "had forgotten about them" implies that the essays had been written at least several weeks prior to the October 8 date of the letter to Carswell. Considering these factors, the approximate date of composition for "Love" could be placed more specifically in the late summer of 1917.

The dates of composition for "Love" and "Life" would be of only bibliographical interest were it not for another, more significant mystery in the 1917 canon: the three missing "Reality of Peace" essays. As illustrated previously (pp. 3-4 above), Lawrence had turned to philosophizing immediately after the completion of *Women in Love* in November, 1916, and had completed the seven "Reality of Peace" essays by March 7, 1917 (Letters, p. 401). A March 17, 1917, letter to Pinker indicates the importance of the "Reality of Peace" to Lawrence: "I am sending you seven little Articles called The Reality of Peace. . . . They are very beautiful and dear to me, I feel very delicate and sensitive about them. I intend to follow them up with more such chapters, to make a book" (Letters, p. 420). The letter

contains a postscript: "Harrison must not cut the articles without letting me know first—if he takes them." Lawrence was disappointed when only four of the "Reality of Peace" essays were published in the English Review; however, he still hoped that the unpublished essays would be printed elsewhere, and as late as August 3, 1917, he asked Pinker: "Do you think anybody would care to publish a little book or pamphlet, the 'Reality of Peace,' four numbers of which (out of seven) came in the English Review?" (Collected Letters, p. 521).

According to Lawrence's bibliographers, the three unpublished "Reality of Peace" essays have been lost; moreover, another "lost" portion of Lawrence's pseudo-philosophy, "At the Gates," adds even more complexity to the bibliographical jigsaw puzzle of the 1917 canon. Evidence from the letters indicates that Lawrence was writing philosophical essays during the greater part of 1917: on April 1, 1917, less than one month after completing the "Reality of Peace," Lawrence writes Mark Gertler: "... I am writing short essays on philosophy" (Collected Letters, p. 508); on June 10, 1917, he writes Catherine Carswell: "I am doing philosophy only: very good I think, but a slow job" (Collected Letters, p. 515); and in a letter to Waldo Frank dated July 27, 1917, Lawrence's announces that he has "just written a tiny book of philosophy ..." (Collected Letters, p. 519). The first specific reference to "At the Gates" was not made until August 30, 1917.

1917, on which date Lawrence writes Pinker: "I will send you on the MS. of *At the Gates* in a day or two. On second thoughts, I send it at once. You will see it is based on the more superficial *Reality of Peace*" (*Letters*, p. 414). When Lawrence and Pinker ended their business relationship in 1920, Pinker returned to Lawrence all unpublished manuscripts, including the "At the Gates" manuscript which has since been lost.\(^5\)

By assembling the information thus far presented, the importance of "Love" in relation to Lawrence's other philosophical writings of 1917 may at least be conjectured, if not ascertained. First, Lawrence had completed by March 7, 1917, seven essays entitled the "Reality of Peace," which he wanted very much to be published and of which only four were published. Second, Lawrence had completed a book of philosophical writings, "At the Gates," by August 30, 1917. Finally, Lawrence had written during the late summer of 1917 two essays, "Love" and "Life," which were sent directly to the *English Review*, circumventing Pinker. These three facts indicate that "Love," if it was not one of the lost "Reality of Peace" essays,\(^6\) was either part of "At the Gates" or was at least written during one of Lawrence's most intense pseudo-philosophic periods.

---

\(^5\) *The Intelligent Heart*, p. 291.
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