

SHORT TITLE OF THESIS:

PATTERNS OF STYLISTIC CHANGE IN NOVELS OF D.H. LAWRENCE

McGILL UNIVERSITY

PATTERNS OF STYLISTIC CHANGE IN THE
NOVELS OF D.H. LAWRENCE

BY

MARION SMITH McKEOWN

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

MONTREAL, QUEBEC
AUGUST, 1974

ABSTRACT

In the novels of D.H. Lawrence changes in patterns of stylistic choices parallel changes in ideas of the functions of words. When words are presented as vehicles of individual expression the characteristic stylistic options are expansion transformations, as in the early novels. When the role of words in communication is considered, deletions increase. For example, in Women in Love, Lawrence discusses the need for verbal self-expression and rejects verbal communication, and expansion and deletion are both used extensively. Deletion increases in Aaron's Rod and Kangaroo which depict verbal communication as threatening. The Plumed Serpent and Lady Chatterley's Lover retreat from the threatening world of the realistic novel to a mythic world in which verbal communication is often superfluous, and fewer deletions are present.

RÉSUMÉ

Le choix des structures stylistiques dans les romans de D.H. Lawrence correspond aux changements dans sa pensée sur les fonctions des mots. Quand les mots sont présentés comme véhicules d'expression individuelle son style préféré est celui des transformations expansives, comme dans ses premiers romans. Mais insiste-t-il sur le rôle communicatif des mots, alors son texte est plein de ratures. Par exemple, dans Women in Love, Lawrence, appuyant sur la révélation verbale de soi, refuse la communication verbale, et se sert librement de l'expansion et de la rature. Et cela plus encore dans Aaron's Rod et Kangaroo qui dépeignent la communication verbale comme une menace. Mais The Plumed Serpent et Lady Chatterley's Lover, s'échappant du monde menaçant du roman réaliste se réfugient dans un monde mythique où la communication verbale est souvent superflue; alors il y a très peu de ratures.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to take this opportunity to thank all those who have assisted me in the preparation of this dissertation.

Special thanks are due to Professor Alan Heuser and Professor Ben Weems of McGill University for their patient reading of drafts, and their helpful suggestions on structuring the argument.

I am also grateful for the assistance of Professor Virginia Clark of the University of Vermont who spent considerable time discussing transformational grammars and stylistic analyses. In this connection I must also thank Professor James Marino of the University of Alberta who checked my analyses and researched problematic transformations.

My thanks are also due to my father and my husband who both took on the exacting task of compiling the statistics and checking the mathematical calculations involved. Mrs. Terry Diduch was most helpful with her speedy and accurate typing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	111
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
INTRODUCTION	1
 Chapter	
I SIGNIFICANT TRANSFORMATIONS AND PATTERNS OF CHANGE	11
II THE FIRST THREE NOVELS: WORDS AS EXPRESSION OF THE INDIVIDUAL	44
III <u>THE RAINBOW: THE NEED FOR</u> COMMUNICATION	77
IV <u>WOMEN IN LOVE: EXPRESSION</u> VERSUS COMMUNICATION	108
V <u>AARON'S ROD AND KANGAROO:</u> THE FEAR OF COMMUNION	157
VI <u>THE PLUMED SERPENT: THE</u> ESCAPE TO SOLUTIONS	178
VII <u>LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER:</u> A STEP TOWARD RESOLUTION	203
VIII THE THEORETICAL CONSTRUCTS	228
 APPENDIX A	 269
APPENDIX B	277
BIBLIOGRAPHY	286

INTRODUCTION

Amid the numerous studies of the novels of D.H. Lawrence there are comparatively few full-length analyses of Lawrence's style. The three recent dissertations on the subject, by Anne Englander,¹ Anthony Heilbut,² and Jane Gurko,³ are useful primarily as they examine isolated lexical or semantic patterns in the light of Lawrence's psychological conflicts, his biography, or his personal theories. Apart from the three dissertations most of the comments on Lawrence's style are incidental, and many of those are limited to approval of Lawrence's description of his own "continual, slightly modified repetition."⁴

Some critics, to be sure, extend impressionistic evaluations, such as those found in Harry T. Moore's study. They repeat Moore's comments that Lawrence's style is

¹ Anne Englander, Technique as Evasion, Diss. Northwestern, 1966.

² Anthony O. Heilbut, The Prose Style of D.H. Lawrence, Diss. Harvard, 1966.

³ Jane Gurko, The Flesh Made Word, Diss. Berkeley, 1972.

⁴ D.H. Lawrence, "Foreword," Women in Love (New York: Viking-Compass, 1960), p. viii.

"penetrating" or "intense," or they praise "the magnificent style of writing" in which "the highly colored prose is at once admirably concrete and successfully poetic."⁵ More specific and verifiable than either the dissertations or the impressionistic studies are a few short articles which discuss very restricted aspects of Lawrence's style. For example, Frank Baldanza presents an illuminating study of some of the rhythmic patterns in The Rainbow and Women in Love,⁶ and Derek Bickerton points out some of the outstanding lexical features in Women in Love.⁷ Throughout all these studies, however, of whatever length, there is a scarcity of verifiable statements describing general stylistic patterns and changes in Lawrence's prose.

An indication that verifiable statements about patterns and changes are possible was given in 1964. In his seminal article "Generative Grammars and the Concept of Literary Style," Richard Ohmann points out the limitations of some ten approaches to literary analyses, including

⁵ Harry T. Moore, "The Prose Style of D.H. Lawrence," Actes du Congrès de la Fédération Internationale des Langues et Littératures Modernes, Vol. VIII (Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1961), pp. 317-318.

⁶ Frank Baldanza, "D.H. Lawrence's Song of Songs," Modern Fiction Studies, VII (1961), 106-114.

⁷ Derek Bickerton, "The Language of Women in Love," Review of English Literature, VII, 11 (1967), 56-67.

those alluded to above.⁸ Defining a writer's style as his characteristic use of options within a language system, Ohmann blames the incompleteness or fragmentary nature of the various approaches on an inadequate theory of language. Many may disagree with the theories of transformational grammar on which Ohmann bases his investigations, but few disagree that the insights gained through application of transformational analyses are revealing, especially those on Lawrence.

In his article, Ohmann grounds his impressionistic comments about Lawrence's style in the transformations which generate the particular emotional effect. He notes that Studies in Classic American Literature has "an especially brusque, emphatic style, which results partly from Lawrence's affection for kernel [minimally transformed] sentences. But his main idiosyncrasy is the use of truncated sentences, which have gone through a variety of deletion transformations" (Ohmann, p. 135). After demonstrating how his statements may be verified, he ends with the comment that "the reasons for Lawrence's preferring deletion to conjunction might well be worth some study" (Ohmann, p. 136).

⁸ Richard M. Ohmann, "Generative Grammars and the Concept of Literary Style," Readings in Applied Transformational Grammar, ed. Mark Lester (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970), pp. 117-136.

It is disappointing that there are so few studies which even tangentially follow-up such a rational pioneer study of Lawrence. Ohmann's remarks do indicate a basis for a thorough and perceptive survey of Lawrence's stylistic patterns and changes. Others who might have taken up Ohmann's challenge have not yet reported on their study, but my own study in response to his suggestion indicates that his major assumptions require modification. A wider exploration of Lawrence's style shows that kernel or minimally transformed sentences are not characteristic of Lawrence, and that he does not prefer deletion to conjunction. Instead the numbers of expansion transformations, conjunctions and deletions fluctuate in a significant pattern.

For me, an interest in Ohmann's remarks was heightened when I compared them with a few comments made by Roger Sale in "The Narrative Technique of The Rainbow," which are repeated and endorsed by Colin Clarke in The River of Dissolution. While discussing how the narrative technique controls the content Sale says:

The simplest declarative sentence is one of the main aids the novelist has in building up a stable ego, an identity. . . .

If we turn to a passage in The Rainbow, we can show how Lawrence tries there to break down

this natural building up process. . . .⁹

Sale's comment suggests that in The Rainbow Lawrence avoids the minimally transformed sentences which Ohmann states are one of the touchstones of Lawrence's style in Studies in Classic American Literature. The measurable similarities in the stylistic tone of both works raise questions about the validity of the apparently "contradictory" responses of Ohmann and Sale. They also arouse curiosity as to the variations possible within a recognizable style.

In the first chapter of this dissertation I will offer resolution to the contradictions, and answers to the questions, by discovering some of the stylistic options consistently characterizing Lawrence's style, and by tracing the pattern of stylistic change from novel to novel. The discovery is directed in the light of the two major questions raised by the quotations from Ohmann and Sale: did Lawrence consistently tend to use minimally transformed sentences? and, did Lawrence prefer deletion to conjunction? In subsequent chapters the answers to these questions form the basis for speculations about the reasons for Lawrence's stylistic preferences, and the reasons for

⁹ Roger Sale, "The Narrative Technique of The Rainbow," Modern Fiction Studies, V, 1, (1959-1960), 30. Also quoted in Colin Clarke, The River of Dissolution: D.H. Lawrence and English Romanticism (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), p. 55.

stylistic changes, reasons which are reflected both in the slant of his novels and in his theories of words and language.

In my analysis of Lawrence's style I use transformational grammar simply as a tool, following Ohmann. I am fully cognizant that many do not accept the theory behind the so-called transformations, and that both the theory and the interpretation of many of the surface structures are still being investigated more fully and constantly revised. I merely stipulate that transformational grammar may be used to provide an easily tabulated list of stylistic variables which in turn may serve as a constant against which to measure D.H. Lawrence's stylistic preferences, such measure becoming a clear and objective definition of what we mean by his "style."

The tabulated list of stylistic variables presented in Appendix A is an expansion of the table developed by Donald R. Bateman and Frank J. Zidonis in their investigations of changes in the writing style of ninth and tenth grade students.¹⁰ The transformations included are, of necessity, simple and basic to English. The table

¹⁰ Donald R. Bateman and Frank J. Zidonis, The Effect of a Study of Transformational Grammar on the Writing of Ninth and Tenth Graders, National Council of Teachers of English: Research Report No. 6 (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1966), 8-11.

has been expanded only slightly to fit the demands of Lawrence's prose; I have included entries on appositives, on reversed sentence order, on unnecessary conjunction, and on extended adverbial deletion. Some transformations such as adjective expansion and adverbial expansion and replacement have also been broken down into more precise categories at the suggestion of Dr. Virginia Clark of the University of Vermont, who, I believe, used a similar tabulation to aid in her analysis of John Berryman's Homage to Mistress Bradstreet.¹¹ Although the Bateman-Zidonis table was originally chosen quite arbitrarily as a tentative guide, it was found, in the main, sufficiently broad to cover most of Lawrence's characteristic stylistic structures. The transformations, also, are quite straightforward in terms of traditional grammar. When a nice discrimination is required in the application of transformational rules, I explain the procedure in the text.

I should again stress the instrumental nature of the transformational tables chosen. Concentration on syntactical data should not make them exclusive aids to interpretation. Accordingly, I refer to lexical or semantic concepts where appropriate and as they impinge on or qualify the purely syntactic. It may be interesting to know the syntactic

¹¹Virginia Prescott Clark, "The Syntax of John Berryman's Homage to Mistress Bradstreet," Diss. University of Connecticut, 1967.

context of twenty of a writer's adjectives, but it is more illuminating to know if they are twenty different adjectives, or the same adjective repeated twenty times.

Again, in order to present data which is as illuminating as possible I have chosen broad samples from each of Lawrence's major novels.¹² In deciding on material to tabulate, the analyst faces the temptation to narrow the field sufficiently to predispose his results in favour of his own theory. To avoid this problem I have chosen a sample from each novel which is from 4,000 to 5,000 words long, and which includes both descriptive and conversational passages. In order to give a probability of unity of tone

-
- ¹² The sample passages are as follows:
 D.H. Lawrence, The White Peacock (London: Penguin, 1950), pp. 59-72.
 _____, The Trespasser (London: Heinemann, 1955), pp. 54-61.
 _____, Sons and Lovers (New York: Viking-Compass, 1958), pp. 169-179.
 _____, The Rainbow (New York: Viking-Compass, 1961), pp. 115-124 and pp. 314-322. Expurgated passages have been re-inserted from Penguin ed. (London, 1969).
 _____, Women in Love (New York: Viking-Compass, 1960), pp. 236-247. Textual corrections have been made. See Eldon S. Branda, "Textual Changes in Women in Love," Texas Studies in Literature and Language, VI (1965), 306-321.
 _____, Aaron's Rod (New York: Viking-Compass, 1961), pp. 265-276.
 _____, Kangaroo (New York: Viking-Compass, 1960), pp. 232-242.
 _____, The Plumed Serpent (London: Penguin, 1950), pp. 206-218.
 _____, Lady Chatterley's Lover (New York: Grove Press, 1962), pp. 102-111.

I have omitted The Lost Girl and Boy in the Bush from this list because the first was written and revised in two very different stylistic periods, and the second was a collaboration.

All subsequent quotations will be cited from the above editions.

I have chosen samples which centre on incidents connected with the moon whenever possible. This is a large sample in comparison with those used by, say Ohmann,¹⁴ or Ringbom,¹⁵ but I think that the size of the sample serves to increase the significance of the variations in statistics.

One further problem must be faced in any assessment of style, and that is the definition of characteristic peculiarities of style. In his important article "On Defining Style" Nils Erik Enkvist comments:

Altogether it seems advisable first to define the norm against which the individuality of a given text is measured, not as the language as a whole, but as that part of language which is significantly related to that passage we are analyzing.¹⁶

There are few yardsticks which may be used to gauge the variant uses of transformations in prose, but I have found the statistics presented by Bateman and Zidonis very useful as a guide, and the information compiled by Henry Kučera and W. Nelson Francis in Computational Analysis of Present-

¹⁴Richard M. Ohmann, "Generative Grammars" and Shaw: The Style and the Man (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1962).

¹⁵Hakon Ringbom, George Orwell as Essayist: A Stylistic Study, Acta Academiae Aboensis, Ser. A -- Humaniora, 44, 2 (Abo, 1973).

¹⁶Nils Erik Enkvist, "On Defining Style," Linguistics and Style, ed. John Spencer (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 24.

Day American English most suggestive.¹⁷ To gain more significant comparisons, however, I have analysed control passages from the novels of four English authors writing between 1896 and 1925: Thomas Hardy, Joseph Conrad, Arnold Bennett, and Virginia Woolf.¹⁸ In my selection I have deliberately chosen authors who were writing about the same time as Lawrence and who were known to have influenced his thought and style, shown stylistic affinities, experimented with similar narrative techniques, or dealt with similar subject matter and aspects of life. Although the uniformity of focus provided by Lawrence's moon images was impossible to duplicate in the control authors, a definite attempt was made to choose scenes which combined description and dialogue, as in Lawrence, and which treated a situation similar to one of those in the Lawrence novels.

¹⁷ Henry Kučera and W. Nelson Francis, Computational Analysis of Present-Day American English (Providence, Rhode Island: Brown University Press, 1967).

¹⁸ The sample passages are:
 Thomas Hardy, Jude the Obscure (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1896), pp. 331-334.
 Joseph Conrad, "Heart of Darkness," Modern Short Stories: The Uses of the Imagination, ed. Arthur Mizener. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1967), pp. 23-25. First published, 1902.
 Arnold Bennett, The Old Wives' Tale (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), pp. 306-309. First published, 1908.
 Virginia Woolf, Mrs. Dalloway (London: Hogarth Press, 1925), pp. 159-163.
 The passages are each approximately 1,000 words long.

CHAPTER ONE

SIGNIFICANT TRANSFORMATIONS AND PATTERNS OF CHANGE

When Lawrence's stylistic options are tabulated it is easily seen that he does not characteristically prefer minimally transformed sentences, nor does he prefer conjunction to deletion. Instead, Lawrence is shown to use a variety of stylistic variables which form an interesting and complicated pattern of changes.

Before the notions of minimal transformation and deletion are discussed more fully, however, it would be helpful to point out statistics connected with Lawrence's basic writing style which help to pattern the prose and the changes. On the whole, Lawrence's sentences are short. In their computer survey of current American English Kučera and Francis show that the average sentence length of all fifteen types of prose writing they survey is 19.27 words per sentence. In the genre described as "Belles Lettres" the mean is slightly higher, at 22.7 words per sentence, but in the sub-classification of fiction entitled "Romance and Love Story" the sentence length is very short, 13.72 words per sentence. Following Kučera-Francis's arbitrary definition of a sentence as a unit of words followed by a simple period and a space, I

found that Lawrence consistently uses fewer words per sentence than any genre in the Kučera-Francis classification. The average sentence length over all nine novels is 12.03 words per sentence, and the range runs between 10.8 words per sentence, and 12.85.

Lawrence's use of short sentences is emphasized when the average length of his sentences is compared with those of the control authors. Arnold Bennett actually has the shortest sentences in this group, but his contain an average of 14 words per sentence, much more than Lawrence's average or his highest incidence. Joseph Conrad has the next lowest average, at 15.6, but Thomas Hardy and Virginia Woolf use much longer sentences, at 21.2 and 24.3 words respectively.

The changes in the sentence lengths of Lawrence's novels form a pattern which is consistent with Harry T. Moore's division of Lawrence's work into four stylistic periods.¹ The first three novels seem to form one group and their sentences are consistently shorter: The White Peacock averages 11.9 words per sentence; The Trespasser, 11.8; and Sons and Lovers, 11.65. The Rainbow and Women in Love form a second group in which the sentences become

¹Harry T. Moore, "The Prose Style of D.H. Lawrence," p. 317.

longer, although the sentences in the former novel, averaging 12.1 words, are slightly shorter than those of the latter, at 12.6. The third group contains Aaron's Rod at 10.8, and Kangaroo rising to 12.1. Quite frankly the figures obtained for Kangaroo show the danger of implicit faith in statistics, for in this novel in particular Lawrence uses idiosyncratic syntax and punctuation which tends to confuse. Often, two or three syntactic units are contained within the bounds of one period -- far more than in other novels. It is probable that the longer sentences of the next group -- The Plumed Serpent (12.85) and Lady Chatterley's Lover (12.47) -- also need pruning, but here the syntax is not quite as idiosyncratic, and the problem not so obvious. Nevertheless, the statistical pattern does reflect that Lawrence writes reasonably short sentences in the first three novels, increases the sentence length in The Rainbow and even more in Women in Love, abruptly decreases sentence length in the next two novels, to return to lengthy sentences in The Plumed Serpent and Lady Chatterley's Lover.²

²I have attempted, in each passage analyzed, to choose a reasonable balance of descriptive prose and dialogue, since, on the whole, sentences of dialogue are much shorter than those of prose description. In analyzing paragraphs of speech, introduction to speech, or appended interpretation, I find that the sentence averages are consistently shorter than the overall averages in the novel. They do, however, show surprising variations. The figures, beginning with The White Peacock, run: 10, 10, 9.8, 7.8, 9.4, 9.85, 11.1, 9.05, and 7.45.

It is interesting to notice that, with various exceptions which will be discussed later, the changes in sentence length roughly correspond with the changes in the numbers of transformations used in the novels. In general, the novels with longer sentences have more transformations; those with shorter sentences have fewer. This pattern suggests that sentence length has a connection with the two problems under discussion, in that short sentences may indicate that the sentences contain few transformations; they may also indicate that a great deal of deletion has taken place. The pattern of variation in sentence length may also indicate some pattern in the variation in the use of the transformations and in the use of deletion. It is indicative that Studies in Classic American Literature, from which Ohmann took his samples of Lawrence's use of deletion, was finally written in the time of the short sentences of Aaron's Rod and Kangaroo.³

Did Lawrence, in his shorter sentences, prefer

³ Studies in Classic American Literature was probably begun in January 1917, although Lawrence had been reading widely in American literature in preparation for some time before this. The 1917 essays were revised two or three times before publication in 1923. The earlier versions are published as The Symbolic Meaning, ed. Armin Arnold (Fontwell, Arundel: Centaur Press, 1962), and a comparison of the versions reveals very clearly the changes in sentence length which occurred during the revisions. The sentences of the published edition are much shorter than those of the first two versions.

minimally transformed sentences? The statistics are not particularly revealing. If the average number of transformations per sentence is computed for each novel, Lawrence is found to range from a low of 5.01 transformations per sentence in The Rainbow, to a high of 5.39 in Women in Love. In these averages, however, Lawrence is within range of the four control authors. Arnold Bennett, for example, is close to Lawrence's low with 5.2 transformations per sentence. The other three authors, however, use more transformations per sentence: Joseph Conrad uses 6.94, Virginia Woolf, 7.0 and Thomas Hardy 8.3. Lawrence, therefore, does not prefer "minimally transformed" sentences, but the number of transformations he does use is probably below the average for a novelist of his period. The Bateman-Zidonis statistics show that the average number of transformations used in syntactically correct sentences by literate Grade Ten students is 5.9. Perhaps this helps to indicate that Lawrence writes straightforwardly, with simply an average number of transformations per sentence. Very few of his sentences, however, are straightforward kernel sentences without any transformations.

The kinds of transformations which Lawrence prefers are perhaps more significant than the numbers of transformations in explaining Ohmann's comment that Lawrence prefers "kernel sentences." Certainly, Lawrence

does prefer the straightforward active sentence, as the low incidence of passive transformations, it-inversions or there-inversions indicates. Such a preference would account for the many descriptions of Lawrence's "rapid" or "intense" style by the impressionistic critics, as the three transformations which he avoids weaken the strength of the verb, or add flat or circuitous words. "There was a bird on the bough overhead. . . ." (Rainbow, p. 116) has less force than "A bird sat on the bough overhead," and "Siegmond it was that the whole world meant" (The Trespasser, p. 55) is far more circuitous than "The whole world meant 'Siegmond'."

Lawrence's minimal use of passives is well illustrated in the statistics. The incidence ranges from 1.42 per thousand words to a high of 3.83. The average, however, is 2.21. The control authors all show a higher general incidence of the passive construction. Thomas Hardy, for example, uses 13.700 per thousand words, and Arnold Bennett, 8.725. Virginia Woolf and Joseph Conrad are, perhaps, closer to Lawrence, with 6.700 and 4.85 respectively, but it should be noticed that their averages are much greater than the highest incidence of passives in Lawrence's writing.

The changes in frequency of these three indirect transformations generally follows the same pattern traced

by the changes in sentence length, but there is one surprising variation. The number of these three transformations seems to fluctuate in the first three novels, and rise to Women in Love in the same way that the sentence length increases. There is, however, no decline in these transformations in Aaron's Rod and Kangaroo; while the sentences in these novels may be shorter, they are also more indirect. Surprisingly, there is a decrease in the number of indirect transformations in The Plumed Serpent even though the sentences are longer, but the incidence increases again in Lady Chatterley's Lover.

The relative directness and power of the sentences is made more clear if two further stylistic traits are considered: cleft sentences and reversed sentences. Complexity and ambiguity is added if a sentence is cleft with subject and object repeating one another. Lawrence uses the cleft sentence very rarely indeed, but the incidence follows roughly the pattern made by the changing use of the passives. Reversing sentence order is a more artificial way of introducing complexity and ambiguity. By reversing the order I do not mean simply changing the position of adverbial phrases or subordinate clauses, and putting them at the beginning of the sentence. I mean reversing the order of the subject, verb, and the direct or

indirect object: "The beloved image she had broken."⁴

Lawrence actually does not use this device extensively in narration. The early novels appear to have a large number of sentence reversals but this is caused by Lawrence reversing the conversational designators while striving officiously for variety and a high literary tone. "He said" is almost always written as "said he." If this kind of flourish is ignored, it can be seen that the incidence of reversed sentences again follows the incidence of the passives, fluctuating in the first three novels, climbing abruptly in The Rainbow and Women in Love, diminishing but slightly in Aaron's Rod to climb in Kangaroo, and rest at a reasonably high average in the last two novels. Again, the complexity increases as the sentence length increases until Aaron's Rod and Kangaroo, in which relatively short sentences still maintain a high degree of complexity and passivity.⁵

⁴The reversal of the order of subordinate clauses was deliberately left out here because often reversal of clausal order aids in the clarity of the sentence, defining the time, place, or circumstance of the main action. Adverbial replacement transformations (subordinate clauses) are treated more completely below.

⁵The exception here is, of course, The Trespasser which has a remarkably high incidence of reversed sentences. Perhaps this fact may help to account for the "precious" and "overwritten" quality which mars this work.

This quick survey of elementary sentence structure does reveal that Lawrence tends to prefer straightforward subject-verb-object order in active sentences. This would explain more clearly Ohmann's remark about Lawrence's preference for "kernel sentences." It would also account for the "vitality" and "intensity" in the impressionistic descriptions of his style. It does, however, contradict Sale's comment that Lawrence avoided straightforward declarative sentences in The Rainbow.

Factors which contribute to Sale's assessment of Lawrence's style must be investigated further, but I think it is worth while to begin by investigating other elements which contribute to the intensity of Lawrence's style. The number of contractions also has a direct relation to the fast pace and directness of the prose. In the first five novels, that is, up to Aaron's Rod, the numbers of contractions are in some respect functions of the amount of conversation in the samples chosen, since contractions are only present in conversation. The statistics for The Rainbow, for example, reflect the lack of conversation in the passages chosen and in the novel as a whole. A careful survey, however, reveals a difference in the use of contractions between, say, The White Peacock and Women in Love. In The White Peacock, speeches such as "Let us go up to the water" or ". . . let us be

still -- it is all so still" (White Peacock, p. 69) are quite possible and usual; the incidence of contraction is not relatively high. By Women in Love, however, contractions in speech are the rule rather than the exception ("But we'll be still, shall we," p. 244), and their presence or absence is finely modulated to convey stress or emphasis, as they are in ordinary speech. For example, in the quarrel between Ursula and Birkin Ursula ends a tirade with: ". . . Go to them then, if that's what you want -- go to them." And Birkin replies "No . . . I want you to drop your assertive will, . . . that is what I want (Women in Love, p. 243).

In Kangaroo there is a sudden departure which changes the impact of the style considerably, as there are not only a great number of contractions used, but the contractions are used in the narrative as well as in the conversation. It is not merely a slight change in direction; one third of the contractions in the sample passage are from the narrative rather than the conversation. The style picks up a casual speed and emphasis as a result. Contractions are seldom used in the narrative of The Plumed Serpent, as they are in the prayers and religious soliloquies in the book. Perhaps Lawrence wishes to give a religious aura and dignity to his prose in this way. Many normal contractions are also

missing in the conversation, which is supposed to have a stilted, slightly Spanish flavour. Certainly, in Lady Chatterley's Lover, Lawrence returns to the mode of Kangaroo, and contractions are numerous in both the narrative and the conversation, giving a forceful, slangy flavour to the work.

Three other simple transformations add to the force and vitality of Lawrence's prose: the question transformation, the exclamatory transformation, and the imperative transformation. The first two transformations may be treated together as they share many similar characteristics. In the early novels, The White Peacock and The Trespasser, questions and exclamations appear only in conversational passages. In fact, the close reader will be struck, in The White Peacock especially, by the way in which the conversation is mainly composed of commands, questions, and exclamations. After The Trespasser, however, the exclamations and questions become integrated into the narrative as the distance between the narrator and his characters diminishes. For example, in The Trespasser Helena's thoughts are described:

She had no idea what she thought or felt. All she knew was that he was strong and was knocking urgently with his heart on her breast, like a man who wanted something and who dreaded to be sent away. How he came to be so concentrately urgent she could not understand.

The Trespasser, p. 58

A somewhat similar situation is presented quite differently in Sons and Lovers:

Then came an agony of new shame. She shrank within herself in a coil of torture. Did she want Paul Morel, and did he know she wanted him? What a subtle infamy upon her.

Sons and Lovers, p. 171

The integration of question and exclamation in both conversation and narration continues throughout the remaining novels and is reinforced in these novels in which the distance between the narrator and his characters is minimal. The incidence, in general, fluctuates according to the length of the sentence in the pattern already set down for transformations which increase the rapidity and energy of the prose; the high points are Women in Love and The Plumed Serpent, and there is a sudden dip in Kangaroo. The incidence of the imperative transformation is more curious, since the trend opposes the other patterns of change, fluctuating but decreasing until The Plumed Serpent when it suddenly soars, to subside again in Lady Chatterley.

Lawrence's great use of question, command and exclamation is more readily apparent if his novels are compared with those of other authors of his time. In his novels Lawrence uses an average of 13.8 of these transformations per thousand words. Of the four control authors only Thomas Hardy approaches Lawrence's sentence

variety, using an average of 11.154 per thousand words. This is almost precisely Lawrence's lowest incidence. The other control authors trail behind Hardy: Virginia Woolf uses 10.50, Arnold Bennett uses 7.94 and Joseph Conrad uses 2.91. Lawrence therefore uses a great deal more sentence variety than these four authors, a detail which argues against the charge that he was fond of "kernel sentences," but which does suggest that Lawrence tended to choose those sentence structures which would give his prose an air of vitality, movement, and emotional vigour.

To this point in the investigation an interesting discrepancy has been discovered in the patterning of the changes in Lawrence's use of certain transformations: transformations which increase the vitality and intensity of the prose tend to fluctuate roughly according to the variations in sentence length; transformations which decrease the power of the prose, however, although they may increase up to Women in Love, do not decrease with the decline in sentence length in Aaron's Rod. Sentences after Women in Love tend to be shorter, more deleted and yet more passive.

Lawrence's use of negations tends to reinforce the ambiguities in this pattern, for although Lawrence has been seen to prefer active and positive structures, he also uses a great number of negatives which introduce a

quieter tone into the prose. A quick look at the table will show that Lawrence consistently uses negatives more than any other simple transformation. A closer look will show that they follow the same pattern as the less active transformations discussed above. They increase following the increase in sentence length, but do not follow the sudden drop in Aaron's Rod. In the last four novels the shorter sentences contain a proportionally larger number of negations.

Another consideration must be taken into account in the discussion of negatives. Obviously the pattern shows that at the same time Lawrence is increasing the directness and force of his prose, he is also introducing a correspondingly strong note of hesitation and ambiguity.

I have traced Lawrence's use of negation by listing his uses of verbal negation transformations and also his negations of nouns; that is, by counting his uses of "not" (n't), "cannot," "never," or "no," "nobody" and "nothing." The word frequency tables of Kučera and Francis may serve as a loose guide here. If the Kučera-Francis frequencies of the key words are added and computed as a per centage of the total word count it is found that the six words account for 0.813 per cent of the words. In the category "Belles Lettres" the incidence is somewhat higher, being approximately 0.95 per cent; in "Romance and

Love Story" it is approximately 0.860 per cent.⁶ None of the categories approach Lawrence's lowest count of 1.03 per cent, and in three of his novels Lawrence uses about twice the expected average with 2.11 per cent, 2.1 per cent and 1.46 per cent.⁷

Although incidence of negations lower than Lawrence's permitted Ohmann and Ringbom to state that negatives were of importance in the style of Shaw and Orwell,⁸ the modern novelist seems to be a far more violent nay-sayer than the modern essayist. A survey of the control group shows that three out of four use more negatives than the expected average, though only one, Thomas Hardy, touches anywhere near Lawrence's maximum.⁹ Lawrence's use of negatives is still great, but not as unusual or outstanding as first appears.

⁶ These figures are, of necessity, approximations, since the number of words per genre is not listed by Kučera-Francis. Statistics presented in tables A and B, gave most of the information necessary for computation.

⁷ It should also be remembered that a count of negation signs and negative transformations does not account for all the negatives which may occur in a passage. Words like "unsociable," "incapable" or "illogical" are of course, negatives, and Lawrence uses them frequently. He also uses many constructions implying incompleteness, such as those which begin with "only" or "without."

⁸ See Ohmann, Shaw, p. 85ff, and Ringbom, Orwell, p. 34 ff.

⁹ The figures are: Virginia Woolf, 0.765 per cent; Arnold Bennett, 1.59 per cent; Joseph Conrad, 1.75 per cent, and Thomas Hardy, 2.14 per cent.

It may still be concluded, however, that in his use of simple transformations Lawrence simultaneously chooses to use transformations to impart greater force and greater ambiguity to his writings, and that this ambiguity appears most predominantly when the sentences are comparatively shorter, in Aaron's Rod and Kangaroo.

The question of ambiguity leads directly to the question of deletion, for deletion, because it compresses prose, gives a sinewy force to writing, but, because it may cut out necessary grammatical pointers, deletion may also introduce greater possibilities for ambiguity.

The whole question of ascertaining Lawrence's preference for deletion is fraught with problems, as many transformations, by their very nature, introduce obligatory deletions. In order to avoid some of the more obvious problems I count as deleting transformations only those transformations in which deletion is not obligatory, but optional. Lawrence's preference for deletion will only be revealed when he is seen to choose deletion over other alternatives which do not imply deletion. In the chart, I have marked with "D" all transformations which include deletions and options in order to point out the relative proportion of expansion and deletion. In Appendix A, Extracts 1, 2, and 3, I have listed all deletion transformations and subtracted them from all transformations

which are clearly expansions.

In his article Ohmann states that Lawrence prefers deletion to conjunction, and it might be well to begin to investigate Lawrence's use of deletion by first looking at his use of conjoining transformations. Conjoining transformations often involve deletion, but deletion is completely optional with this transformation, and omission of deletion is still stylistically acceptable.

As a first step in assessing Lawrence's use of conjunctions it should be pointed out that taken as an average over all nine novels, his use of the mechanics of conjunction, "and," "but," and "or" amount to 4.27 per cent of the words in the text. If this figure is compared with Kučera-Francis's average frequency tables it is seen that Lawrence's average is quite considerably above the general average of 3.69 per cent of the text. He exceeds the average of "Belles Lettres" (3.83) by a smaller amount, but he is still above the average of "Romance and Love Story" which is 4.18 per cent. In addition, Lawrence's use of "and," "but" and "or" far exceeds that of any of the control writers. In this grouping Arnold Bennett uses the highest per centage of the three words as they compose 3.973 per cent of his text. The rest follow with 3.948 per cent for Thomas Hardy, 3.153 per cent for Virginia Woolf, and 3.007 per cent for Joseph Conrad. The

assertion that Lawrence avoids conjunction cannot be maintained when his usage is compared with the general average or with that of other writers of his era and genre.

Before the relative proportions of conjunction and deletion are discussed I should point out some peculiarities of Lawrence's use of the words of conjunction which have some repercussions on the effectiveness of the conjoining structures. The use of conjunctions in Lawrence's novels on the whole declines from The White Peacock to Kangaroo; in The Plumed Serpent the average rises abruptly and the rise is maintained to a certain extent in Lady Chatterley. On the other hand, the use of "and," "but" and "or" at the beginning of the sentence, as unnecessary conjunction, increases reasonably consistently to Kangaroo, and falls off only slightly in the last two novels. In effect, as Lawrence decreases the use of true conjunction, he blurs its use by placing the signs of conjunction at the beginnings of sentences.

One other factor is Lawrence's use of punctuation as a form of conjunction. It should be remembered that a sentence was considered arbitrarily to be the unit contained within a capital and a period. Any punctuation within this unit, such as dashes, colons, semi-colons or commas, which separate units grammatically forming a sentence are considered to be conjoining punctuation. The

frequency of Lawrence's use of conjoining punctuation varies quite widely; there appears to be little pattern, but a pattern becomes apparent to a close reader of the prose. For example, in the first three novels, Lawrence tends to use conjoining punctuation to give variety to the sentence structure, and to separate long sections in a predicate series. In The Rainbow and Women in Love the semi-colon is used much less frequently to give variety, but much more between the predicate series which are present in far greater numbers.

A more revealing characteristic, which has been alluded to before, is Lawrence's use of a comma to conjoin two sentences. He uses one comma splice in The White Peacock; a very few occur in The Trespasser and Sons and Lovers, mainly when the occasion demands short, closely related sentences as in Helena's soliloquy. In The Rainbow, however, the comma splices begin to be a definite stylistic feature, connecting short sentences which conventionally demand semi-colons: "The days went by, they ran on dark-padded feet in silence" (p. 115). This tendency increases in Women in Love and Aaron's Rod, but dominates the prose of Kangaroo. In The Plumed Serpent and Lady Chatterley's Lover the incidence again declines.

The effect of the use of commas is curious. Not only does it make sentences which are already short much shorter

(see above, p. 13), and therefore more compact and intense, it also gives a curious impression of conjunction by contiguity. Things seem connected to one another because they are written side by side.

A comparison of the number of conjoining transformations and the number of deleting transformations connected with conjunction yields interesting results. As has been mentioned before, the deletion of common elements in a conjoined sentence is optional. The two sentences "John is tall" and "he runs fast" could be written "John is tall and he runs fast," or could be "John is tall and runs fast," with the deletion of the pronoun "he," standing for John, the subject of both sentences. If a comparison is made between the total number of conjoining transformations,¹⁰ and the number of common elements deleted (38a) it will be found that the number of conjoining transformations is consistently greater than the number of deletions. Again, however, the changes follow the pattern of the changes in sentence length, as the deletion of common elements tends to compress the prose and make the movement more rapid. The deletion of common elements tends to fluctuate in the first three novels, increase abruptly in The Rainbow and

¹⁰ The total number of conjoining transformations is found by adding 37a and 37b. For the sake of accuracy 37c should be omitted. The resulting figures, following the order of the chart, are: 58.4, 48.9, 38.3, 54.4, 63.4, 49.48, 54.4, 55.2, and 47.2

Women in Love, decrease in the next three novels and increase in Lady Chatterley's Lover.

The pattern of deletion of necessary words also follows the general trend of those transformations which increase the force of the prose. In the first three novels words necessary to the grammar of the sentence are usually deleted only in conversation, since normal conversation is made up of sentence fragments, without a subject or without a verb, which are completely understandable in the context of the conversation. The White Peacock abounds in fragments like "And you?," "Don't you?," or "I couldn't." This type of deletion is continued in the passages of conversation in all the novels. From The Trespasser, however, sentences in the narrative begin to drop necessary grammatical elements occasionally. "The lane twisted among meadows and wild lands and copses -- [it was] a wilful little lane, quite incomprehensible" (p. 54). In The Rainbow the incidence of this type of deletion comes to be quite noticeable, and it increases, until in Kangaroo, it is a major factor in the style. Consider, for example, one short paragraph in Kangaroo in which I have presented the deleted elements which are necessary to grammar in square brackets:

[It was] London -- [it was] mid-war London, [in which there was] nothing but war, [there was nothing but] war. [It was] lovely sunny weather, and [there

were] bombs at mid-day in the Strand. [It was] summery weather. [It was] Berkshire -- [there were] aeroplanes -- [it was] springtime. He was as if [he were] blind; he must hurry the long journey back to Harriet and Cornwall.

Kangaroo, p. 235

In The Plumed Serpent and in Lady Chatterley's Lover the incidence of this type of deletion declines once more. The overall effect of Lawrence's use of conjunctions and deletions is one of increasing force and compression in the shorter sentences as the total number of deletions begins to reach toward the total number of conjunctions; yet a greater opportunity for ambiguity is introduced by the very device which gives the prose its vitality.

Other transformations must be taken into consideration to make any assessment of Lawrence's use of deletion and conjunction more complete. For example, Lawrence uses methods of conjunction other than coordination. He uses adverbial replacement transformations (subordinate clauses) in numbers well within the range of the control authors. Lawrence's lowest incidence of adverbial replacements is in The Rainbow in which 13.85 occur per thousand words. The high point is found in Sons and Lovers at 21.87; the average is also high at 17.047. In comparison, the control group ranges between 8.613 and 22.328, and the average is low, at 12.74. Lawrence uses more subordination than any of the control authors except Thomas Hardy. In this way also, Lawrence is more complex

in style than those critics suggest who talk of his preference for "kernel sentences."

One minor point should be added about Lawrence's use of adverbial replacement. Lawrence is fond of clauses expressing time relations, especially in the early novels. Often, too, the clausal order is reversed so that the subordinate clause comes first. This peculiarity was not mentioned in the section dealing with reversed sentence order because, in my opinion, the reversal of clauses is often an aid to clarity rather than an introduction of ambiguity. The introductory clause often serves to define the main action.¹¹

It is noticeable, however, that the incidence of the reversed temporal clause declines sharply after the first three novels, and recovers the pattern again, only roughly and at a much lower level. The changes in the use of adverbial replacement transformations are surprising because they indicate that The Rainbow and Women in Love with long sentences, and a great number of transformations giving both force and ambiguity to the prose, have also the fewest number of subordinate clauses. This indicates that not only do all the transformations

¹¹ For further comment about the significance of this technique see Roger Sale in "The Narrative Technique of The Rainbow."

take place within one clausal structure, but the ideas are not so generally connected to one another with reference to time, place, and causation. An additional degree of ambiguity is introduced into these two novels and those which follow.

The second major deletion transformation group (39a and 39b) loosely follows the pattern of increasing sentence lengths,¹² though its increase is far more dramatic, and presents two anomalies in The Trespasser which contains an astonishingly high number of deletions, and in The Plumed Serpent which has surprisingly few. It would be interesting to speculate whether the rise in the deletions in 39a had any connection with the decrease in the gerundive adjectives of 6a, and whether Lawrence, as his writing progressed, came to prefer the more ambiguous and loose adjectival structures which followed the noun

¹² Transformation 39a presents certain problems in discrimination which I have solved quite arbitrarily. For example, take the sentence "I saw the man running." This sentence could be taken as a variant of 6a, a gerundive adjective with a required deletion (who was), and the optional change in order ignored (He saw the running man). It could also be listed as 25, a telescoped progressive. I have decided that only gerundive adjectives which precede the verb shall be counted as 6a, and, since deletion is mandatory with the change in order, 6a will not be considered a deletion. Similarly in 39a the gerundive must follow the noun and its adjectival function must be made clear in the positioning or in the phrasal structure. 25 must be clearly a deletion of a progressive tense.

rather than the tightly defined gerundives which preceded.

Other major deletion progressions tend to be irregular. For example, the extended adverbial deletion supplying the prevalent cadence in the first novels, declines very markedly in the middle novels and never really revives.¹³ In the same way the deletion of "that" as the first word in the object ("He knew [that] she could come") follows the pattern reasonably well in the first three novels but then takes a surprising decline in the next two novels, and becomes then quite consistent thereafter, in accordance with the pattern.

Two further major transformations need to be discussed to round out the general picture of Lawrence's stylistic choices. One transformation is an expansion, the other a deletion. The expansion transformation is that in which the adjective is placed in front of the noun. At first glance the numbers of adjectives used varies in accordance with other expansion transformations; that is, the variance roughly follows the changes in sentence length. But it must be pointed out that not only do the numbers change and increase, but the nature of the adjectives changes as the novels progress; they change from concrete to insubstantial. Not only are the later

¹³ For example, "Quickly she hid her hand into the fold of her skirt, blushing" (The White Peacock, p. 64). Very little ambiguity is introduced.

adjectives comparatively ephemeral, they make up closeknit and repetitive groups, such as the dominant groups made up of "queer," "strange," "curious," and "weird."

The adjectives in The White Peacock tend to be physical and picturesque. Only once does Lawrence use the adjective "queer" in a completely undefined sense; he mentions a "queer clump of Scotch firs" (p. 62), and the careful reader wonders what is queer about them. There are occasional examples of this usage in the other two early novels. The Morels' flower-garden in Sons and Lovers, for instance, is flooded with "a strange, warm light that lifted every leaf into significance" (p. 173). In The Rainbow, however, the number of these words increases, and the usage is usually unexplained: Anna and Will kiss "Till something happened in him, he was strange" (p. 120); and with Ursula "A strange rage filled her, a rage to tear things asunder" (p. 318).

The number of such adjectives is greatest in Women in Love, where they are reinforced by the use of similarly undefinable adjectives as "pure," "perfect" and "real." "Suddenly his strange strained attention gave way. . . . There was the paradisal entry into pure single being . . ." (p. 247). The ambiguity of these adjectives is further emphasized, as Derek Bickerton points out,¹⁴ by the use of

¹⁴ See Derek Bickerton, "The Language of Women in Love," pp. 60 ff.

inexact intensifiers and modifiers. Does "quite" mean "completely," or does it mean "almost"? What does "really" signify?

Although they appear most prominently in Women in Love, Lawrence never stops using these imprecise adjectives. They dominate descriptions in the next four novels, appearing especially often in The Plumed Serpent and Lady Chatterley's Lover. The conclusion must be made that as Lawrence increases the number of his adjectives, he also increases their ambiguity. Amplification and ambiguity are used at the same time, especially in Women in Love and the novels following.

Two other points add to the ambiguity of Lawrence's adjectives. The first is that Lawrence often uses adjectives in the place of adverbs, often when the grammar of the construction calls for adverbs. The second point is closely connected with the first, in that Lawrence often displaces adjectives, adding them at the end of sentences, in the position usually occupied by the adverb. Both of these devices have the effect of increasing the ambiguity, since when it is placed in the adverbial position the adjective seems to govern the verb, whereas by function it actually governs the noun. In the early novels, when the sentence structures and conjunctions are relatively unambiguous, the complexities introduced in this way are not great: "Miriam, walking home with Geoffrey, watched

the moon rise big and, red and misty" (Sons and Lovers, p. 170); one hesitates very slightly, wondering about the physical dimensions of Miriam. In the later novels, however, the displacement of adjectives becomes far more common, and more ambiguous. For example, in her nocturnal visit to Willey Water Ursula "sat down among the roots of the alder tree, dim and veiled, hearing the sound of the sluice like dew distilling audibly into the night" (Women in Love, p. 233), and the African statuette is described as "a tall, slim, elegant figure from West Africa, in dark wood, glossy and suave" (Women in Love, p. 245).

Lawrence's use of appositives is the final use of deletion to be considered. Surprisingly, the types and patterns of use reveal the same tendency as the adjectival expansion transformation: increased amplification is accompanied by a deliberate creation of ambiguity. Appositives are curious constructions; scholars debate whether they are formed from a stringent reduction of relative clauses or from a deletion of a compound subject joined by a coordinate conjunction. They are nevertheless deletion transformation, but, as every schoolboy who takes Latin discovers, they are also an excellent means of expanding a subject or including tangential information.

Lawrence controls the use of the appositives very

tightly and uses them in many different ways. In the three early novels, it is usually the subject that is repeated in apposition, and this permits clarity and control. Often, however, Lawrence splits the appositive, separating the two subjects with a length of sentence. Often in the early novels, this is simply used to gain a pleasing cadence in the sentence. The split appositive is used, like the extended adverbial deletion, to create a cursus. "We had lived between the woods and the water all our lives, Lettie and I . . ." (p. 59), Cyril explains at the beginning of The White Peacock sample. Even in that early novel, however, the appearance of a split appositive in a relatively complex sentence structure may distort the prose. "One [rat] dropped with an ugly plop into the water, and swam towards us, the hoary imp, his sharp snout and his wicked little eyes moving at us" (p. 69).

In the later novels, beginning with The Rainbow the ambiguity of the appositives is increased. Lawrence habitually uses "it" or "this" to begin a sentence, and does not explain what the pronoun stands for until the appositive is reached at the end of a sentence. In addition, Lawrence often places the object in apposition, and separates the appositive from the antecedent by the insertion of modifiers. "But at the centre, the heart of all, was still a vivid incandescent quivering of a white

moon not quite destroyed, a white body of fire writhing and striving and not even now broken open, not yet violated" (Women in Love, p. 239).

The number of appositives is greatest in Women in Love, and the ambiguity of which the construction is capable is also at its height in that novel. In the later novels, the appositives are still very much in evidence, contributing to the jerky disrupted tone of Kangaroo with the use of split order, and to the incantatory tone of The Plumed Serpent with the closed order of subjects in apposition: "Serpent of the earth, . . . snake that lies in the heart of the world, come!" (p. 208). The incidence varies in the same way as those constructions which add directness and vigour to the prose; it follows roughly the pattern of sentence length. The terse strength of the deleting transformation is valued by Lawrence for the vigour it gives to the prose, but at the same time its greatest use is accompanied by the greatest indirection and complexity.

In order to answer Ohmann and Sale directly I summarize: Lawrence does not necessarily prefer kernel sentences. The total number of transformations may be relatively low, and he may prefer straightforward, active constructions, but his use of conjoining transformations, adverbial replacement transformations, imperative, interrogative, exclamatory and negative transformations

equals or surpasses other authors of his time and genre (see Appendices).

Again, Lawrence does not prefer deletion to conjunction. At no time does the total of 38a and 38b deletions approach the number of conjoining transformations. In an over-all survey, contrasting all the deletion transformations with the expansion transformations (excluding all conjunctions), the relative proportion of deletion and expansion approaches equality at only one point, Women in Love, and expansion still exceeds deletion in this case (see Appendix A, extracts 1, 2, 3).

More important, it can be seen that the changes in the use of transformations follow a pattern. In the first three "apprentice novels" the tendency to expansion is accompanied to a certain extent by deletion, but there is only minimal attendant ambiguity. The Rainbow is a transitional novel in which the incidence of all transformations declines, although the proportion of deletion and ambiguity increases. Women in Love, proceeding from the material of The Rainbow, demonstrates the limits of amplification, deletion, and ambiguity simultaneously.

After Women in Love there is a definite alteration in the nature of the changes: shorter sentences prevail, the less vigorous constructions tend to increase,

amplification tends to recede, and, especially in Kangaroo, deletions dominate the style. The Plumed Serpent and Lady Chatterley's Lover show a tendency to return to the previous degree of expansion, although ambiguities and deletions are still strong factors in the style.

At the end of his discussion of Lawrence Ohmann remarked that it would be interesting to know why Lawrence preferred deletion to conjunction. I am prompted to inquire why Lawrence tended to increase ambiguity and amplitude at the same time, and why there is so much stress on deletion after Women in Love. Emile Delavenay may give a hint. Discussing Lawrence's delight in foreign languages, and his amused use of French as a "private language" with Jessie, he comments: "Faut-il voir là encore un besoin d'évasion, de jeu? La langue étrangère est-elle pour lui un système d'expression qui lui permet d'échapper son milieu?"¹⁵ Does Lawrence's simultaneous use of expansion and deletion, amplitude and ambiguity, show the same need for evasion in English? Schopenhauer, in his essay on style which Lawrence almost certainly

¹⁵ Emile Delavenay, D.H. Lawrence: L'homme et La Genèse de son Oeuvre, Les Années de Formation, 1885-1919 (Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1969), I, 70.

knew,¹⁶ states that "A man's style shows what a man is," then he goes on to discuss those who "tremble between the two separate aims of revealing what they want to say and concealing it."¹⁷ The question remains whether the content of Lawrence's writing gives any indication of the reasons for his simultaneous desire, after Women in Love, to amplify and to create ambiguity, or for the patterns of changes which the transformations show.

¹⁶ See Rose Marie Burwell, "A Catalogue of D.H. Lawrence's Reading from Early Childhood," D.H. Lawrence Review, III, 111 (Fall, 1970), 203.

¹⁷ Arthur Schopenhauer, "On Style," The Essential Schopenhauer (London: Unwin, 1962), pp. 37-38.

CHAPTER TWO

THE FIRST THREE NOVELS: WORDS AS EXPRESSION OF THE INDIVIDUAL

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

In the previous chapter expansion was seen to be the dominant stylistic tendency in the first three novels, although a degree of deletion and slight signs of syntactical ambiguity were also noted. As a parallel, all three early novels show Lawrence's implicit acceptance of the idea that words are to be prized as a means of self-expression necessary to the individual's full development

and advancement in the social, cultural, and economic spheres. At the same time, however, in all three novels there is an undercurrent of distrust of words as possibly false means of expression, endorsed by a culture of ambiguous value. In many ways, in these early works, Lawrence's acceptance of words as valuable is tied to his acceptance of cultural values, as understood by him. As the books show, and as critics such as Stephen Miko have pointed out, Lawrence's acceptance of the cultural values gleaned from his mother is often fraught with ambiguities and evasions, and results in stilted dialogue, imprecise and ambiguous depiction of character, and uncertainty in the meanings, values, and attitudes within the works.¹ The ambivalence is also reflected in the early preference for expansion which contains an underlying tendency toward deletion and possible ambiguity.

Before exploring the attitudes to words presented in each of the first three novels, it may be well to review the stylistic peculiarities of each novel, and explain the significant differences between the novels. But I must repeat that all three novels are treated in a group, although they differ slightly in characteristic uses of transformations, because one tendency is dominant:

¹Stephen Miko, Toward "Women in Love": The Emergence of a Lawrentian Esthetic (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971), pp. 11 ff.

the use of expansion is greater than the use of deletion to a degree not found again in Lawrence's work until, perhaps, The Plumed Serpent. Among the three novels the use of deletion changes; proportionally there is more deletion in the first novel, although it occurs in conversation; there is almost exactly the same amount in the second, although ambiguity is more pronounced; and there is the smallest relative amount of deletion in the third. But all three novels show much more use of expansion than of deletion.²

Although expansion is dominant in all three novels the characteristic methods of expansion change from novel to novel. For example, The White Peacock often depends on an adjective plus a gerundive or participial adjective plus an "of-phrase" to expand the noun, and often joins sentences together by using an undeleted coordinate conjunction. The following sentence is typical: "The sweet carelessness of her attitude, the appealing, half-pitiful girlishness of her face touched his responsive heart, and he leaned forward and kissed her cheek . . . (The White Peacock, p. 60). The overall effect is of direct open sentence structure, with series of adjectives

² See Appendix A, Extract 2.

giving richness to the subject or object.

In The Trespasser similar modes of expansion are used, except that there tend to be fewer gerundive adjectives and many more compound nouns.³ In addition, however, the number of expansions and comparisons of adjectives and adverbs is greater in The Trespasser, and there are almost twice as many similes involving "like". The greater number of comparisons and similes points directly to a greater complexity of thought and style in The Trespasser, and certainly it is far more difficult to find a sentence pattern "typical" of the second book. Perhaps some of the differences between the styles of expansion may be seen more clearly if the following sentence is compared with the first sample: "As she lay in Siegmund's arms again, and he was very still, dreaming she knew not what, fragments such as these flickered and were gone, like the gleam of a falling star over water" (The Trespasser, p. 59).

Sons and Lovers continues the tendency toward fewer one word expansions. Gerundive adjectives, participial adjectives and adjectival series in front of the noun appear much less frequently. But there are more relative clauses, noun phrase complementizers, compound nouns, and

³The gerundive adjectives tend to be displaced and appear as 39a or 25.

of-phrases. There is much more variety in subject and object, especially as these noun expansions are accompanied by greater numbers of infinitives and gerundives used as subjects and objects, and of noun clauses used as objects. The greater variety in subject and object is again accompanied by increases in the expansions of adverbs and adjectives. The general effect is one of greater length and variety of expansion.

In great part, Sons and Lovers cuts down on the loose series of adjectives used in the earlier books, and uses phrases and clauses closely integrated into the sentence to build up stylistic effect. As a result, the sentences seem to have greater strength and compactness than those in the previous novels.

This compactness is also emphasized by the absence of similes; there are only two direct similes in the entire sample passage. Often structures which could be used as similes are integrated more fully into the sentence and the role by the use of the verb "to seem" the incidence of which is much increased in this novel. Often, too, direct physical comparisons are presented in expansions of adverbs of manner, or compared adjectives, or in subordinate clauses. As a result, descriptions tend to seem more direct, more physical, and the sentences tend to be more integrated without the break in thought and structure occasioned by "like".

The impression of compactness is increased as the sentences in this novel are slightly shorter than those in the previous two works. In fact, they are even shorter than the statistics indicate since there is relatively little dialogue to bring down the average of the sentence length.

It is again difficult to choose a sentence typical of this novel, but perhaps the change in the ordering of the adjectives, the use of relative clauses, compounds, and variety of verbs could be found in: "The sky behind the townlet and the church was orange-red; the flower-garden was flooded with a strange, warm light that lifted every leaf into significance" (Sons and Lovers, p. 177).

In summation, then, it may be said, that in the first three novels Lawrence increases the numbers and variety of expansion transformations to produce, in Sons and Lovers a prose that is rich and vital.

The types of deletion employed in all three novels are also varied. With the exception of The Trespasser, in which grammatical deletion is allied with variations in sentence order, the grammatical deletions add very little ambiguity to the prose.

The most common type of deletion in all three novels is the deleting of common elements in conjoined sentences;

this type of deletion is common in English and invariably straightforward. It should be noted, moreover, that the deletion of conjoined elements does not equal the use of "and," "but" and "or" as conjunctions; quite often, as in the sample sentences for the two first novels which I have cited, repeated elements are not deleted. Often, Lawrence uses the rhythm of a repeated subject for rhetorical effect: "Lately, however, she had noticed again the cruel pitiful crying of a hedgehog caught in a gin, and she had noticed the traps for the fierce little murderers . . ." (The White Peacock, p. 59). Deletion of common elements increases somewhat in The Trespasser and Sons and Lovers, but it never equals the number of conjunctions.

Another form of deletion used frequently in all three first novels is the optional deletion of the "that" introducing a noun phrase used as objects after verbs such as "know," "think," "consider," etc. "Had it not been for the scarlet light on her face, I should have thought [that] her look was sad and serious" (The White Peacock, p. 58). But again, those deletions, though optional, are common to English and do not confuse the sense of the sentence.

Again, all three novels use deletion increasingly as they increase in variety of verb expansion. But verbal structures such as ". . . she saw Paul fling open the

gate . . ." (Sons and Lovers, p. 171), or "Helena wanted the day-wanness to be quite wiped off the west" (The Trespasser, p. 55), do not add ambiguity. In fact, although these structures employ deletion they are more smooth and clear to the English ear than the undeleted "deep" structures.

The most typical of the deletion transformations in the first three novels are extended adverbial deletion (40b) and the deletion of the relative pronoun and the verb "to be" in relative clauses (39a). Both these deletion transformations present possibilities for ambiguity, but, except in the case of The Trespasser, ambiguity is not often pursued. For example, when Lawrence writes in The White Peacock, "Quickly she hid her hand into the folds of her skirt, blushing" (p. 64), the reader is aware that "blushing" is really an adverb of time telling when she hid her hand, though it seems to refer to the subject more than the verb. But the reader is not in the least confused as to the meaning.

In The White Peacock and Sons and Lovers the use of deletion in relative clauses does not usually add any ambiguity or confusion to the prose, "Instead of attending, she looked at his hands, big, hard, inflamed by the snail of the scythe" (The White Peacock, p. 63). After some thought the reader may become aware that "which were" should be inserted before the adjectives and adjectival

phrase of the series, but the absence of these words does not confuse the meaning.

On the whole, with reference to syntax, The White Peacock and Sons and Lovers are quite straightforward. Much has been said about the ambiguities of attitude and character in The White Peacock,⁴ but these are rarely caused by the syntax. The one confusingly structured sentence in the sample chapter of The White Peacock has already been quoted in chapter one.⁵

The contradictions in Sons and Lovers likewise do not have a grammatical basis. With the few exceptions noted above, and in the previous chapter in connection with 40b, the grammar is clear and straightforward. The contradiction of juxtaposed sentences is semantic not syntactic. For example:

By tacit agreement they ignored the remarks and insinuations of their acquaintances.

"We aren't lovers, we are friends," he said to her. "We know it. Let them talk. What does it matter what they say."

Sons and Lovers, p. 173.

and:

Everybody was so excited that even Miriam was accepted with warmth. But almost as soon as she entered the feeling in the family became close and tight.

p. 175.

⁴ See especially Stephen Miko, Toward "Women in Love," pp. 5-34, and John E. Stoll, The Novels of D.H. Lawrence: A Search for Integration (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1971), pp. 20 ff.

⁵ See above, p. 39.

The semantic ambiguity which occurs in Sons and Lovers and in many later novels, lies outside the scope of this dissertation, but it is interesting to note its advent in a novel which has exceptionally clear and concrete verbal expansions and a lack of deletions and ambiguity.⁶

The Trespasser requires some extra comment since it presents some stylistic habits -- uses of deletion to cloud the clarity -- which are unusual in this period. In fact, this novel combines the stylistic peculiarities of The White Peacock with those of later novels such as Women in Love. For example, the number of extended adverbial deletions is very high, as in The White Peacock, but the sentence order (exclusive of conversational introductions) is reversed to a much greater extent than in any other novel, even Women in Love and Kangaroo.⁷ The number of relative clause deletions is not equalled until Women in Love and Kangaroo, and the reduced relative clauses are often displaced throughout the sentence and not put immediately after the noun they modify. Even more

⁶The question of semantic ambiguity in Sons and Lovers is treated and explained at length in Ann Engländer, D.H. Lawrence: Technique as Evasion, Diss. Northwestern, 1966. Miss Engländer traces these contradictions to Lawrence's reluctance to face up to certain psychological problems, and his maintenance of a double set of values, reminiscent of a schizophrenic mind-set.

⁷See Appendix A, p. 4.

revealingly, deletion of necessary words from a sentence is twice as great as in The White Peacock, and over four times as great as in Sons and Lovers. In addition, the examples of deletion do not occur merely in abbreviated conversation, as is usual in The White Peacock, but in narration and description.⁸ In general, The Trespasser is ornately expanded, but the deletions and displacements make the style opaque and occasionally confusing, quite in the manner of Women in Love.

It is interesting to watch how Lawrence's acceptance of words as a valuable means of self-expression parallels his use of expansion, how his confusion of the function of words in society leads him into mistrust, and how the whole notion of words as a means of communication leads to deletion and ambiguity.

Primarily, in the first three novels, Lawrence's attitude to words is positive. In all three novels the narrator implicitly accepts the struggle into consciousness and the striving for articulation as valuable, no matter what reservations or difficulties may be depicted in the progress of the novels. In both The White Peacock and The Trespasser the narrators themselves are depicted as cultured and articulate, and, in The White

⁸ See above, p. 31.

Peacock especially, Cyril's stance as the cultivated male is never seriously criticized.

More particularly, each book contains a discussion about articulation and the necessity of using words. In The White Peacock the whole novel turns on the need for George to become conscious and integrate his ability to express himself through words with his rich, physical life. In this novel, the importance of the ability to use words as a means of self-expression is introduced early and explained more and more fully as the work progresses, as are Lawrence's criteria for evaluating good usage of words. For instance, in the first scene between Lettie and George, Lettie is playing and singing at the farm:

. . . Then she gave him "Drink to me only with thine eyes." At the end she turned and asked him if he liked the words. He replied that he thought them rather daft. But he looked at her with glowing brown eyes, as if in hesitating challenge.

"That's because you have no wine in your eyes to pledge with," she replied, answering his challenge with a blue blaze of her eyes. Then her eyelashes drooped on to her cheek. He laughed with a faint ring of consciousness, and asked her how she could know.

"Because," she said slowly, looking up at him with pretended scorn, "because there's no change in your eyes when I look at you. I always think people who are worth much talk with their eyes. That's why you are forced to respect many quite uneducated people. Their eyes are so eloquent and full of knowledge." She had continued to look at him as she spoke -- watching his faint appreciation of

her upturned face, and her hair, where the light was always tangled, watching his brief self-examination to see if he could feel any truth in her words. . . .

The White Peacock, p. 28

Several ideas which are central to Lawrence's early concept of words are introduced in this scene. Implicit, of course, is the idea that articulation, the ability to speak and express one's self is of great value. This conversation is the beginning of George's education by Lettie, an education which is never explicitly condemned, only made invalid by George's failure to claim Lettie as a bride and continue the growth of both in a wholesome and satisfying marriage. The narrator later notes with approval, for example, that George has profited from his lesson and that his eyes are beautifully eloquent (p. 106).

Another important concept is introduced near the end of the quotation, when George looks for the truth in Lettie's words, and looks into himself to perceive and judge the truth. In this and other incidents Lawrence clearly implies that as words are expressions of an individual, they are of value to another person only as that other person finds the words true within his own consciousness. Words are not, therefore, a means of communicating new ideas or experiences, they are purely products of the individual either in expression or in comprehension.

In both The Trespasser and Sons and Lovers these two central ideas are maintained: words are seen as valuable to the individual, and as completely individual products. In The Trespasser, for example, knowledge of words and names is /seen as significant, though not of such central importance as in The White Peacock. Siegmund, the central character, who is searching for meaning and integration in his life, is shown to be fascinated by the names of things -- types of ships (The Trespasser, p. 37), the stars, constellations and wayside plants (p. 57). His interest in names and naming is a reflection of Siegmund's desire to explore and control the world which otherwise shows him his incompleteness and makes him feel lost as a kitten at the beach.

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

Words are much more central in Sons and Lovers. The major conflict in the novel involves opposing attitudes to words and speech: the mother is word-centred and battles the father who knows little of

letters (Sons and Lovers, pp. 27, 47), and is unable to use words to express his feelings (p. 40). Ironically, one of the attractions which Gertrude first has for Morel is her "southern pronunciation and purity of English" (p. 9). Later, the split between them is emphasized by Mrs. Morel's refusal to speak the dialect of the mining community and her insistence that the children speak the King's English in the house. She is particular about "correct" English and judges others harshly on their failures to use the language precisely (p. 56).

More particularly, Mrs. Morel finds her life through words, and the narrator accepts this as a positive characteristic. She is described before her marriage:

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

Sons and Lovers, p. 9

Because Morel cannot meet her in speech, Mrs. Morel turns from him to the children with her demands. "The children, alone with their mother, told her . . . everything. Nothing had really taken place . . . until it was told to their mother" (p. 62). By expressing their experiences in words, the children are able to realize them, and

themselves, and are urged on to greater growth.

It is Mrs. Morel, too, who upholds the middle class belief in books, in education and in writing as tools for advancement, and she inculcates this attitude into the children. It is when she writes papers for the Bestwood "Co-op," "writing in her rapid fashion, thinking, referring to books, and writing again," that the children feel for her "the deepest respect" (p. 51). It is she who encourages the children in talking, in reading the printed word, in learning languages, and in educating themselves generally, and at no time does the narrator seem to question her attitude. On the other hand, Morel, who cannot use words, is explicitly condemned because he cannot talk with the rest of the family. Because he refuses to utilize words he is seen as an outsider who "had denied the God in him" (p. 63).

The attitude to words established by the mother is adopted by the central character, Paul. Paul's "chattering" is his most important personality trait. Paul talks with his mother to express himself in words, and realize himself through speech. When he goes to work, the events are told to the mother, and made real in their expression. She, in turn, uses Paul's words to create a life for herself within her own fantasy; that is, she does not simply participate in Paul's communicated

experience, but recreates a life for herself out of Paul's words. As Lawrence comments: "His life story, like an Arabian Nights, was told night after night to his mother. It was almost as if it were her own life" (p. 113). In the same way, when Paul finally launches into the provincial art world under the patronage of Miss Jordan; "He told her everything that took place, everything that was said. It was as if she had been there" (p. 255).

Even when Paul escapes from his mother he still talks intensely. To Miriam he expresses all his thoughts about theology, art, psychology, and she acts as a neutral receiving ground while he threshes out the ideas expressed in his speech. Paul himself describes his relationship with Clara as less verbal, but he often subjects her to his expressing and working out of his own ideas. It is the speech that is important for thought, however, not the other person. Indeed, the mother, Miriam and Clara often do not act at all in Paul's arguments with his own ideas. It is in wrestling with his own expressed notions that Paul grows.

Miriam, on the other hand, ponders his sayings, and finds her own truth in the "struggling abstract speeches" which are almost incomprehensible to Paul himself. Words are also "the medium through which she came distinctly at her beloved objects" (p. 152). Although they are Paul's words, Miriam has taken them to herself and found her own, individual, truth in them by looking

within herself as George did. It is by those individual truths, found by pondering on Paul's words, that Miriam grows.

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

Lawrence, however, is also often uncertain in his own valuation of words as expression, and he introduces concrete criticisms of words in each of the novels. These criticisms are important because they show some of the weaknesses in Lawrence's ideas about words, they pave the way to some of the changes in Lawrence's discussions of words, and they suggest reasons why Lawrence should be attracted to deletion as well as expansion, ambiguity as well as straightforward expression.

In The White Peacock, for example, George is shown to require facility in words as part of the growth process, but Lettie, the vendor of visions and the promoter of speech, is shown to misuse words, to evade rather than

express herself. Throughout the novel Lettie is seen to divorce her words and meanings almost totally, and to avoid perception of reality by a torrent of words. When Leslie tries to propose, Lettie will not permit him his aim, but chatters to the others and insists on dancing a mad and exhausting polka. Even when she manages to express her deepest feelings Lettie tries to evade realization of the meaning of her words. Early in the novel, when she is introducing George to art, Lettie bursts out and tells him "things don't flower if they are over-fed. You have to suffer before you blossom in this life" (The White Peacock, p. 42). But immediately, she catches herself up and laughs, "Oh! my dear heart, are you bewildered? How amiable of you to listen to me -- there isn't any meaning in it at all -- there isn't really!" George, intent in finding his truth in her words can only murmur "But . . . why do you say it?" (p. 42).

George emphasizes the basic weakness in the concept of words which Lawrence presents in the first three novels. If words have value only as an expression of the individual, they are useless if they are used in any way other than truthful expression of the individual's momentary self, thoughts or attitudes.

Yet the novel is full of examples of the misuse of words which should deprive them of all value. Not only does Lettie try to avoid the meaning of her words by

repudiating them, she also tries to avoid the implications of her emotions by expressing them in a foreign language, especially French. Strongly attracted by George after the interview over the art books, Lettie repudiates her own feelings, and George's warm attraction, by "talking madly to herself in French." Cyril comments:

. . . her raillery and mockery came out in little wild waves. She laughed at him, and at herself, and at men in general, and at love in particular. Whatever he said to her, she answered in the same mad clatter of French, speaking high and harshly. The sound was strange and uncomfortable.

. . . "I wish I could understand," he said plaintively.

The White Peacock, p. 44

Lettie also uses words to define and limit people, especially George. By defining people as abstractions Lettie tries to ignore some of the complexities of human beings, and to reduce them to rather lifeless but more manageable proportions. The most noticeable example of this life-denying trick is her nick-naming George "Taurus: the Bull" or "bosbovis: an ox." Simply by applying the Latin labels Lettie makes George painfully conscious of his physical orientation and of his cultural and educational limitations.

The significance of Lettie's use of words is emphasized by its repetition in the story of Annable. The gamekeeper Annable is, of course, an analogue of George. He too is the son of a farmer; he too has a good body of which he is proud; he too aspires to words -- to

learning, and to culture, and to a cultured woman. And Annable is destroyed by a woman who denies his full human potential by treating him as an object and calling him "son animal - son boeuf" (p. 177). Injured by words, Annable tries to repudiate the value of speech and states: "I only know one sort of vermin -- and that's the talkin' sort" (p. 172).

By the end of the novel Lettie's use of words as a means of evasion is strongly established and has wreaked much havoc. Even George is forced to see her misuse of words. Near the end of the book, in a scene which parallels the first meeting at the farm, George and Lettie again confront one another during an evening of talk, playing, and singing, although this time they are in London, not on the farm. Despite his new education George rejects the experience, and, in a manner, finds the words "daft" because he cannot find the truth of them in his heart:

George looked and listened to all the flutter of conversation and said nothing. It seemed to him like so much unreasonable rustling of pieces of paper, of leaves of books, and so on. Later in the evening Lettie sang, no longer Italian folk songs, but the fragmentary utterances of Debussy and Strauss. These also to George were quite meaningless, and rather wearisome.

The White Peacock, p. 324

Lettie has chosen a world of "fragmentary utterances," in which words no longer express the living experience as

the folk songs did. The words cannot be verified by the individual looking into his heart. It is quite clear what George means when he later remarks of Lettie, "she does lie, doesn't she?" (p. 325). Even Cyril recognizes that George refers to "her shirking, her shuffling of life," as is shown by her shirking and shuffling of words and meanings. Cyril, however, like Lettie, refuses to acknowledge his understanding of the truth of George's words.

Surprisingly, although a great deal is said about Lettie's refusal to express herself in words, very little is said about the ensuing disruption of communication. It is as if the thought of communication does not enter into Lawrence's concept of words at this time. Instead it is implied that if words are used by the individual to express the truth as clearly as possible then the individual who is listening will be able to ascertain the true application of the word to himself as clearly as possible. Participation in another's experience by means of words is not even hinted at.

In The Trespasser, even more than in The White Peacock, the acceptance of words apparent in the whole context of the novel is repeatedly juxtaposed with the possibilities for evasions and deceptions which words present. At the same time, however, the problem of communication or disruption of communication, although

clearly implied, is never directly confronted. Siegmund's reliance on word symbols is seen as positive, and it is suggested that words are a means of ordering and controlling the world. Helena uses words to evade or distort almost constantly, but the problems in communication that this raises are never considered.

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

Occasionally, Helena's desire to evade through fantasy results in her speech being completely incomprehensible. When the lovers find a light bulb undamaged by the sea she responds: "It is a graceful act on the sea's part. . . . Wotan is so clumsy -- he knocks over the bowl and flap-flap-flap go the gasping fishes, pizzicato!- but the sea --" (p. 42).

In the same way Helena will ignore the "truth" which her heart recognizes in another's words, if that truth will not bend to her fancies. When Siegmund several times alludes to suicide or death Helena "does not take in his meaning" (p. 21), and at moments of decision she "does not understand" (p. 109). She has also no recognition that her words could be searched for "truth" by another. When Siegmund asks her "What is myself?" she can answer brutally, and completely without thought, "Nothing very definite," and the next moment wrap her arms lovingly around him and speak of daily trivia (p. 73).

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

important because they express the individual and aid in the individual's development. Communication is an unimportant by-product of honest self-expression.

The ambivalence in Lawrence's valuation of words, expression and communication is seen in Siegmund's assessment of Helena's speech. Thinking of Helena's deficiencies in using words Siegmund recognizes:

She can't translate herself into language. She is incommunicable; she can't render herself to the intelligence. So she is alone and a law unto herself; she only wants me to explore me, like a rock-pool, and to bathe in me. After a while, when I am gone, she will see I was not indispensable. . . .

The Trespasser, p. 100

Helena's incapacity is first seen as an inability to use language to express herself. That she cannot therefore communicate what she is, is a by-product. But Helena's incommunicability is not seen at all negatively; it may frustrate Siegmund, but it is seen as a form of strength which keeps her isolate, and therefore inviolable and a law unto herself. The passage almost suggests that although Siegmund/Lawrence approves of words as means of self expression he also sees a threat to individual integrity in the communication which words may facilitate. Lawrence's avoidance of the significance of words as means of communication in The White Peacock is partially comprehensible on these terms.

Sons and Lovers tangentially suggests one problem in connection with words as means of communication while it emphasizes more fully the function of words as a means of self-development and self-expression. And again, in this novel, words as a means of self-expression are shown as being subject to misuse as well as being possibly insufficient for the task. Although Paul's talking and chattering functions as a means of self-expression, self-exploration and growth, Paul also uses words to cover up his feelings or evade other people. Going with his mother to apply for a job:

Paul walked with something screwed up tight inside him. He would have suffered much physical pain rather than this unreasonable suffering at being exposed to strangers to be accepted or rejected. Yet he chattered away with his mother. He would never have confessed to her how he suffered over these things, and she only partly guessed. She was gay, like a sweetheart.

Sons and Lovers, p. 92

Later, with the sensually oriented Clara, Paul uses speech to cover up his emotions as he does with his mother. When he meets Clara at the train he takes her "quickly along the platform, talking at a great rate to hide his feelings" (p. 319).

Paul always speaks openly and as truthfully as possible to Miriam, even though his conflicting emotions and inability to understand himself often make him contradictory or cruel. With his mother and Clara, however, he uses silence as a protection for himself, almost as if words made him vulnerable to their judgment,

or to the judgment of the world. It is an imperfect defense, but it is the only one Paul seems able to use:

There was now a good deal of his life of which necessarily he could not speak to his mother. He had a life apart from her -- his sexual life. The rest she still kept. But he felt he had to conceal something from her and it irked him. There was a certain silence between them, and he felt he had, in that silence, to defend himself against her; he felt condemned by her. . . . At this period, unknowingly, he resisted his mother's influence. He did not tell her things; there was a distance between them. Sons and Lovers, p. 345

With Clara, also, silence helps Paul to evade the "personal element" which he found so hard to face with Miriam.

Silence and passion seem to work together, and speech seems to make Paul vulnerable to those forces which make passion impossible for him. Again, to Paul, as to Lawrence the writer, speech and self-expression seem to be double-edged swords which are invaluable as means of self-expression, but which make the user in some way vulnerable. As a result, words are thought of as totally individual productions, and their connection with interpersonal communication is ignored. There is no connection made between the feeling of vulnerability and the way in which Mrs. Morel takes the words of others to herself, and takes on another's identity through their words.⁹

⁹ Some light may be thrown on the pattern of Lawrence's concepts about words if three extremely interesting recent studies of Lawrence by Ann Englander and David J. Kleinbard are mentioned at this point.

⁹ (cont'd) Miss Englander and Mr. Kleinbard both agree in analyzing Paul as a victim of mental dissociation, or what they term schizophrenia, caused by the absorbing relationship with his mother. Miss Englander discusses at length many of the semantic problems associated with this disorder, and traces similar semantic confusions and displacements in Lawrence, particularly in Sons and Lovers and Women in Love. Mr. Kleinbard, in two closely argued articles, analyzes several of Lawrence's characters -- Paul, and Will, and Anna -- in terms of the theory of schizophrenia put forward by R.D. Laing in his two books The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness (London: Pelican, 1960), and The Self and Others: Further Studies in Sanity and Madness (London: Tavistock Publications, 1961).

The connection with schizophrenia is interesting, as it has long been recognized that verbal disruption to some extent or another is an invariable accompaniment of this mental illness (see especially Jacob Kasanin, Language and Thought in Schizophrenia (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1944) and Julius Laffal, Pathological and Normal Language (New York: Atherton Press, 1965). Other works of interest are listed in the bibliography).

Laing himself is especially suggestive in the case of Lawrence. If I may simplify greatly, Laing puts forward the idea that sometimes persons involved in absorbing relationships with parents when they are children become "ontologically insecure," as "the mother never recognizes the child's freedom and right to have a subjective life of his own out of which his actions would emerge as an expression of . . . autonomous and integral self-being" (The Divided Self, p. 97). As a result, the individual feels guilty at daring to exist as an autonomous being, and doubly guilty at not daring to exist independently. In some cases which Laing quotes the actions of the child are restrained to conformity with the parents' will, and the words become almost the equivalent of action as the vehicle of expression of the true self (p. 97, 98). Words are an ambiguous vehicle, however, since exposure of the true self renders it vulnerable to absorption or destruction by others, and in extreme cases, "any form of verbal understanding threatens a whole defensive system" despite a longing to establish a true and independent self and have it loved and accepted by others (p. 163).

The similarity between these ideas and Lawrence's ambivalent valuation of self-expression is striking. Laing's theory also suggests a reason why communication could be seen as threatening, and thus evaded.

The effect of Lawrence's ambivalent attitude toward words is found in the expansions and deletions of his style throughout the novels, but to the casual observer the effect is clearest in the dialogue, because in the recorded speeches the results of Lawrence's ideas or self-expression and his aversion to communication are presented most plainly.


Most critics in discussing The White Peacock or The Trespasser mention the stilted and unnatural dialogue. The stilted quality has been attributed to Lawrence's inexperience as an author, and to his uncritical acceptance of an idiosyncratic idea of cultured speech as immersed in references to art, painting, music and the classics. Certainly, the speeches in both early works are overburdened with references and allusions. Robert Gajdusek and Keith Alldritt both show that these references carry a great deal of the meaning and add to the complexity of the novel, but they also deaden the spontaneity of speech and show the falsity of Lawrence's impressions of a cultured society.¹⁰

One further cause of the artificiality of the speech is found in the transformational analysis of the

¹⁰ Robert E. Gajdusek, "A Reading of The White Peacock," A D.H. Lawrence Miscellany, ed. Harry T. Moore (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1959), pp. 188-203. Also see Keith Alldritt, The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence (London: Edward Arnold, 1971).

first three novels: many of the speeches are either exclamations, commands or rhetorical questions which allow a character to express himself but demand no response. As a result the speeches exist in isolation. Quite simply, the statistics indicate that Lawrence follows his dominant idea about words in constructing conversations which are expressions of individual personalities rather than vehicles of communication.

Some of the worst examples of stilted dialogue occur in the chapter, "Pastorals and Peonies," and it is interesting to see that although the allusions contribute to the artificiality of the speeches, much is also caused by the fact that the conversation is often a series of monologues. Freddy Cresswell does not expect to be answered on the subject of Theocritus; he ignores interruptions and does not give Tempest a chance to compose his own song. In the same way, when Miss D'Arcy is introduced to George she launches into an affected monologue of statements, questions and exclamations which require no response. Later, when Hilda asks to see the cows milked, Cresswell, Louie Denys, Agnes D'Arcy and Tempest are shown contributing remarks to the conversation, and, although all of them have something to do with cows, only one of the comments contributes anything toward a direct exchange of ideas with the original speaker. The others are simply "expressing themselves."



It is instructive to assess the conversation against criteria derived from outside the novels, from modern philosophy of language. The rules deduced by Richard Ohmann from theory put forward by J.L. Austin provide an interesting yardstick for gauging the "truth" and communicability of a speech. Ohmann paraphrases:

To make a statement felicitously, I must, among other things, utter a declarative sentence (criteria 1). I must be the right person to make the statement (2). (I will not get away with stating that a memory of your grandfather just crossed your mind.) I must not mumble (3), or break off in the middle (4). I must believe what I say (5), and I must not ground my future conduct or speech in a contrary understanding of the state of the world (6).¹¹

The number of exclamations, commands and rhetorical questions shows that criteria 1 is quite often not met; the broken expressions offend against criteria 4. And Lettie, and Cyril, both seem to have the ability to talk without meaning or belief, pronouncing words whose meaning contradicts future conduct (5 and 6). On this assessment many of the characters appear to speak as Lettie often does "half out of conventional necessity of saying something, half out of desire to shield herself, and yet in a measure express herself" (The White Peacock, p. 267).

¹¹ Richard Ohmann, "Speech, Action, and Style," Literary Style: A Symposium, ed. Seymour Chatman (Oxford: University Press, 1971), p. 245.

The number of commands and questions also reveals another aspect which is significant in the light of the attitude to words which Lawrence expresses in these three novels. The commands and questions emphasize the relative isolation of the characters who either command those about them or seek to gain attention and a form of communion through questions. Questions and commands are, after all, the basic speech mode of the child, who is not in a community of equals.

Solipsistic conversations abound in The Trespasser but are somewhat less frequent in Sons and Lovers, partly perhaps because the conversations in the latter book are often based on remembered conversations and native speech patterns, and partly because the heavy freighting of allusion is often missing. In the former book however, the lovers are continually making statements and exclamations or asking questions which are not responded to, ignored, or even forgotten (The Trespasser, p. 59). Not only are the statements "infelicitous," the possibility of any valid statement seems ignored in the lovers' treatment of each other's speech. The isolation of command and exclamation is almost complete.

In summation, many of the stylistic quirks of the first three novels are understandable in the light of Lawrence's apparent belief in words as individual expressions which are of ambivalent value. The stress on

individual expression accounts for some of the transformational patterns evident in the speeches, and also incidentally for some of the idiosyncratic word usage.¹² The adoption of the culturally accepted valuation of words as positive, as well as the private belief in the value of self expression, are paralleled by Lawrence's fondness for expansion at this time. The personal distrust of words and the evasion of all question of communication prepare the bases for future changes in style and emphasis on deletion. The transformational statistics are suggestive. It is interesting to note that the novels which contain the most overt criticism of words, and come closest to touching on the question of interpersonal communication by means of words, that is, The White Peacock and especially The Trespasser, have the greatest number of deletions and ambiguities in the prose.

¹² Lawrence always uses "superb" in its Latin sense of "proud," and "blithe" in its archaic sense of "carefree" without the modern connotation of joyous. It should be noted that Lawrence had attended French classes under the noted etymologist Ernest Weekley, who was fascinated by the curious twists of meaning revealed in the etymologies of words.

CHAPTER THREE

THE RAINBOW: THE NEED FOR COMMUNICATION

The Rainbow is a transitional novel. The style is hard to define because it changes as the romance progresses through four generations. In general, however, the style is a logical extension of the rich expansions of Sons and Lovers. The stylistic variations adopted, particularly the use of appositives, lead directly toward the deletions and disrupted order of Women in Love.

The attitudes towards words developed in the novel are also transitional. In the presentation of the first three generations Lawrence stresses the necessity for self-expression through words. There is, however, an added dimension in the portrayal of the search for self-expression, as Lawrence, for the first time, seems concerned about the reaction of the audience. He wishes the audience to perceive the meaning of the words being expressed, and to react to the words as autonomous beings. He suggests that conversation should involve interaction between two separate beings. The new dimension is seen most clearly in the story of Ursula, the representative of the fourth generation. In

Ursula, Lawrence presents an antagonist who is wholly articulate, who struggles to overcome the problems created by words, and in whom articulation is not sufficient. In Ursula, Lawrence prepares the way for the discussion of communication which informs much of Women in Love.

The style of The Rainbow is interesting. Subtle changes in the choice of characteristic transformations lead to a great change in general effect, and permit the enrichment of the emotional structure of the novel with a rich, sensuous surface, and a broad rhythmic undertone. In general, the richness of the prose may be traced to the increased number of noun expansion transformations which parallel the interest in words as necessary means of self-expression. The pattern of noun expansion transformations follows the pattern of the first three novels, although there are rather fewer relative clause transformations than in Sons and Lovers. The numbers of adjectives and gerundive adjectives more than offset this decrease, however.

Two points concerned with noun expansion deserve special mention, and both of them have to do with the adjectives which are so numerous, and contribute so greatly to the tone of the prose. The first point concerns Lawrence's use of oxymoron as a consistent technique in descriptions of moments of crisis in all,

three relationships of The Rainbow. When Tom finally achieves marriage to Lydia he is described as pressing forward to meet her in "the blazing kernel of darkness" (The Rainbow, pp. 90-91), and further descriptions of the two use the same opposed elements; Lydia is described as glowing and burning darkly (p. 131). When Will first holds Anna in his arms after they have stooked the corn, he finds "all the night in his arms, darkness and shine, he possessed of it all" (p. 119). On their honeymoon, Will and Anna lie together like "the steady core of all movements, the unawakened sleep of all wakefulness" (p. 141). With Ursula, the paradoxical structures are associated only indirectly; it is only in her vision of the horses that the opposites are brought into proximity:

Their great haunches were smoothed and darkened with rain. But the darkness and wetness of the rain could not put out the hard, urgent, massive fire that was locked within these flanks, never, never.

. . . She was aware of the great flash of hoofs, a bluish iridescent flash surrounding a hollow of darkness. Large, large seemed the bluish incandescent flash of the hoof-iron, as large as a halo of lightning round the knotted darkness of the flanks.

The Rainbow, p. 487

In all these examples the oxymoron is used to represent the coming together of unlike things in a relationship. In Ursula's relationships with Miss Inger or Skrebensky, there is no balance, or true relatedness; relationship is seen only in terms of domination or submission and

oxymoron cannot be present.

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

The relative increase in deletions also needs explanation. It should be noted that although The Rainbow has more deletions than Sons and Lovers, the totals are

not extraordinary and are still within the range of The White Peacock and The Trespasser. The proportion of deletion in The Rainbow is comparatively high simply because of the general decrease in expansion transformations, but it may reflect the growing awareness of the conflict between Lawrence's ideas of self-expression and communion which The Rainbow initiates.

In contrast, the totals of other expansion, replacement and simple transformations are much lower than those of the first three novels. The sentences are presented much more straightforwardly in a simple subject-verb-object (SVO) pattern which reflects to some degree the highly rhythmic presentation. As Frank Baldanza points out, the prose of The Rainbow often reflects the rhythmic and semantic structures of Hebrew poetry which uses parallel and repetitive syntactic structures to gain its effect.¹ The repetition of syntactic structures is most obvious in The Rainbow.

Significantly, the numbers of negations, imperatives and exclamations are especially reduced. This could be attributed to the relative dearth of conversation which is especially noticeable in the sample passages and in the earlier sections of The Rainbow as a whole, but it should

¹ Frank Baldanza, "D.H. Lawrence's Song of Songs," *passim*.

be remembered that from Sons and Lovers on, Lawrence assimilates questions and exclamations into the narration, as the narrative voice tends more and more to take on the colouration of each character under discussion. Commands, exclamations, and negations do occur in the narration; there are simply fewer of them, and the drop in the use of these potentially isolating structures may reflect a change in attitude toward expression, conversation, and communication.

The main changes shown by the style of The Rainbow are to be found in changed options in the conjoining transformations and in the deleting transformations. For the first time deletion of common elements in conjoined sentences almost exactly equals the use of "and," "but" and "or" as conjunctions. Other significant changes accompany this, as there is a sudden increase in the use of unnecessary conjunction and in conjoining punctuation.

The changes require some explanation. The increase in conjoining punctuation not only means that more semi-colons and commas are being used to separate syntactically complete sentences within one period, it may also indicate that a series of subjects or objects are being used in a sentence. The increase in the number of subjects and objects in apposition confirms this possibility. With both conjunction and appositives,

however, the deletion of common elements may occur, and this serves to explain some of the increase in 38a.

There are two obvious effects which often result from these changes in stylistic options. The first is that the rhythm of the prose is often enhanced by the presence of the short, simple sentences using conjoining punctuation and by the series of subjects and objects which are often parallel. The second effect is that the increase in conjoining punctuation, along with the appositives, unnecessary conjunction, and extensive deletion of common elements, gives the prose an air of compactness and connection. Because the sentences are short and there is a great deal of connection, and because the accompanying rhythm gives an ongoing force to the prose, things begin to appear connected simply because they are side by side. Roger Sale discusses the continuity of this romance in "The Narrative Technique of The Rainbow," and he points out several semantic features which contribute to the narrative perspective and to the continuity. Perhaps the uses of conjunction revealed by the statistics also contribute to the compactness of the narrative flow.

The rich noun expansions, the rhythmic structures, and the compact narrative flow structure this romance showing the struggle of four generations of one family. In particular, these three devices aid in the portrayal of the struggle for articulation which is almost

inextricably entwined in all aspects of the family's development. Isolating this one strand of the family's struggle necessarily restricts the vision of the whole, but is illuminating in this study of Lawrence's use of word structures.

In the introduction to the Brangwen family Lawrence describes the generations of the Marsh farm as rooted in the soil. In his description, the authorial voice blends with the subject it is describing, and takes on a rich warmth because of the density of sensuous adjectives and images, and the broad sustaining rhythm of the prose. The prose rhythms give an emotional power which reflects the nature of the Brangwens Lawrence is describing. Basing the surety of their being on the intercourse of farm people with nature, the Brangwen men are physically rich, and inarticulate.

In contrast, the women search for something beyond:

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

The Rainbow, p. 2²

In the family, the woman is "the symbol for that further life which comprised religion and love and morality" (p. 13), but she, as the physical representative of

²The italics are mine.

abstractions, looks ever further, to conscious articulation of the abstractions she stands for. In her own steps toward this desire she is guided by the speech of those in the world she is familiar with:

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

The Rainbow, p. 3

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

The women of the village might be much fonder of Tom Brangwen, and more at their ease with him, yet if their lives had been robbed of the vicar, and of Lord William, the leading shoot would have been cut away from them, they would have been heavy and uninspired and inclined to hate.

The Rainbow, pp. 5-6

In Tom Brangwen, the first hesitating steps toward self-expression are taken. Tom is, with the rest of the Brangwen men, strong and alive physically; he is also deeply emotional; but at school he feels himself a failure because abstract intellectual effort is beyond him. He wishes to develop intellectually, so he loves anyone who can convey enlightenment to him in the only way that it is possible for him to receive it, through feeling (p. 10). He is moved by the sound of the words read aloud by a teacher, although he is incapable of gaining insight through the abstract medium of print.

Tom achieves his potential and establishes his identity when he recognizes that he is accepted by Lydia, a woman, "the other." But Lydia, although she is foreign, a lady, and fulfills the role of "the other," is fundamentally similar in nature to Tom. Lydia's knowledge, too, is perceived through all her senses, "never [finding] expression in the English language, never [mounting] to thought in English" (p. 99). Together, Tom and Lydia establish a relationship in which "The whole intercourse is wordless, intense and close" (p. 100). From the beginning of their courtship Tom and Lydia ". . . could not talk to each other. When she talked, of Poland or of what had been, it was all so foreign, she scarcely communicated anything to him" (p. 52).

Despite his recognition by Lydia, Tom still cannot come to terms with the spoken word, and he is still made uneasy by it (p. 101). Yet he wishes to develop further and express himself fully, and the authorial tone treats his desire as worthy of respect. Tom is upset by Anna's marriage because it reminds him of his unfulfilled aim and the little time left for future development. It is only at Anna's wedding that Tom brings himself to "spread himself wordily," to speak in a "slow, full-mouthed way" to celebrate his achievement (p. 133).

Tom's achievement of speech may be assessed from the two points of view which Lawrence's rendering presents.

The reader who is attentive to Tom's words is impressed by the inspiration which has mixed earthiness and reverence to produce a celebration of that union of man and woman which brings a religious dimension, a condition of value, to life. The reader admires Tom's expression of himself, truly experiences the man through his words, and is "deeply serious and hugely amused at the same time" (p. 133). Concurrently, however, Lawrence shows the value of Tom's words in his own world, where they fail to communicate Tom's meaning. The company, listening to Tom, is by turns gravely interested, sardonically amused, uneasy, set on edge, and finally disruptive. Tom's words are not understood, and are lost completely in commonplace chatter.

In this vignette Tom is seen to express himself movingly in words, but the words are judged incomplete because they are unable to communicate the depths of his feelings to his audience. He expresses himself, but his audience does not react to the true spirit of his utterances. For the first time it is suggested that communication may be a necessary extension of expression.

In his treatment of the next generation Lawrence leaves the question of verbal communication in abeyance; the interest is still focussed on the necessity of attaining self-expression. Will and Anna have not learned fully to express themselves in words. Anna is the more

inarticulate; she belongs wholeheartedly to the world of rich physical communion found in Marsh Farm. She has a potential interest in the abstractions and their expression as is seen in her reaction to the rosary she inherits from her real father, Paul Lensky who was "very ardent and full of words." But Anna can never express the meaning of the rosary in words (p. 99). Even the words of the Ave Maria and Pater Noster fail to satisfy Anna, as she sees "a discrepancy, a falsehood" (p. 99) between what the words mean and what the rosary signifies. Instead of searching further towards words, Anna puts the rosary away.

Will is important to Anna because of his talk; he participates in words, and as she envisions him "In him the bounds of her experience were transgressed: he was the hole in the wall, beyond which the sunshine blazed on an outside world" (p. 109). Lawrence repeats, however, that "Will's sentences were clumsy, he was only half articulate" (p. 109). He is limited in his use of words, partially because he tries to limit them to an emotional experience.

Early in marriage an incident gives Anna an insight into Will's limitations. They are sitting in the kitchen, in silence, after a long day of intimacy, and Will thinks of his carving:

"What are you thinking about?" [Anna] asked.
He found it difficult to say. His soul

became shy when he tried to communicate it.

"I was thinking my Eve was too hard and lively."

"Why?"

"I don't know. She should be more --," he made a gesture of infinite tenderness.

There was a stillness with a little joy. He would not tell her any more. Why could he not tell her any more? She felt a pang of disconsolate sadness.

The Rainbow, p. 145

Anna reaches out to Will because in his ability to talk she sees the dimension toward which the Brangwen women aspire, which is beyond the rich physical life of the Marsh. But as Will cannot express himself fully, as he tends to use words to build up an emotion, or to transcend and escape experience rather than express it, Anna turns on him. Will cannot fulfill her expectations, and in fact threatens to negate the values which are the centre of her established being.

In his depiction of the first three generations of Brangwens Lawrence's choice of stylistic options, resulting in heavy rhythms and blurred conjunction, mirror the sensuous inarticulate nature of the characters. A good example of the way in which Lawrence controls the emotional response by modulating the rhythm and altering the feature of the images is found in the chapter called "The Cathedral," in which similar emotional experiences of Will and Anna are presented. Will's reaction is given first:

The rhythm is used to escape meaning, in much the same way as Will seems to exult in ecstasy to escape living in a fully human or social context. Will uses the rhythm of words to transcend his experiences rather than to express them.⁴

⁴There are many interesting studies on the effect of literary rhythm which are pertinent to this section. Of particular interest in connection with Lawrence's treatment of Will Brangwen are those authors who discuss literary rhythm in connection with religious experience. It is interesting to note that as great an authority as Baron Von Hügel accepted rhythm as a necessary function of mystical writing, and used the presence or absence of rhythm as a test to distinguish between the genuine and spurious writings of St. Catherine of Genoa. Von Hügel insisted, however, that coherent symbolic content be coexistent with rhythmic expression. Both Miss Underhill and Baron Von Hügel warn against false mystics who lose themselves in self-indulgent emotional raptures which have no true religious content.

Of related interest is Edward D. Snyder's book Hypnotic Poetry: A Study of Trance-Inducing Techniques in Certain Poems and its Literary Significance (Philadelphia: Penn. Press, 1930). Snyder points out that rhythm induces a form of hypnosis especially when the content is monotonous or, at least, distinctly lacking in mental stimulation. He points out that the most persuasive rhythmic stimulation (in a physical sphere) retards mental activity to a decided extent.

Underhill and Von Hügel are unanimous in pointing out that mystic prose integrates unusual sensory stimulation in strong rhythms, and profound intellectual content.

See Evelyn Underhill, Mysticism (New York: Dutton, 1961), pp. 76-80, 158, 278.

Friedrich Von Hügel, The Mystical Elements of Religion (London: Dent, 1961), I, 189.

Wayne Shumaker, Literature and the Irrational (New York: Washington Square Press, 1960), pp. 104ff.

Ar. Nehr, "A Physiological Explanation of Unusual Behaviour in Ceremonies Involving Drums," Human Biology, XXXIV, 11 (1963), 151-160.

William M. Patterson, The Rhythm of Prose (New York: Columbia University Press, 1917), *passim*.

See further entries in Bibliography.

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

She too was overcome with wonder and awe.

She followed him in his progress.

Here, the twilight was the very essence of life,
the coloured darkness was the embryo of all
light,
and the day.

Here, the very first dawn was breaking,
the very last sunset sinking,
and the immemorial darkness,
whereof life's day would blossom
and fall away again,
re-echoed peace,
and profound immemorial silence,

The Rainbow, p. 198

The experience has a religious and emotional depth for Anna, and this is expressed in the rhythm. But it is also a physical experience which seems intelligible to the intellect because it is rendered in terms of familiar and comprehensible sensory images. The "coloured darkness" of the Cathedral is understandable in terms of experiences of stained-glass windows. All know dawn and sunset. Anna's experience is seen to contain a physical reality which it transmutes; she does not seek to escape her body of sensations, nor the familiar world of dawn and dusk, day and night. The serenely sustained rhythm created by longer syntactical units, and the vividly pictorial language give the reader a knowledge of Anna's more balanced perception which she herself is still not

able to express, or communicate.

Unfortunately, Anna's attainment of perception and balance is momentary. She is awed at first, but later made frightened and angry by her husband's ecstatic loss of self and of the physical world. As a result, she retreats from the experience instead of moving from it into verbal expression. She catches at the particularities of her physical experience, and limits her future expression to the creation of children.

Lawrence condemns the self-sufficiency which cuts Anna off from the need for verbal communication. Dancing before the fire to celebrate her pregnancy she is reminiscent of David dancing in triumph before the Ark of the Lord, especially when she taunts Will, "Why do you interfere with me?" (p. 181). She rejects the potential in Will which she was once attracted by. The marriage of Anna and Will becomes as wordless as that of Tom and Lydia. "What was between them they could not utter. Their words were only accidents in the mutual silence" (The Rainbow, p. 212). In this marriage, however, the failure in self-expression is judged more harshly because of the potential for self-expression within each one of the participants.

Ursula, the representative of the fourth generation is essentially different from those who have gone before. Living in the house next to the church in

Cossethay she is to some extent removed from the rich physicality which proximity to the land gave to the inhabitants of the Marsh Farm. At the same time she is stimulated into precocious consciousness by her childish attempts to remedy the emotional deficiencies of her father and meet his neurotic demands:

Her father was the dawn wherein her consciousness woke up. But for him, she might have gone on like the other children, Gudrun and Teresa and Catherine, one with the flowers and insects and playthings, having no existence apart from the concrete object of her attention. But her father came too near to her. The clasp of his hands and the power of his breast woke her up almost in pain from the transient unconsciousness of childhood. Wide-eyed, unseeing, she was awake before she knew how to see, she was awakened too soon.

The Rainbow, p. 218

With Ursula's early-awakened consciousness stirs her awareness of words. Her reaction to her grandmother indicates her difference from the earlier generations. Tom, even after he achieves his marriage cannot understand Lydia's talk, especially her talk of Poland. "But he knew her, he knew her meaning, without understanding. What she said, what she spoke, this was a blind gesture on her part. In herself she walked strong and clear, he knew her, he saluted her, was with her" (p. 91). To Ursula, however, Lydia's talk is significant. She immediately enters imaginatively the story-land of her grandmother's early life when she hears it described. The words, bringing the great space of the past to the

child, give her relief from her sense of the inadequacy of herself which she has acquired in fruitlessly trying to fulfill her father. The words also give her illusions about herself "how she was truly a princess of Poland, how in England she was under a spell . . ." (The Rainbow, p. 266) which give her a pride in herself and lead her toward self-development. If she cannot understand all the words, they are still not meaningless or ignored; they are still filled with "mystic significance" and become "a sort of Bible to the child."

In a way, like Mrs. Morel, Ursula lives through words at the beginning of her development. Ursula is directed and developed by words in a way impossible to her parents and grandparents. Lydia's words frighten Ursula, but they serve as a direction to the girl ". . . some man will love you, child, because it's your nature. And I hope it will be somebody who will love you for what you are, and not for what he wants of you. But we have a right to what we want" (The Rainbow, p. 257).

Even more of a guide to Ursula are the words she hears from the disembodied voice in the church, and it is Ursula's consideration of the meaning of the words she hears, and her attempts to live their meanings and reconcile their contradictions that leads her to experimentation, growth and eventual maturity. It is

fascination with the words of Christianity which lead Ursula to test out the meanings of the week-day world and the Sunday world. She tries to fit the physical world to the world of the vision (pp. 281-284), and tries to recreate Christ's words in a way that fulfills her physical demands (p. 285).

Through all Ursula's attempts at understanding, the fundamental value of words is carefully maintained. That ideas should be expressed in words is the essentially positive thing, that people should wrestle for understanding, or that understanding should be incomplete is secondary:

. . . the words continued to have a meaning that was untouched [by her knowledge of their historical or semantic background]. The historical, or local, or psychological interest in words was another thing. There remained unaltered the inexplicable value of the saying.

The Rainbow, p. 275

Although words are seen as having a positive value, and although Ursula is able to work with words in a way impossible to her forebears, the negative aspects of words discussed so fully in the first three novels are introduced into The Rainbow as problems which Ursula must deal with; in particular, she has to fight the power which words have to create unreal worlds cut off from physical reality. Her development is seen as a series of revelations in which she perceives different aspects of the world of lies which she, others and society have

wrought from literary fantasy, sexual dreams and religious ideals. These word fabrications are simply illusions of life out of which she must move in order to express herself truly (p. 266).

An over-riding positive attitude toward words is maintained, despite the presentation of the negative aspects of words. Although Ursula must reject the illusive worlds which may be created by words, Ursula must not reject words by themselves. Ursula's development is dependent on her rejection of the wordless Anthony Schofield. Schofield does not listen to Ursula's words, but to Ursula herself (p. 413), and he does not express himself in words, but like Will, through the emotions, in the peculiar, reedy twang in his penetrating voice (p. 415). Ursula cannot regress to a wordless Eden.

Ursula's relationship with Anthony Schofield is useful in indicating the dangers she will face with Anton Skrebensky who is also incomplete in the way he uses words. Skrebensky, however, is not simply inarticulate in the way that Schofield or Tom Brangwen are. Skrebensky is Polish, which in The Rainbow is always associated with culture, literature, idealism, and words (see pp. 45, 194, 253, 254). His home, in particular, is described as literate. But Skrebensky, with the possibility of further articulation before him,

turns his back on expressing himself, preferring the "wordless darkness" of sensuality even more completely than Anna or Will. He gives himself up to "duties," and to the idea of "the general good." "At the bottom of his heart his self, the soul that aspired and had true hope of self-effectuation lay as dead, still-born, a dead weight in his womb" (p. 326). Anton can not express himself, not because he lacks words, but because there is nothing to express.

It is not only Anton's lack of self-expression which dooms his relationship with Ursula, it is also their mutual inability to communicate. The quality of their relationship is pre-figured in their drive from Derby, when, without speaking or looking at her, Anton sensually strips the glove from Ursula's passive hand:

. . . Then his hand closed over hers, so firm, so close, as if the flesh knitted to one thing his hand and hers. Meanwhile his face watched the road and the ears of the horse, . . . Neither of them spoke. In outward attention they were entirely separate. But between them was the compact of his flesh with hers, in the hand-clasp.

The Rainbow, p. 295

When they do speak, on this outing, the incompleteness of any relationship is emphasized in the quality of their conversation. Skrebensky tells of a friend who sat in a church with a girl for a rather sordid love-making.

Ursula, naive and romantic, misunderstands completely and sees the incident as beautiful, as a fitting resolution

of fleshly love and spiritual awareness. Neither understands nor is affected by the other's speech, nor can they communicate wordlessly. Each is the other's means of sensual gratification.

The lack of communication in speech is insisted on throughout the entire relationship, and is seen as entirely negative. When Anton returns from South Africa to meet Ursula at college, Lawrence comments: "She laughed, with a blind dazzled face as she gave him her hand. He too could not perceive her." Then he goes on: "He talked, but not to her. She tried to speak to him, but she could not reach him" (p. 443).

The one time Skrebensky does connect with Ursula and gain a response he does so by using the techniques of Will and Anthony Schofield. He speaks to her "like a voice out of the darkness" in "low vibrating" tones, and in talking about Africa "he transferred to her the hot, fecund darkness that possessed his own blood" (p. 446). It is not, however, the words in themselves that communicate; it is the "soft, cajoling vibrating tones." And she does not receive his message as a separate individual; instead, his words help them to merge "so that they were one stream, one dark fecundity," by destroying all that is associated with the light in Ursula: the intellect, consciousness, social

responsibility. Two individuals do not share experiences as a result of this form of communication; instead two people lose identity, merge themselves into one, "the light of consciousness gone, . . . the darkness reigned, and the unutterable satisfaction" (p. 447). Communication is only achieved at the cost of part of the personality.

Ursula and Anton achieve the "sensual darkness" only at the price of rejecting that part of themselves which is responsive to the social world around them, and to social responsibility. It nullifies Ursula's achievement in education and as a teacher which is won at great cost, and shown as valuable. Skrebensky, when he is near Ursula, feels "rich and abundant in himself," and has "no use for people, nor for words" (p. 449). The falsity of this communication has its price, however, for without Ursula, Skrebensky "feels as if turned to clay." "Her absence was worse than pain to him. It destroyed his being" (p. 457). For Ursula, however, the sensuality is a game which flatters her ego, but leaves her untouched. Even Skrebensky's passion does not communicate itself to her meaningfully. "It could not occur to her that anybody, not even the young man of the world, Skrebensky, should have anything at all to do with her permanent self" (p. 452).

The couple's rejection of words as means of

communication is closely associated with their rejection of society and of their social role. Their discussions of marriage are excellent examples of how the two articulate people use words to evade each other rather than communicate:

"I suppose we ought to get married," he said, rather wistfully. It was so magnificently free and in a deeper world, as it was. . . .

He watched her pensive, puzzled face.

"I don't think I want to marry you," she said, her brow clouded.

It piqued him rather.

"Why not?" he asked.

"Let's think about it afterwards, shall we?" she said.

He was crossed, yet he loved her violently.

"You've got a museau, not a face," he said.

"Have I?" she cried, her face lighting up like a pure flame. She thought she had escaped. Yet he returned -- he was not satisfied.

"Why?" he asked, "Why don't you want to marry me?"

"I don't want to be with other people," she said. "I want to be like this. I'll tell you if I ever want to marry you."

"All right," he said.

The Rainbow, pp. 452-453.

The evasions, the insults which are unnoticed, Skrebensky's hurt at Ursula's not wishing to do something which he does not wish to do, all these latent contradictions lie ignored in the conversation, which is rather an avoidance of conversation. If the Ohmann-Austin criteria are employed it is seen how both Skrebensky and Ursula avoid making statements, how Skrebensky speaks of things which he does not believe, and how he refuses to act in accordance with his statement.

With regard to the proposal things are not "all right."

Ursula is the first to wish to return to the world. After a few weeks' dalliance in sensual darkness in London and Paris, Ursula is drawn toward Rouen with its political, social and religious inheritance. She is fascinated by the Cathedral, which symbolizes for her the world of the Voice which first spoke to her and guided her, "She turned to it as if to something she had forgotten, and wanted" (p. 456).

When Ursula turns away from him to the Cathedral, Skrebensky is made aware, to some extent, of his deathlike state. He makes one final effort to escape himself and join the social world, by using words and writing a letter. Because he has nullified himself and limited himself to willed sensual gratification, he has no self to express; his language is as dead as he himself is, and, as a result, he is unable to communicate. Ursula can not find meaning in his words, and replies to his letter with a pleasantly evasive and utterly meaningless letter of her own (p. 458).

In this passage Lawrence extends the ideas about language which he has presented to this time. To review: Ursula and Anton are both presented as potentially articulate. Both use their powers of articulation meaninglessly, but their evasions of meaning in speech express exactly their evasions of themselves; their

descent into "sensual darkness," and their evasion of consciousness and social life are actually evasions of their potential. As a result, although the evasive words of Ursula and Anton express their natures accurately enough, Lawrence terms their words "dead language" because it is devoid of meaningful communication. The criterion here is not specifically expression, as Lawrence's earlier works suggest. Instead, as in Tom's speech, communication is seen as important.

In The Rainbow Lawrence develops an idea of "true speech" which is an expression of the individual, and which also communicates a truth. The second criterion seems an extension of the first. This is one incident in the relationship of Ursula and Anton which illustrates Lawrence's notion of true speech. Both individuals express their fundamental feelings honestly and without evasion, and communication takes place. Significantly, both deny the honest statements of the speeches and the insights about the other person which are communicated. Both characters recoil in horror from honest expression or communication.

The illustration is found in the scene concerning Anton's second proposal, at Richmond. The parallels with the earlier proposal scene are emphasized in order to throw the differences into high relief:

"When shall we be married?" he asked her, quietly, simply, as if it were a mere question of comfort.

She watched the changing pleasure traffic of the river. He looked at her golden, puzzled muséum. The knot gathered in his throat.

"I don't know," she said.

A hot grief gripped his throat.

"Why don't you know -- don't you want to be married?" he asked her.

Her head turned slowly, her face, puzzled, like a boy's face, expressionless because she was trying to think, looked toward his face. She did not see him, because she was preoccupied. She did not quite know what she was going to say.

"I don't think I want to be married," she said, and her naive, troubled, puzzled eyes rested a moment on his, then travelled away, preoccupied.

"Do you mean never, or not just yet?" he asked.

The knot in his throat grew harder, his face was drawn as if he were being strangled.

"I mean never," she said, out of some far self which spoke for once beyond her.

The Rainbow, p. 466⁵

For once Ursula expresses herself truly and straightforwardly as she makes a statement. That this true speech has the power of communication is seen in the power of Skrebensky's emotional reaction, which he can neither control nor fathom. Ursula is stunned by the force of his grief, and she is immediately humble and repentant. Under the impact of the recognized truth of Ursula's speech Anton too expresses one of the essential truths of himself:

⁵The italics are mine.

. . . "I didn't know you cared so much," she said, . . . humbly.

"I didn't," he said. "I was knocked over myself. -- But I care -- all the world."

His voice was so quiet and colourless, it made her heart go pale with fear.

"My love!" she said, drawing near to him. But she spoke out of fear, not out of love.

"I care all the world -- I care for nothing else -- neither in life nor in death," he said, in the same steady, colourless voice of essential truth.

"Than for what?" she murmured duskily.

"Than for you to be with me."

And again she was afraid.

The Rainbow, p. 470

Ursula reacts with fear to the truth, just as Anton had reacted with unrestrained grief. Because of their negative reactions and because of the pressures to external conformity their true speeches and reactions are only momentary. When she sees Anton's "automatic" grief, Ursula wishes to be "good" and kind. So she immediately disavows her own words, saying that "the words came without my knowing. They didn't mean anything, really" (p. 468). Later she protests "You needn't mind everything I say so particularly" (p. 470). Not only does she evade, she denies the need for, or existence of, communication.

Despite the refuge in lies encouraged in Ursula by her training and her cowardice, the truth has been expressed and communicated. Later, it is possible to act on the truth when the sexual failure on the Lincolnshire coast translates into physical terms the truth of the words her deepest self had known and uttered.

As the novel ends Ursula is purified to recognition of the nature of her essential self by the horses. "Sunk to the bottom of all change," she accepts herself in peace, and looks to the new Day of truth promised by the Rainbow bridge.⁶ In the future, it is implied, she will ground her behaviour and speech on the truth of herself which she has disentangled from her connection with father, mother, lover, and place in the world of things (p. 492). She is prepared for the exploration of individual expression and communication which takes place at such length in Women in Love.

The Rainbow serves to recapitulate many of Lawrence's ideas about words, to organize them, develop them, and place them in perspective. The idea that each individual must learn to express himself in speech is a powerful motif running through the development of all four generations. At the same time, however, Lawrence emphasizes the destructive aspects of speech, and cautions that the false views of the world and the

⁶ The use of the Nietzschean elements in The Rainbow -- the rainbow bridge to the superman, the injunction that the Brangwens and Ursula must remain "true to the earth" of their natures in order to develop, the use of the vision "of that which is loved" to develop, the implicit idea of marriage as a supportive and creative union of separate identities -- is especially interesting when it is remembered that Nietzsche insisted that words were purely social in function, evolved in order to permit man to communicate.

evasions which speech encourages must be avoided.

Lawrence extends these ideas in two ways, however, when he suggests that speech that expresses the individual should also communicate its truth to another person.

In The Rainbow Lawrence also introduces a major contradiction to his theory of words and communication. He shows that the only people who achieve true communion do so without words. Tom and Lydia do not speak to each other, and do not "know" one another, but they accept and respect each other as separate individuals in a way that occasions a mutual understanding and communion. Will and Anna, also, communicate wordlessly, despite the incompleteness of their relationship. Ursula does not share communion with anyone, although she is articulate. Words do not enable her to communicate with Skrebensky, yet she cannot turn her back on words, as her parents did, for there is no inarticulate communication for her.

In The Rainbow the value of words is seen as even more problematical than it was in the first three novels. The increased expansion and the increased deletion show the effect of the conflict about words, a conflict which is further explored in Women in Love.

CHAPTER FOUR

WOMEN IN LOVE:

EXPRESSION VERSUS COMMUNICATION

In Women in Love Lawrence struggles to develop and reconcile his theories of words as a means of individual expression with his emerging attitudes to communication. The result is contradictory. Lawrence accepts that words must express the truth of the moment to establish the person and create his moral value, but he also insists that words are inadequate to the task. At the same time, however, he implicitly extends the ideas of The Rainbow on the necessity of communication and judges word usage according to its communicative value. Yet he also judges that words are incomplete instruments of communication, and that communication is paradoxically accomplished in silence. Moreover, his treatment of speech communication suggests that he feels communication through speech to be a type of violation of personal integrity in which the listener is dominated by the speaker, and almost forced into an assumption of the speaker's identity which he is powerless to oppose. There is no resolution to the conflicting attitudes towards words and communication, and the value of words

is uncertain throughout the novel.

The conflict in the attitude to words is reflected in the style, which presents two stylistic patterns simultaneously. Women in Love emphasizes expansion and deletion at the same time and uses the deletion transformations to produce a great deal of ambiguity. The novel has comparatively long sentences, and the greatest number of transformations per thousand words in the Lawrentian canon. There is greater variety in the transformations than in The Rainbow, and a high proportion of true expansion transformations. It also has the greatest number of deletions. In addition to the number of appositives, deleted relatives and deletion of unnecessary words, inverted sentence order and displaced structures add to the opacity of the prose. The desire to expand and explain is seen in conflict with the desire to conceal or mystify, just as the desire to seek self-expression in speech conflicts with a fear of speech communication.

The concern with the problem of speech shown in Women in Love has long been commented on.¹ As Lawrence Lerner notes, the novel is full of conversation, far more than in The Rainbow, and all the characters are extremely

¹ See especially Martin Jarrett-Kerr, D.H. Lawrence and Human Existence (London: SCM Press, 1961), p. 53.

articulate people, accustomed to analyzing themselves and their emotions, and defining and transvaluating words.²

The importance of words is emphasized in the way that the characters are assessed according to the "truth" of their speech. Lawrence evaluates the speeches of almost all the characters according to the criteria explored in the first four novels. And the greater number of the characters are found to fail in using words to express themselves, even though they are articulate. Lawrence, as well as Birkin, dismisses most of the people in the society of the novel as "not anything at all. . . . They jingle and giggle. . . . Essentially, they don't exist" (p. 19).

The reasons for their failures are various. Will Brangwen, the half-articulate man of The Rainbow, is shown to use words which he imagines others would use in his situation as he plays "heavy father" (pp. 249-251). Birkin sums him up ruthlessly: "Her father was not a coherent human being, he was a roomful of old echoes" (p. 250). Hermione Roddice, on the other hand, is condemned because she perverts words to create an illusion of reality which has no truth, in somewhat the same fashion as Helena of The Trespasser. In "The Classroom" Hermione inveighs

² Lawrence Lerner, The Truth Tellers: Jane Austen, George Eliot, D.H. Lawrence (London: Chatto and Windus, 1967), p. 196.

against knowledge [" . . . aren't we forfeiting life for the dead quality of knowledge" (p. 35)] in a way that is not true to her own experience, but is a fulfillment of an intellectual wish. Birkin points out that she is lying about her attitudes to knowledge; then he tells her that she is using words to construct lies and evade reality: ". . . you won't be conscious of what actually is: you want a lie that will match the rest of the furniture" (p. 35).

Gudrun is shown to be like Lettie, caught up in irony and evasion; she does not wish to look too closely at meanings. Yet Gudrun also displays a paradoxical desire to be "quite definite," to establish ideas permanently and irrevocably through words. In the first chapter her contradictory character is broadly outlined. She puts a rather vague question on marriage to Ursula, and is irritated when Ursula asks for a more precise definition before she can answer. Gudrun does nothing to clarify the aspects of marriage which she is discussing although she wants a definite answer to her vague question, and in the rest of the conversation she is even more evasive and elliptical (p. 1).

In the German, Loerke, Lawrence extends his argument against words, and emphasizes a fear that words may be totally divorced from a human context, and used as weapons. Loerke is shown to manipulate the emotional and

intellectual content of words, divorcing them quite from human meaning, so that he gains his own ends. Loerke's words are never expressions of his thoughts or emotions; he is always distanced from them as if they had a separate life of their own, unconnected with his own life, as a form of artistic creation or as instruments. For example, when Loerke is introduced, he is shown to use his powerful and flexible voice to reduce the four main characters to helpless laughter at a German story which they do not understand (p. 396). Loerke is condemned and found wanting for character faults reflected in his misuse of words, and, in this novel, as in the previous novels, the implication of all the character assessments is that words are of a positive value and they must be used to express the individual as truly as possible.

In Women in Love another dimension is present in the evaluation of the characters' use of words. In almost all cases it is implied that the character who offends against true word use also inhibits communication in speech. The tricks of speech or the mannerisms which inhibit communication are condemned. For example, when Hermione creates her fantasy of "knowledge" in "Classroom" she "rhapsodizes" in a "singsong casual voice," like a prophetess caught in a trance, utterly oblivious to the others around her, and presenting an elliptical and

abstract monologue in a way that preserves her fantasy-world from the intrusion of reality (p. 33). If Ohmann's criteria for communicability are used, Hermione is found to offend against criteria five, six, and one, and Lawrence, similarly, condemns her for not actually believing what she says, for grounding her conduct and speech in a contrary understanding of her words, and for speaking in a series of disjointed rhetorical questions to which she expects no answer. Like Lettie, Hermione likes to speak in a foreign language, but Hermione does not do this to evade meaning, but to exclude some members of her audience from any possibility of communication. Her asides to the Contessa at Breadalby, and her intimate conversations with Mino and Birkin while in Ursula's presence are two examples of her typical behaviour, condemned by Lawrence because it inhibits communication.

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

Many of the resulting disjointed conversations between the characters sound like the artificial and

disconnected speeches of the early novels like The White Peacock. The effect, however, is totally different because of the authorial awareness of evasion in conversation, and the psychological bases Lawrence prepares so that the reader may analyze and judge the disjointed exchanges. For example, one of the most confusing exchanges in the novel occurs between Gudrun and Gerald after Gudrun dances in front of the Highland cattle. Gerald frightens off the cattle with a shout, then calls to her, "What do you think you are doing?" (p. 160). Gudrun replies "Why have you come?" an answer, typical of the exchanges in The White Peacock, which altogether ignores the question as if it did not exist. Then Gerald repeats his question, ignoring her cry in turn. In the ensuing conversation Gudrun attempts to ignore Gerald, then, when that proves impossible, to play with his words so that their sense is confounded and Gerald is confused. Finally she strikes Gerald.

The context shows that this behaviour is dictated by psychological imperatives in a way that is totally foreign to The White Peacock. The conversation is not just a pointless entertainment presented to the reader; instead Lawrence shows that he recognizes the evasive qualities of the speech by indicating the causes of these evasions. Gudrun can hardly explain that she had felt

jealous of Ursula's self-possession, and had contrived the whole scene, at first to give her a sense of participation (p. 157), then, when the cattle appeared, to give her a sense of power to offset the impotence of one who feels an onlooker in life instead of a participant. With the evasions, the playing with words and the Blow Gudrun puts on a mask of power to cover her impotence, defends herself from a threat felt in the questions which might lead to communication, and, especially in the blow, expresses the violent rage she feels toward anyone who threatens her. Gudrun does speak the truth for once when she tells of her fear of Gerald and his cattle. But she so constructs the conversation that she reveals and conceals at the same time. The slap destroys any possibility of communication. Lawrence's explanation of Gudrun's conversational behaviour, and his suggestion of her fear of communication in speech, epitomizes a new attitude to words and conversation which appears in Women in Love. Conversations are evasive, because all too often they appear to threaten the participants.

Gudrun employs conversation in another way which is also condemned in the novel. Since Gudrun requires relationship -- the whole dancing scene began because of her feeling of separation from Ursula -- she attempts to construct an illusion of community with her words. When Gudrun has thoroughly repelled and confused Gerald, and

cut him off from any contact, she is terrified, and approaches him in child-like fashion, asking if he is angry and creating an illusion of rapport with her words. As Loerke uses words as instruments of power to control others, Gudrun uses words as instruments of illusion in order to gain power. Another, very negative aspect of words, is introduced into the novel, and again, not just in connection with words as means of false expression, but in connection with words as false means of communication, or interaction with another person.

The problems of false communication are especially prominent in Gudrun's relationships, particularly in her relationships with Loerke and with Gerald. As Gudrun tends to vacillate between her desire for verbal certainty in the words of others, and a wish to evade her own meaning, she becomes fascinated with Loerke. Loerke prefers conversation which is "full of odd, fantastic expression, of double meanings, of evasions, of suggestive vagueness" (p. 445). Loerke and she laugh

. . . in an endless series of quips and jests and polyglot fancies. The fancies were the reality to both of them, they were both so happy, tossing about the little coloured balls of verbal humour and whimsicalities. Their natures seemed to sparkle in full interplay, they were enjoying a pure game.

Women in Love, p. 460

In the abstraction of words from any living emotion or meaning, Loerke leads Gudrun to imagine that

they create a world of their own apart from the world of humanity. The world of the human moment is limited because of emotional attachments and the quest for meaning and values, and cannot be absolute, because of change. Because Loerke and Gudrun use words of "barely comprehensible suggestivity" to create an isolate world, they believe that they can escape the limitations of humanity, escape the moment, and achieve a perfect art-world (p. 435), which has no relation to the world of human emotion and value (p. 421), and which over-rides the changing moment to create a kind of static perfection. This perfection fulfills Gudrun's need for verbal certainty, and also her need for evasion since it is completely abstract and unliving, dominated and controlled by Loerke.

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

people, especially with Birkin, because he wishes to be close to them, or rather, he wishes, like Gudrun, to have the illusion of intimacy, the illusion of being close to people in speech communication. Gerald himself recognizes that he regards the bond of words as an illusion. His bond with Birkin is an intuitive affair based on tacit recognition of potential relationship, and he degrades the potential by disregarding the words of conversation which are the symbols and modes of community between men:

There was something very congenial to him in Birkin. But yet, beyond this, he did not take much notice. He felt that he, himself, Gerald, had harder and more durable truths than any the other man knew. He felt himself older, more knowing. It was the quick-changing warmth and quick interchange of feelings he enjoyed. The real content of the words he never really considered; he himself knew better.

Women in Love, p. 51

Gerald's friendship with Birkin is a paradigm of his relationship to humanity. He uses words to simulate the closeness and community for which he will not recognize his need. Despite his "powerful but suppressed friendliness," Gerald feels safer in isolation, and therefore tries to deny the contact which on another level he needs and wants by denying the expressive and communicative value of words. He makes himself self-sufficient by his physical stamina, his wealth, his machinery. When Gudrun watches Gerald swim in Willey Pond she recognizes that he "exulted to himself because of his

own advantage, his possession of a world to himself. He was immune and perfect. . . . unquestioned and unconditioned . . . without bond or connection anywhere" (p. 40). It is suggested, however, that his isolation and his reliance on intuition rather than concrete modes of communication make him vulnerable.

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

"You know you never have loved me, don't you?"

"I don't know what you mean by the word 'love'," he replied.

"Yes, you do. You know all right that you have never loved me. Have you, do you think?"

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

"And you never will love me," she said finally, "Will you?"

There was a diabolical coldness in her, too much to bear.

"No," he said.

"Then," she replied, "what have you against me?"

. . . "Why do you torture me," he said.

She flung her arms about his neck.

"Oh, I don't want to torture you," she said pityingly, as if she were comforting a child. . . .

"Say you love me," she pleaded. "Say you will love me for ever -- won't you -- won't you?"

. . . Won't you say you love me always?" she coaxed. "Say it, even if it isn't true -- say it Gerald, do."

"I will love you always," he repeated, in real agony, forcing the words out.

She gave him a quick kiss.

"Fancy your actually having said it," she said with a touch of raillery.

He stood as if he had been beaten.

Women in Love, pp. 433-434³

Gerald feels "degraded to the very quick, made of no account" after such an episode, but his actions are simply a logical extension of his original attitude to words. Gerald avoided the meanings of words, and refused to recognize their value in communication. In this incident he is forced to strip words of all significant value and meaning in a way that strips value and meaning from himself. The demeaning of the words reflects the demeaning of Gerald. Yet Gerald suffers under Gudrun's attack because of his suppressed desire for relationship which makes him attempt to speak the truth in his words. As

³If this conversation is analyzed according to the criteria for felicitous communication suggested by Ohmann it will be seen that Gudrun is not actually attempting to communicate. She very rarely makes statements (1); usually she uses bullying questions, commands and exclamations. Many of the statements she does make are inadmissible (2); she cannot tell another person what he is or what he will or will not do. The statements she does make are false (5 & 6) in that her actions do not bear out the truth of her speech. She can not say that she does not want to torture Gerald when she has just deliberately embarked on doing just that. Although Gudrun's speech does not communicate, it is a powerful weapon for the domination and humiliation of Gerald.

the narrator comments: ". . . in Gerald's soul there still lingered some attachment to the rest, to the whole" (p. 444). Gerald still wishes to establish a relationship with Gudrun, and her words have the ability to touch him. With this desire for relationship Gerald also retains the desire for value; he has still the ability to recognize truth from falsehood; he can still see through Gudrun's misuse of words and call her a liar (p. 438), and he can revile Loerke who has totally rejected community and value. He can also recognize his own degradation. He is simply a victim to the more detached Gudrun who can manipulate words, values and relationships with complete freedom, and use words to control, manipulate, degrade.

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

The most complete presentation of the emerging complexities in Lawrence's ideas on words and on communication is found in the portrayal of Rupert Birkin. Birkin's development is an exploration, restatement, and development, of all of Lawrence's theories on words and

communication to this time. At the beginning of the novel Birkin is presented as an articulate and literate member of an educated society. He is also socially self-conscious and insecure, though adept, essentially isolated and in opposition to a society whose faults and strengths he shares. He is seen as a man tired unto death with the isolate intellectual and sensuous preoccupations of the society of which he is part. He has preserved enough of himself intact and apart that he can recognize the empty pretensions of people who use the power of articulation to evade themselves, and simply "jingle and giggle" but do not matter at all, essentially.

For the first two chapters Birkin is shown as a quiet observer; during general conversation he often drops out of sight completely. In "Classroom," however, Birkin has a conversation with Hermione and Ursula which introduces clearly his attitude to words and the problems he has with words. Birkin enters the discussion to protest Hermione's "playing with words"; she has pretended to challenge the idea of consciousness, but chosen such a restricted meaning of the concept, that she has simply been putting down an idea of straw. Birkin immediately opposes her, and insists correctly that her understanding of consciousness is too narrow and distorts her argument. In this section he shows that he understands the importance of words, that he believes they must be used to

express the truth of a situation, and that they must not be used to distort the understanding of the hearers. Birkin actually repeats and argues many of Lawrence's theories about words.

Other implications about words become clearer as Hermione continues to denounce knowledge, despite Birkin's interjections. As Hermione ignores Birkin's arguments and advice Birkin becomes frustrated; he is expressing himself truly, but he is communicating nothing to the person he is speaking to. Obviously the suggestion is made that speech should communicate meaning to complete the value of expression. Lawrence is restating and emphasizing the idea first presented with Tom in The Rainbow.

Although Birkin repeats Lawrence's ideas, and expresses a desire for true expression and communication, he is far from able to establish the ideals in practice. In his argument with Hermione Birkin shows that he shares her limited concepts of certain words, like knowledge, when he uses Hermione's terminology in his own argument. He also shows that he is quite as able as Hermione to twist words or manipulate them to gain his own ends. Obviously, he recognizes and hates in Hermione what he is capable of himself.

Later, Birkin shows his limited ability to express his notions in clear speech which communicates his

meaning. When asked by Ursula to present the wider meaning of knowledge in speech, his words falter, become dislocated and vague, and communication becomes impossible. In terms of Ohmann's assessment of the felicity of conversation he offends against criterion four, if not against two, for he speaks in incomplete phrases, and pretends to be a spokesman for the generality of man, although he is actually stating and distorting his contemporary experience and momentary notions:

"Sensuality is a fulfilment -- the great dark knowledge you can't have in your head -- the dark involuntary being. It is death to one's self -- but it is the coming into being of another."

"But how? How can you have knowledge not in your head?" she asked, quite unable to interpret his phrases.

"In the blood," he answered; "when the mind and the known world is drowned in darkness -- everything must go -- there must be the deluge. Then you find yourself in a palpable body of darkness, a demon -- "

"But why should I be a demon -- ?" she asked.

"'Woman wailing for her demon lover' -- " he quoted -- "why, I don't know."

Women in Love, p. 36

Although Birkin boasts that he knows "enough" of what he is talking about, the inconsequential images, the disrupted structures, the verbal imprecision, all show that truly Birkin does not know. He neither expresses himself nor does he communicate. He may have a notion that he must use words to express himself and achieve communication but the structures and images he uses show that though he may wish to use words to express and

communicate he is not yet able to do so.

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

As the novel progresses Ursula struggles to judge words more accurately and more consciously. For example, after Gudrun has coolly and accurately analyzed Birkin's faults in "Moony," Ursula thinks that she has to agree with the truth of Gudrun's analysis, but in trying to accept the pronouncements as final she is filled with "the most barren of misery." In wrestling with the emotion roused by her sister's words, Ursula becomes able

to judge the words consciously from a wider perspective:

Gudrun finished off life so thoroughly, she made things so ugly and final. As a matter of fact, even if it were true as Gudrun said, about Birkin, other things were true as well. But Gudrun would draw two lines under him and cross him out like an account that is settled. There he was, summed up, paid for, settled, done with. And it was such a lie. This finality of Gudrun's, this dispatching of people and things in a sentence, it was all such a lie.

Women in Love, p. 256

Ursula reacts against the tendency to accept the word as the complete and absolute truth. She recognizes, as Gudrun and Lettie do not, that words taken as absolutes can limit the wonder and mystery of life, reducing people and things to mere aspects of themselves, or to purely anthropomorphic caricatures.

In the same way, throughout the novel, Ursula battles the power of words to construct an unreal world in which she is tempted to believe. At Breadalby (p. 76) with Gerald, with Hermione, and with Gudrun in the Tyrol (pp. 428-429) she continues the battle which Lettie, Helena and others avoided.

Ursula's search for meaning and truth in words is a surprise in a novel populated with characters who misuse words in so many ways. There is no reason given for Ursula's unusual capacity, just as there is no reason given for the capacity for sympathy and understanding which she alone possesses. Yet the characteristics seem

intended as complementary, and the reader suspects that both are connected with the conscious recognition and acceptance of herself which was accomplished at the end of The Rainbow. She is the only character in the novel who seems to know what she really feels; Birkin has to "think about it" to tell whether he is feeling well or ill. And with these qualities she is an excellent foil for Birkin in his search.

After the conversation in "The Classroom" Birkin and Ursula have a series of conversations in which the problems of self-expression and communication are developed. Birkin's first conversation with Ursula takes place on an island. Birkin's physical and psychological isolation is reflected in the conversation which turns into a monologue tirade against humanity. In the speech itself, Birkin's colourful use of expanded metaphor is attractive, but his wavering between love of metaphoric overstatement and reluctance to accept the logical implications of his figures of speech shows the falsity of his expression and impedes communication.⁴ The very violence of the speech and use of sustained elaborate imagery tells against the honesty of the statement of his emotions (pp. 118-119). In the tirade against the dead

⁴This kind of verbal problem seems quite common in the early Birkin. See Women in Love, p. 33.

tree of mankind, however, Birkin restates Lawrence's notions about words, and damns the human race roundly that its individual members do not use words to express truth.⁵

To this point, the conversation between Ursula and Birkin is a reiteration and slight expansion of ideas previously held by Lawrence. At the end of the scene, however, two further ideas are introduced which bring all previous ideas and conclusions into question. The first departure occurs when Ursula is moved almost to tears by the radiant daisies scattered over the water. She likens "the shy bright little cotillion" to "a convoy of rafts," and demands "Why are they so lovely. . . . Why do I think them so lovely?" Birkin mocks her demand for definition, first giving botanical classifications of the flowers, then suggesting a series of metaphoric descriptions which Ursula energetically rejects:

"Explain it so, then," he said. "The daisy is a perfect little democracy, so it's the highest of flowers, hence its charm."

"No," she cried, "no -- never. It isn't democratic."

⁵In this conversation Birkin defends the idea that words and actions are of equal value as statements of truth. Even though Ursula queries "What they do doesn't alter the value of what they say, does it?" Birkin reiterates ". . . if what they say were true, then they couldn't help fulfilling it" (p. 119). Birkin implies that if only a man could express himself truthfully, his actions would miraculously achieve livingness. This concept of the identity of speech and action is important in the later development of Lawrence's ideas about words.

"No," he admitted. "It's the golden mob of the proletariat, surrounded by a showy white fence of the idle rich."

"How hateful -- your hateful social orders!" she cried.

"Quite. It's a daisy -- we'll leave it alone."

"Do. Let it be a dark horse for once," she said; "if anything can be a dark horse to you. . . ."

Women in Love, p. 123

Birkin mockingly appeals for an end to definition, and indeed to the expression and explanation of feelings and reactions in words. He seems to wish only silent appreciation of things as they are, rather than a restatement of personal appreciation in words and images. Indeed he seems to suggest that words are entirely inadequate either to express the nature of an external object or the subjective reaction of the individual. It is the first real reaction from the idea of the positive value of self-expression.

The second idea about words which is stressed in this section is an extension of the ideas on communication developed in The Rainbow. Lawrence shows that as with Tom and Lydia rapport is wordless, but he does not suggest that words should in any way be connected with communication. Ursula and Birkin talk a great deal in this chapter, but communication occurs in spite of words, more often than it comes because of words. They touch each other, not because of perfect self-expression, or mutual understanding of absolute meanings, but because of the intuitive insight

one has into the nature of the other, "the beam of understanding between them" (p. 122). It is this "beam of understanding" which Ursula recognizes even before she has really talked with Birkin; she sees that, "he seemed to acknowledge some kinship between him and her . . . a using of the same language," and she defines this "language" as "a natural tacit understanding" (p. 15).⁶ Lawrence at this point seems to understand communication as a feeling of communion, really as a psychic experience in which the individual feels himself in tune with another person. If this is so, then it is no surprise that words and communication are seen as separate, even though earlier, Lawrence seems to have wished them joined.

The confrontations between Birkin and Ursula which follow "An Island" intensify the emerging contradictions in the theory of words. For example, in "Mino" Birkin does not accept his own advice and avoid explanations and definitions, but repeatedly tries to define the type of relationship he wishes to have with Ursula. His attempts at definition show the futility of attempting expression in words, since his words of explanation and his illustrations continually contradict themselves. He says he wishes "an equilibrium, a pure balance of two

⁶My italics.

single beings" (p. 139), but his illustration "like a star in its orbit" (p. 142), reveals that he really wants to dominate in a relationship, but does not want to admit it. When the two cats are seen Birkin talks of "superfine balance," but what the actions show is bullying -- a lordly housecat cuffing the subservient and frightened cat from the wilds. Birkin's speech does not in any way reflect the truth of the man, or his situation, and seems to help very little in extending his consciousness of himself or his surroundings.

In addition, the only understanding or communication in this interview is again achieved in spite of words. Ursula intuits Birkin's feelings despite his words, and her teasing and her forthrightness break through his stiff abstraction to a certain degree. After a great deal of abstract talk on Birkin's part, Ursula laughs:

"I think you are very silly. I think you want to tell me you love me, and you go all this way round to do it."

. . . She interpreted it, that he had made a deep confession of love to her. But he was so absurd in his words, also.

They were silent for many minutes, she was pleased and elated like a child. His concentration broke and he began to look at her simply and naturally.

"What I want is a strange conjunction with you --" he said quietly; "-- not meeting and mingling; -- you are quite right: -- but an equilibrium, a pure balance of two single beings: -- as the stars balance each other."

She looked at him. He was very earnest, and earnestness was always rather ridiculous, commonplace, to her. It made her feel unfree and

uncomfortable. Yet she liked him so much. But why drag in the stars?

Women in Love, p. 139

Words have very little to do with Ursula's understanding of Birkin. In fact, one cannot dismiss the suspicion that the emotional rhetoric and plethora of images have obscured communication rather than aided it. As Ursula says, why drag in the stars? Instead the words seem to be used almost as emotional bludgeons to bewilder and control the person who is being spoken to, while the fragmented syntax reveals and conceals meaning at the same time.

In the next few interviews the conflict is expressed more directly. After the water-party, shocked by the deaths, Birkin attempts once more to explain what he wants from Ursula, yet the inadequacy of words either to express what he feels or to communicate his meaning is clearly recognized:

She knew, as well as he knew, that words themselves do not convey meaning, that they are but a gesture we make, a dumb show like any other.

Women in Love, p. 178

Yet despite the limitations of words the necessity of using words for growth and self-expression is still upheld:

There was always confusion in speech. Yet it must be spoken. Whichever way one moved, if one were to move forwards, one must break a way through. And to know, to give utterance was to

break a way through the walls of the prison as the infant in labour strives through the walls of the womb.

Women in Love, p. 178

In this complex presentation, also, the necessity for communication is maintained at the same time that the dangerously coercive power of words is emphasized. Ursula is close to Birkin in the emotional aftermath of the evening, but she does not wish to listen to his words. The narrative almost implies that if she permits herself to realize the meaning of Birkin's words she will accede to them:

Ursula listened, half attentive, half avoiding what he said. She seemed to catch the drift of his statement, and then she drew away. She wanted to hear, but she did not want to be implicated. She was reluctant to yield there, where he wanted her, to yield as it were her very identity. . . . And she seemed to feel his gesture [i.e. his words] through her blood, and she drew back, even though her desire sent her forward.

Women in Love, p. 178

This passage is the most explicit presentation of the notion that words which communicate have the power of spell-words to put the hearer in the speaker's power, or to force him to take on the speaker's identity. The idea is hinted at throughout the book, in Ursula's fight against the power of Gudrun's words (pp. 428-429), and in Gerald and Gudrun's fear of communion. It is indirectly suggested that all three fear and fight communication through words because other's words have the power to

overwhelm the sense of identity.⁷

After this exchange between Birkin and Ursula the novel generally emphasizes the inadequacy of words, either in self-expression, or in communication. Birkin, on the whole, speaks far more simply; his images are much more subdued, which should show ease of expression and facilitate communication. But after a sharp argument in "Moony" Birkin decides to abandon words. He stops in despair thinking "But what was the good of telling her he wanted this company in proud indifference. What was the good of talking, anyway? It must happen beyond the sound of words" (p. 242). After they have agreed verbally that "the accord does not come," and sat in silence for a few moments, they find themselves inexplicably "together in happy stillness." In this wordless communion they attain the ability "to be content in bliss, without desire

⁷ It is interesting to note that in the two examples of verbal interaction between characters which occur in the earlier novels this type of loss of identity is also portrayed. In The Rainbow Ursula listens to her grandmother's words and imaginatively becomes part of her grandmother's life. The assumption of identity here is not complete, and is in a sense positive, since it widens the child's horizon, but it is also seen as a dangerous trap which may limit the girl in illusion. In Sons and Lovers on the other hand, the exchange of identity is complete and Mrs. Morel becomes Paul and lives his life vicariously. In this autobiographical episode, significantly, the mother is still seen as dominating and absorbing even though she is a listener.

or insistence anywhere" (p. 244). The narrative shows words to be unnecessary. Later, in "Excuse" the same thing happens. After an argument in which nothing is resolved verbally, Ursula and Birkin come together, and the author insists that now their perception of each other is changed, that they belong to each other in peace, and that words which express or communicate love or acquiescence are unnecessary (p. 302).

He stood on the hearth-rug looking at her, at her face that was upturned exactly like a flower, a fresh, luminous flower, glinting faintly golden with the dew of the first light. And he was smiling faintly as if there were no speech in the world, save the silent delight of flowers in each other. Smilingly they delighted in each other's presence, pure presence not to be thought of, even known.

Women in Love, pp. 304-305

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

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

Women in Love, pp. 361-362

In all these incidents Lawrence presents communication as a subjective state of apparent psychic

communion which has little connection with that curious blending of objective knowledge and emotional empathy which communication in words usually means. There are no bits of information transferred from one individual to the other; instead, there seems to be an almost ecstatic emotional communion. Words do not appear to have any connection with this subjective state. They are powerless to induce it; they are unnecessary to sustain it; and they are impotent to repair it. When Birkin tries to find words to reassure Ursula when she loses direct apprehension of the union he finds that words will neither express the truth which he feels, nor communicate his emotions:

She could not know how much it meant to him, how much he meant by the few words.

. . . There were infinite distances of silence between them. How could he tell her of the immanence of her beauty, that it was not form, or weight, or colour, but something like a strange golden light! . . . He said: "Your nose is beautiful, your chin is adorable."

But it sounded like lies, and she was disappointed, hurt. Even when he said, whispering with truth, "I love you, I love you," it was not the real truth. It was something beyond love, such a gladness of having surpassed oneself, of having transcended the old existence. How could he say "I" when he was something new and unknown, not himself at all.

Women in Love, p. 361

By this point in Women in Love Lawrence seems to have contradicted himself completely. He insists that words are necessary for the development and growth of

the individual, but he shows again and again that they are inadequate to the task. He insists that words express the truth of the individual, a task for which they are again shown to be inadequate. He insists that communication is necessary, and that words must not be abandoned, but he demonstrates that communion only occurs in the absence of speech and that words are often a barrier to communion and communication. In addition, communication by means of words is shown to be threatening to the integrity or even the identity of the individual.

The underlying conflict is emphasized in two significant and contradictory incidents concerning Gudrun. The first occurs in the chapter "Gudrun in 'The Pompadour'." Many critics have noted that this is an extremely powerful piece of writing whose purpose is not entirely clear. It seems an excrescence in the straightforward continuity of the plot. But the episode at "The Pompadour" is carefully timed. It occurs after Ursula and Birkin have established their wordless union and moved to the Continent. In the scene itself Lawrence takes care to emphasize that both Gerald and Gudrun are isolated and unconnected. They are going to the continent, but they remain unmarried, and the action concerning Birkin's letter takes place after the interview with Minette which emphasizes Gerald's essential

sensuousness and isolation from meaningful communion.

Halliday's drunken parody of Birkin's letter is wonderfully done. The letter itself is a beautiful example of all that is intolerable about the speechifying of the early Birkin: his intensity, his abstract phrases, the imprecise and grandiose images that have been subdued in his speech since the discussion on the island. The reader cannot help participating in the mockery, since it reflects what he himself feels about much of Birkin's talk. At the same time, however, the reader writhes in embarrassment, because he is made aware, through the cruelty of the mockery, that Birkin's words do have value. They are the means by which Birkin expresses his frail concern for humanity. That the words in this scene are taken from a letter, instead of from the book of poems of the original incident emphasizes Lawrence's interest in Birkin's words as possible means of communication. Birkin may have announced his misanthropy, but as Ursula points out in the island discussion, he has also an unquenchable desire to be at one with his fellow men which is indirectly and exasperatingly expressed in his desire to preach and correct.

Gudrun's action is significant and powerful because it reinforces the reader's dim consciousness of the value of Birkin's words. The awareness is given force because the action is undertaken by a character who is isolate,

who notably does not try to connect or communicate with her fellow humans, and who evades the meaning of words at every available opportunity. But Gudrun's actions indicate that even she can recognize the value of expression and communication and act to preserve it. Her action is more powerful as it is more poignant and hopeless. Gudrun's slight recognition of the value of community is doomed by circumstance.

The other anomalous incident occurs at a major crisis in the book. It is presented after the four major characters meet in Innsbruck on their way to the Tyrol. Gudrun has just rescued Birkin's words from the "Hell" of the Pompadour, and the incident is explicitly recalled just before a conversation between the four at dinner. At the beginning of the discussion Gudrun comments on the England they have left and Birkin pontificates in restrained fashion. Then the atmosphere becomes intense:

Gudrun looked at him with dilated dark eyes. "You think there is no hope?" she asked in her pertinent fashion.

But Birkin backed away. He would not answer such a question.

"Any hope of England's becoming real? God knows. It's a great actual unreality now, an aggregate into unreality. It might be real, if there were no Englishmen.

"You think the English will have to disappear?" persisted Gudrun. It was strange, her pointed interest in his answer. It might have been her own fate she was enquiring after. Her dark, dilated eyes rested on Birkin, as if she could conjure the truth of the future out of him, as out of some instrument of divination.

He was pale. Then, reluctantly, he answered:

"Well -- what else is in front of them but

disappearance? They've got to disappear from their own special brand of Englishness, anyhow."

Gudrun watched him as if in a hypnotic state, her eyes wide and fixed on him.

"But in what way do you mean, disappear? -- " she persisted.

. . . "I don't mean anything, why should I?" said Birkin. "I'm an Englishman, and I've paid the price of it. I can't talk about England -- I can only speak for myself." . . . Birkin refused to answer any more.

Gudrun watched him for a few seconds. Then she turned away. It was finished, her spell of divination in him. She felt already purely cynical. She looked at Gerald. . . .

[Gerald] was looking bright and abstracted, puzzled, for the moment. She stretched out her beautiful arm, with its fluff of green tulle, and touched his chin with her subtle, artist's fingers. . . .

And to Birkin it was as if she killed Gerald with that touch.⁸

Women in Love, pp. 386-387

The exchange between Birkin and Gudrun is critical. The incident at the Pompadour has shown that Gudrun is capable of recognizing the value of community, especially as it is established through the word. Her questions to Birkin are significant. It is as if Gudrun, still partially isolate to hide her vulnerability, were using a safely distanced topic to establish some contact with Birkin. But, inexplicably, Birkin refuses to answer Gudrun's questions and to make a gesture toward communication; indeed, after several mocking replies (some of which are omitted above) more in Gudrun's style than his own, he refuses to speak any more. With this refusal to communicate on any level, either to convey meaningful content or general emotional concern, Gudrun stops

⁸ My italics.

seeking. She turns her objective, artistic sensibility on Gerald, and touches him as if he were an interesting object, of no intrinsic concern to her. It is Birkin who has caused Gudrun to kill Gerald with that touch, because of his refusal to initiate Gudrun into community.⁹

Reasons for Birkin's refusal will not stand up to scrutiny. Birkin says that he can not talk about England; he can only talk for himself. This is a noble sentiment, one that would support Lawrence's theory that a man's word must express the truth of himself. Unfortunately, Birkin has not only generalized about Englishmen just previously, he has also, throughout the novel, put forward as facts his suppositions about things he is not competent to judge. His habit falls into abeyance somewhat under the influence of his communion with Ursula; he progresses to talk about himself and his own needs, rather than about humanity, but it is a strange point at which to develop scruples about an error committed minutes before.

Another argument could be advanced that Birkin did not wish to be an "instrument" to Gudrun, or that he did not wish to give her his own words or control and dominate her by means of words, since, as we have seen, it has been

⁹It should be noted that Gerald also asks Birkin for verbal advice and assurance of his care, and this is also refused. See Women in Love, p. 90.

suggested several times that words which communicate actually dominate and control the listener. Again, this seems to be a specious argument. Birkin has never hesitated before in giving advice or telling people the theories by which they should live their lives; in fact, he has never hesitated in dominating them, or in asking that they give their identity to him. Moreover, if the passage is scrutinized, it can be seen that Gudrun does not really want domination at this point; what she requires is some indication that she is worth saving, that she has some value, that Birkin cares. And in this she is denied.

In effect, then, in this section Gudrun is asking Birkin to use words not as expression, or even as direct communication, but merely as a sign of some human contact or community. Birkin refuses, and avoids community for the avowed reason of preserving pure individual speech. The conflict between communication and individual speech which was evaded in the portrayal of Birkin's development is suddenly brought into focus in this critical confrontation, and the issue is decided in an emphatic rejection of communication. It is not that words cannot communicate meaning but that they should not be used to communicate.

The two incidents concerning Gudrun exemplify the basic contradiction in the attitudes to words presented in Women in Love. "Gudrun at 'The Pompadour'" emphasizes

the positive value of words as attempts at self-expression and attempts at communication. The tenor of the chapter suggests that it is good to care for one's fellow man and to express and reinforce that caring through words. In the conversation in the Tyrol, however, any expression of care or attempt at communication is repudiated, and words are almost rejected.

As was mentioned at the beginning of this chapter the style of Women in Love reflects the attitudes to words presented in the novel. The desire to expand, to express and explain, is seen in conflict with the desire to delete, to conceal and mystify, just as the desire for expression and communication in speech conflicts with a fear of communication by means of words.

The most obvious indication of the desire for expression is the great number of noun and adjective expansion transformations used in the novel; Women in Love has the highest totals in both categories. In addition, Women in Love shows more numbers and more variety than The Rainbow in verb expansion and noun replacement transformations.

Investigation of individual statistics shows that these expansion transformations are occasionally used in strange ways. For example, the statistics show that Women in Love has the greatest number of adjectives positioned in front of the nouns they modify. These

adjectives, however, do not necessarily add richness of texture to the descriptions. The numbers of the vague and inexact modifiers noted in the latter part of The Rainbow are greatly increased in Women in Love. Adjectives such as "strange," "terrible," "curious," "weird," "wizard," and "magic" control the nouns in a way that tends to conceal implications as much as reveal them.

In addition, apparent intensifiers such as "real," "complete," "utter," "pure," "perfect," "profound," and "supreme" are used freely throughout the text, as Derek Bickerton notes.¹⁰ But these "intensifiers" are not in fact positive words; they are vague, and they are invariably used pejoratively, and this, of course, deprives them of any force they might have theoretically to strengthen the nouns which they modify. The reason for their pejorative use, is, of course found in Lawrence's belief: "That which triumphs, perishes"; that which makes itself complete, perfect and extreme is essentially life-denying. Thus Gudrun's favourite words are "really," "completely" and "perfectly" as she seeks for absolute certainty in words. Birkin, when he is most lost in trying to express himself, speaks as if he were "utterly" abstract, and feels the "perfect hard flame of passionate

¹⁰ See Bickerton, p. 60.

desire" for Ursula. In the same way, Gerald and Gudrun, in love-making, have "extreme" pleasure of one another, and "perfect" gratification.¹¹ Bickerton's word count of the narrative (excluding dialogue) shows adjectival or adverbial qualifiers such as those above account for one word in every fifty, that is, twenty in every thousand. Although the comparisons can not be exact since Bickerton's count includes adverbs, it seems obvious that these ambiguous "intensifiers" must make up a large percentage of Lawrence's forty-two adjectives per thousand words. As Bickerton implies, such frequent use of qualifiers weakens the force of the verbs or nouns which project the meaning, and expansion and concealment actually take place in the one stylistic option.

Adjectives are further used as devices to conceal meaning in Lawrence's widespread use of oxymoron, and his use of dissociated adjectives to contradict nouns or each other. In The Rainbow, the true oxymoron construction is used at critical points in relationships to represent the coming together of unlike protagonists in a paradoxical union which preserves each individual nature.

¹¹ The negative power of these vague "intensifiers" is seen most clearly if the union of Ursula and Birkin (pp. 304-305) is compared with that of Gerald and Gudrun (pp. 337-338). The words I have mentioned are almost entirely absent in the first description and abound in the second.

In Women in Love Lawrence does not use the device to focus on one particular idea; it is used indiscriminately. More, he often abandons the true oxymoron construction and presents a dissociated adjective or adverb contradicting a noun or verb. Oxymoron degenerates into a general semantic contradiction between syntactic elements. It does not necessarily present a paradox, although it often obtains beautiful effects. For example, Lawrence describes the creative ambiguity of spring: "Purple twigs were darkly luminous in the grey air, high hedges glowed like living shadows", hovering nearer, coming into creation" (p. 39).

The lack of direction in the use of oxymoron is seen most clearly in the first chapter, "The Wedding," where the device is used lavishly. Describing the country through which the two sisters are walking, Lawrence comments: "Still the faint glamour of blackness persisted over the fields and wooded hills, and seemed darkly to gleam in the air" (p. 6). The elements of contradiction in further examples vary between the outright opposition of "dark" and "gleam" and the subtle disharmony of "glamour" and "blackness." Describing the countryside Lawrence is drawn to remark: "White and black smoke rose up in steady columns, magic within the dark air" (p. 6), and in a description of a churchyard: "There was a vague scent of sap and spring, perhaps of violets from off the

graves. Some white daisies were bright as angels. In the air the unfolding leaves of the copper-beech were blood-red" (p. 8).

Even in conversation and in descriptions of characters this strange insistence on opposition is maintained. Sometimes it is quite descriptive and comprehensible, as when Ursula says "'I know' . . . looking slightly dazzled and falsified, as if she did not know" (p. 4). Sometimes the comment simply outrages logic, as when Birkin apologizes to Mr. Crich with the childish ". . . I'm always late. . . . But today I was really punctual, only accidentally not so" (p. 15). But with almost every page the contradictions appear. Hermione has a "rapt look on her face, that seemed spiritual, like the angels, but which came from torture, . . . her rapt face, the face of an almost demoniacal ecstatic" (p. 16). Ursula is described as having "that strange brightness of an essential flame that is caught, meshed, contravened" (p. 3).

It may be argued that the contradictions in "The Wedding" are used to portray a world of disintegration, in which no true wedding can take place. But as the novel continues paradox and contradiction are employed at many moments, and they are not consistently disintegrative in effect; they often render complexity. When Hermione

recognizes the natures of the Brangwen girls as they reveal themselves in the dance she "writhes in her soul, knowing what she could not know" (p. 84). And when Ursula finally accepts Birkin, the narrator comments: "Yes, she acquiesced -- but it was accomplished without her acquiescence" (p. 302). Similarly, it is fitting that when Gudrun reacts to the "heavy gold glamour" that the sunset gives to the amorphous squalour of the colliery district she should comment: "It has a foul kind of beauty, this place" (p. 107). Her remark mirrors the ambiguous attraction of the countryside, and the confusion of her mind which "suffers from fascination."

While oxymoron and contradiction may mirror a world in disintegration, or complexity, their use is often pointless as in the description of spring. After the fiasco of the proposal, for example, Birkin goes off in a "blithe drift of rage" (p. 254). Out for a walk one morning the two sisters "drift swiftly" along (p. 39), as Birkin does later when he goes to propose to Ursula (p. 247). Ursula escapes from Hermione by Willey Water and "strays absorbedly" toward the Mill (p. 115).

The way in which the contradictions are presented in many of the examples is also indicative of the stylistic trend in Women in Love. As I mentioned earlier, the paradox or contradiction is not usually presented in the tight form of adjective/noun opposition, as it is in

The Rainbow. Instead, many parts of speech are employed to create oppositions wherever possible. Adverbs and verbs oppose one another, adverbs and adjectives, nouns and nouns. Lawrence especially likes to introduce contradiction in the "of-phrases" which abound, as in "a foul kind of beauty." Often a modifier is misplaced to give a false expression of paradox as when Ursula "strays absorbedly"; the adverb does not really modify the verb, but refers to the condition of the subject.¹² The additional sense of confusion which the diffuse constructions add to the contradictions is indicative of the tendency toward both expansion and concealment in Women in Love.

Lawrence's use of adjective expansions is closely connected with his use of deleted relative clauses, for in Women in Love a great number of adjectives are removed from in front of the noun and presented in deleted relative clauses somewhere else in the sentence. For example: "They were looking at some Indian silk shirts, [which were] gorgeous and sensual . . ." (p. 85). Not only does Lawrence often seem to prefer the use of the deleted relative clause to present his more colourful

¹²The use of adverbs in adjectival positions and adjectives in adverbial positions which becomes very common in Women in Love. See above, p. 37.

adjectives, he often uses the looser structure of this transformation to introduce ambiguity into his sentences. As I have already mentioned, the clause may be removed from its true antecedent, creating a momentary confusion as to the word it is supposed to modify. In the sentence, "She sat down among the roots of the alder tree, [which were] dim and veiled . . ." (p. 238), "dim and veiled" obviously applies to Ursula, although by position it seems to apply to the roots of the tree.

The confusions which are introduced by the displacing of deleted relative clauses are reinforced by Lawrence's use of apposition, and his use of punctuation as a method of conjunction. Both of these latter constructions are plentiful in this novel, as they are in The Rainbow where they were used to provide parallel structure to aid in creating rhythm. In Women in Love, however, the rhythmic function is downplayed, and the constructions are used in a way that emphasizes ambiguity. A random example from the first chapter shows the construction in its usual form: "But she caused a constraint over Ursula's nature, a certain weariness" (p. 7). The phrase "a certain weariness" is the object of "caused," and is parallel to "a constraint." At the same time because of its position, the use of punctuation as conjunction, and the omission of the verb, it seems to act as a deleted relative clause to qualify and

describe "the constraint."¹³

In the above example, and in most usages, the ambiguity is slight, but it is still definitely present, and the effect is intensified by the great number of such structures, and the variations between similar structures. Lawrence not only uses ambiguous appositives, he also uses a great number of repeated relative clause deletions with the same rhythmic structure. For example, Birkin says "You can only have knowledge, strictly, . . . of things concluded, in the past" (p. 79). Again, the relative clause deletion "in the past" could substitute for the relative clause deletion "concluded." But the omission of "and," which would give equal status to the second phrase, throws the sentence off balance, and "in the past" appears on fast reading, to modify "concluded." The surface similarity of the constructions which operate in different ways confuses the understanding. Especially in the chapter "Breadalby" these constructions tend to

¹³It should also be noted that although the object in opposition does supply a cursus it does not create the strong rhythms caused by parallelism in The Rainbow.

Further ambiguity is often introduced in this type of construction when the repeated phrase seems to contradict the phrase of equal value which immediately precedes. For example: "Hermione came down to dinner strange and sepulchral, her eyes heavy and full of sepulchral darkness, strength" (p. 82).

cluster together, blurring the response. "The talk was very often political or sociological, and interesting, curiously anarchistic. There was an accumulation of powerful force in the room, powerful and destructive" (p. 83).¹⁴ A sentence ending in an appositive is followed by a sentence using a displaced deleted relative clause, and the reader is put off balance. The final effect on the reader is either one of a numbed disregard for meaning, or a fearful struggling after a comforting meaning for which he himself must supply syntactical or logical connections.

Several other stylistic devices which Lawrence employs in Women in Love reinforce the feeling of disintegration of meaning. One of the most prominent is Lawrence's habit of splitting the position of the subjective appositive, a device which he rarely used in The Rainbow. In Women in Love, however, Lawrence will often present such phrases as "Yes, it is the greatest thing in life -- to know" (p. 78) or "It was getting stronger, it was re-asserting itself, the inviolable moon" (p. 239). The initial presentation of the pronoun "it," and the intervening phrase which separates the

¹⁴ Note also the separation of antecedent and modifier, mentioned earlier, which also contributes to the feeling of ambiguity and disintegration.

pronoun and the infinitive which it represents makes the completed structure project a sense of disintegration similar to that caused by the separation of the adjective from the noun it modifies.

The stylistic option which most clearly illustrates the way in which Lawrence confuses the style of Women in Love is the deletion of words necessary to the grammar. Some deletion of this type occurs in the earlier novels but it appears mainly in conversation and it rarely confuses the meaning. In Women in Love, however, syntactical elements necessary to clarity are simply left out of the sentence. It may happen in moments describing psychic disintegration, as when Hermione reacts to the knowledge of the Chinese painting which Birkin forces upon her: "She suffered the ghastliness of dissolution, broken and gone in horrible corruption" (p. 82). But it may also happen randomly, at any moment, ". . . and a pond surged up, no moon any more, only a few broken flakes tangled and glittering broadcast in the darkness . . ." (p. 240), or "There was the paradisaal 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 . . ." (p. 247).

Lawrence's simultaneous use of expansion and deletion, his use of noun expansions and adjectives,

appositives, deleted relative clauses and punctuation as conjunction, combine, in Women in Love, to give great ambiguity to the prose. The ambiguity is not necessarily inherent in the stylistic options themselves, but is produced when they are presented in such great numbers as Lawrence uses, and in conjunction with semantic contradiction and displacement.

At times these ambiguities enrich the texture of the novel by reflecting the ambiguities and uncertainties of the world which the novel portrays. After all, it is a world of frustrated potential, of certainties which are incomplete, and perfections which must disintegrate, and the syntax often reflects the complexities of such a world with suggestive richness. The reticence and thinness which is part of this prose is only to be assessed clearly when, at moments of crisis or communion, Lawrence tries to return to the physical imagery and rhythmic constructions which he used so tellingly in The Rainbow. It is significant that the rhythm and diction of such passages remind the reader of the essentially abstract and non-physical images associated with the reveries of Will Brangwen:

After a lapse of stillness,
after the rivers of strange
 dark
fluid richness had passed over her,
flooding,
carrying away her mind and

flooding down her spine and
 down her knees,
 past her feet
 a strange flood,
 sweeping away everything and
 leaving her an essential new being,
 she was left quite free,
 she was free in complete ease
 her complete self.

Women in Love, p. 306¹⁵

But even such thin echoes of The Rainbow are uncommon in Women in Love; far more common are the complexities which present the same ideas a few sentences later: "There were strange fountains of his body, more mysterious and potent than any she had imagined or known, more satisfying, ah, finally, mystically-physically satisfying" (p. 306). The vague modifiers, deleted relative clauses, broken rhythms, awkward conjunctions of opposites and disjointed syntax are typical of the general style of Women in Love.

In summary, it seems as if Lawrence's modifications of syntax in Women in Love reflect very closely the

¹⁵ It is interesting to note the use of the "ing" construction in this portrayal of a moment of union. The use of the "ing" construction as participle, gerund or gerundive is an interesting preference, for, especially as a verbal noun, such words unite aspects of the noun and the verb, the state and the action, into one. They are most powerful in presenting the immediate moment of action, when one cannot tell the dancer from the dance. Lawrence often chooses the "ing" constructions in his early novels, and their presence is especially notable in The Rainbow. They are much less common in Women in Love. Compare the first fifteen pages of the two later books for an indication.

conflict between his theories on individual expression and communication which plays so large a part in the novel. Lawrence chooses to maintain his theory that words should be a product of the individual interacting with the moment, that they promote individual growth, and that they should be conducive to communication. At the same time he shows that words are incapable of expressing the individual and communicating his meaning. He shows that communication by means of words is to be feared. In the same way the syntax uses expansion and deletion, revelation and concealment.

In the "Foreword" to Women in Love D.H. Lawrence writes:

The struggle for verbal consciousness should not be left out in art. It is a very great part of life. It is not superimposition of a theory. It is the passionate struggle into conscious being.

Women in Love, p. viii

Yet, in a letter to Lady Ottoline Morrell (30 October, 1916), speaking of Women in Love which was almost complete, Lawrence talks of his hesitation in communicating his ideas to others, a hesitation which he was to express repeatedly, and which would alter the style of his writing from this point on:

[The] novel is another world, in which I can live apart from this foul world which I will not accept or acknowledge, or even enter. The world of my novel is big and fearless -- yes, I love it, and love it passionately. It only seems to me horrible to have to publish it.

Collected Letters, p. 477

CHAPTER FIVE

AARON'S ROD AND KANGAROO:

THE FEAR OF COMMUNION

Aaron's Rod and Kangaroo are much flatter in style than Women in Love. Although the patterns of stylistic options show few very significant changes, Lawrence does not order the transformations in the way that he did in previous novels. There are very few of the rhythmic constructs which gave The Rainbow and Women in Love emotional power; Lawrence does not necessarily use appositives, deleted relative clauses or simple sentence structures for parallelism. The stylistic tricks which projected complexity and ambiguity in Women in Love are also largely absent. The adjective is seldom separated from the noun; ambiguous modifiers do not appear often; there is one example of true oxymoron in the two novels. In contrast to the prolixity of the two preceding novels, the syntactic units in Aaron's Rod and Kangaroo appear, on the whole, very short. Run-on sentences still appear as frequently, and there are a great number of sentence fragments and one word exclamations. In structure, as a whole, the prose seems very straightforward and easy.

In Kangaroo Lawrence indicates that he knew exactly what he was doing. He introduces an entirely superfluous chapter entitled "Bits" in which Richard Lovat Somers admires the style of an Australian newspaper. The paper is made up of unconnected "bits" of information, news and gossip presented in a straightforward, economical style. For Somers, the style represents "the laconic courage of experience" (Kangaroo, p. 277). Lawrence comments that "Somers liked the straightforward, laconic style. It seemed to him manly and without trimmings. Put ship-shape in the office, no doubt" (p. 276). The comment makes clear that Lawrence at this point thinks a straightforward, unambiguous prose "manly"; it avoids "feminine" emotional power; it has the virtue of the impersonality of the business world and the office.

It is not difficult to see Lawrence's preference for an "impersonal" and "manly" style as an extension and a result of the fears of the emotional and coercive powers of words in communication which are dramatized in Women in Love. Certainly, in both novels great stress is laid on the suffocating powers of emotional and verbal communication, and much stress is laid on the search for an "impersonal" mode of communication, or a way of community which does not threaten individual integrity.

The link between Women in Love and the two later novels, in both style and attitude to words, is naturally

more noticeable in Aaron's Rod. The style shows few significant variations between the novels in the expansion transformations. There is a noticeable reduction in the number of adjectives and adjectival expansions but this is slightly offset by the increase in genitives and of-phrases, the increase in noun replacements, and the renewed variety in verb expansions. In the deleting and conjoining transformations the changes are more telling. The deletion of common elements equals the use of "and," "but" and "so," in a way that is reminiscent of Women in Love; the drop in series, appositives, relative clause deletions, and conjoining punctuation accounts for the apparent drop in the deletions here. But there is a surprising increase in the deletion of necessary words; the figures for Aaron's Rod are almost double those for Women in Love. Such deletion implies that the sentences are not only straightforward and brusque, but, in cutting out words necessary to the syntax, run the risk of becoming laconic to the point of obscurity.

The attitude to words expressed in Aaron's Rod shows a movement from the early criticism of words, through the fear of communication expressed in Women in Love to a type of reticence and evasiveness occasioned by the fear of words. The first five chapters are a restatement of all the criticisms and communication which Lawrence presented in his early novels. In the home Millicent and

her mother do not use words which indicate their actual feelings; the conversationalists in the pub make pronouncements on subjects on which they are not in any way qualified to speak; and the Bricknell party's conversation is not complete, nor is it coherent, nor does it convey any information from one character to another.

The five chapters of criticism of words prepare the reader to see Rawdon Lilly as a saviour. He is articulate and aware of the power of words, and he seems honestly interested in the truth of what people say. Jim Bricknell reinforces the reader's expectations of honest expression and communication when he says to Lilly: "I suddenly saw that if there was a man in England who could save me, it was you" (Aaron's Rod, p. 67). Lilly's "certain belief in himself as a saviour" does nothing to contradict the impression.

In response to Bricknell's request Lilly sincerely and conscientiously tells Bricknell what he thinks is wrong with his life, and advises him on what he must do to save himself. In fact, Lilly does what Birkin refuses to do with Gerald and Gudrun. As a result of this attempt at communication, however, Bricknell strikes Lilly a hard blow in the ribs.

The reason for the failure to establish two-way communication is obvious in the context. Lilly's pronouncements deny any dignity and worth in the other man.

Lilly does not give information to the other man, but dominates him, as if he were not there, robbing Bricknell of integrity and self-responsibility. As a result, Bricknell rejects the words, and the man.

Tanny's comments emphasize just how much Lilly's words are the expressions of a man in isolation, using words to control others: "Of course, [she says,] you mustn't expect to say all those things without rousing a man" (p. 77). ". . . You can't say the things you do without their having an effect you know. You've had an answer for once. Usually you don't get an answer you know" (p. 78). Then she turns to Bricknell and explains that usually Lilly "goes on without considering the person he's talking to." Afterward she berates Lilly and insists "You shouldn't play at little Jesus, coming so near to people, wanting to help them" (p. 78). The irony here, of course, is that Lilly is no little Jesus; he fails utterly as a saviour because he does not communicate with men; and he cannot communicate because he can only use words to dominate in a way that smacks of the moral bullying he later says that he hates.

The incident with Lilly and Jim Bricknell presumes to establish that words are ineffective as means of communication. In several exchanges with Aaron it is implied that they are divorced from the truth of human experience as well. For example, after Lilly has been

expounding his ideas about life to the recuperating Aaron, his patient replies:

You talk as if you were doing something special. You aren't. You're no more than a man who drops into a pub for a drink, to liven himself up a bit. Only you give it a lot of names, and make out as if you were looking for the philosopher's stone. . . .
 . . . you talk, and you make a man believe you've got something he hasn't got. But where is it when it comes to it? What have you got, more than me or Jim Bricknell? Only a bigger choice of words, it seems to me.

Aaron's Rod, p. 98

In response, Lilly says nothing. He continues on his own tack and tries to brush away the questions. He insists that his way of life enables him to possess his own soul. With some acuity Aaron again counters the argument and points to the fundamental discrepancy between what Lilly says to be the truth of himself, and what actually is the truth:

Yes . . . [you possess your own soul] when you only stand and talk about it. But when you've got no chance to talk about it -- and when you've got to live -- you don't possess your soul neither in patience nor in peace, but any devil that likes possesses you and does what it likes with you, while you fridge yourself and fray yourself out like a worn rag.

Aaron's Rod, p. 99

In the arguments against Lilly Lawrence picks up the point first suggested by Ursula in Women in Love that words and actions are separate entities. But he goes even further and suggests that words may not reflect the truth of man or of his condition, simply because the act

of using words separates man from his condition, and enables him to falsify it.

With such a negative value attached to words it is little surprise that when Lilly discusses the necessity of community, he describes that condition as "being together with someone else in silence, beyond speech" (p. 99). Lilly's conception of communion as being silent is an extension of Birkin's situation in Women in Love. Birkin finds himself close to Ursula when he stops talking about closeness. With this novel, such a conclusion is logical, given the limitations of words which have been described and discussed up to this point.

The value of words in expression and communication is discounted throughout the novel. At the same time the novel portrays a search, not for a means of communication, but for a means of expressing community that does not contain the threat to integrity inherent in words. The only non-threatening medium suggested, however, is the impersonal whistling of Aaron's flute.¹

¹ Touch is another mode of communication which is suggested, especially in the scene in which Lilly massages Aaron with oil. But touch, in this incident and in Aaron's sexual experiences with the Marchesa and with Josephine Ford, is associated explicitly with power and bullying, the domination of one individual by another. As Lilly's treatment of Jim Bricknell suggests, and his comments to Tanny, Aaron, and to the group in the cafe confirm, Lilly is fascinated by the idea of a communion with power. But as his second comment in the cafe shows, he also loathes bullying. Aaron's ability to communicate with the flute is carefully dissociated from any suggestion of power or usurpation of another's identity.

The scene which presents the flute song communicating to the Marchesa is carefully contrived to show the absence of any interpersonal bullying. Aaron plays his solitary flute and the Marchesa listens in another room, where she cannot see him. The situation and the description of the playing suggest that Lawrence's understanding of expression and communication, always extremely personal, was, at this time, idiosyncratic in the extreme:

It was a clear, sharp, lilted run-and-fall of notes, not a tune in any sense of the word, and yet a melody: a bright, quick sound of pure animation: a bright, quick animate noise, running and pausing. It was like a bird's singing, in that it had no human emotion or passion or intention or meaning -- a ripple and poise of animate sound.

Aaron's Rod, p. 223

The music is impersonal; it does not have the emotional content which Lawrence feared in the make-up of words, nor does it have the intellectual content. Instead, the flute expresses "livingness" in its most abstract form, and at this point, and expressed this way in music, abstraction is not thought of as life-denying, but as life-giving. The expression of livingness, and the power of communication, are now limited to abstract gestures. The music is not threatening; interpretation is completely free to each individual. Because it is free of the demands for emotional and intellectual response of words it is seen as true living communication, not simply as

a narrowing of the possibilities of expression and communication in response to personal psychic demands:

[The Marchesa] . . . seemed like one who had been kept in a horrible enchanted castle -- for years and years. Oh, a horrible enchanted castle, with wet walls of emotions and ponderous chains of feelings and a ghastly atmosphere of must-be. [When she heard the flute-music] She felt she had seen through the opening door a crack of sunshine. . . .

Aaron's Rod, p. 224

The climax of the novel suggests a radical innovation in Lawrence's concept of words, created in response to the fear of communication. In a discussion in a cafe Lilly uses words to express himself, but also as a screen and a blind, to hide his opinions from others. When he is first pressed to give his solution to the problems besetting the world, Lilly speaks of a communion of power, with men submitting to those others they instinctively recognize as their superiors. When opposition is raised, however, he disclaims his words and affirms that he believes in individual responsibility and integrity and loathes bullying. Despite his disavowal, he later makes clear to Aaron that he firmly believes his first statement. The second statement is used as a blind and a screen, although it is probable that his intellectual consent is given to this also.

That words should be used as a blind, to mislead others and protect the speaker, is a curious suggestion to

come from a writer whose first five novels uniformly condemned characters who did not express the truth of themselves. But the suggestion is a logical extension of Lawrence's criticisms of words and fear of communication.

Curiously, however, despite his ever growing fear and rejection of words, Lawrence still includes a scene which wistfully suggests that words are of some value in the development of the individual. Lost and tormented in Florence, Aaron writes an agonized letter to Sir William Franks which tells of his hatred of the world. It is an inappropriate letter to a casual host whom Aaron rather disliked. Nevertheless Lawrence implies that such a letter is a form of expression necessary to Aaron at this point, although he denies that the letter has any value as communication ". . . in the dryness of a withered mind Aaron got it out of himself. When a man writes a letter to himself, it is a pity to post it to somebody else." Then he adds, "Perhaps the same is true of a book" (p. 256). Despite his encroaching fear of words and communication Lawrence still lingers, unwilling to give up his primary idea that words have value in expressing the individual.

Kangaroo, written in six weeks, from 3 June to 24 July, 1922, continues to develop the attitudes to words presented in Aaron's Rod. The novel retains a wistful sense of the possible value of words in self-expression, especially in the chapter entitled "Bits." There is also

a rather tentative assertion that the inarticulate communication of The Rainbow, here called "vertebral consciousness" is necessary to man (p. 31). ". . . the greatest of great individuals must have deep throbbing roots down in the dark red soil of the living flesh of humanity." He must be "forced to live in vivid rapport with the mass of men. If he denies this, he cuts his roots" (Kangaroo, p. 308). But the theme and the action of the book deny any value either to expression in words or to "vertebral" or any other kind of communication. Richard Lovat Somers demonstrates an almost hysterical fear of any kind of communication, vertebral or verbal, and the narrator approves of and supports this fear. As a result, words are seen as a means of controlling and shaping the human experience for defense of the individual. Somers is led to condemn the lower classes for their "lack of reserve" which threatens to engulf him, and to prefer the upper classes, even though they misuse words in a way Lawrence has condemned until Aaron's Rod. Lawrence comments:

Perhaps the best of the upper classes have the same intuitive understanding of their fellow man: but there is always a certain reserve in the response, a preference for the non-intuitive forms of communication, for deliberate speech. What is not said is supposed not to exist: that is almost code of honour with the other classes. With the true common people, only that which is not said is of any vital significance.

Kangaroo, p. 32

With the upper classes words are not a means of self-expression or a mode of communication; they are a means of controlling and shaping the human experience, a means which is not necessarily faithful to the truth of that experience. "What is not said is supposed not to exist;" and obviously, what is said is supposed to be true. In every novel to this point Lawrence has condemned such uses of words to misrepresent the human experience; now he approves of it, and Somers consistently uses words to confuse, to control and to evade, in order to preserve his "fierily cold isolation."²

The confusion and evasion in Somers's speech is reflected in the overall style of Kangaroo, which combines the complex structures of Women in Love, and the straightforward order and increased variety of Aaron's Rod with a great increase in the deletion of words necessary to the meaning. Kangaroo resembles Women in Love in its return to a high incidence of appositives, relative clause deletion, and conjoining punctuation. However, even with an increased number of the structures which gave Women in Love its complexity and ambiguity, the straightforward

² This is the first major use of oxymoron since Women in Love. It is similar to the examples of oxymoron in that novel in that it does not particularly signify the balance of conflicting forces or the clash of opposites.

quality of Aaron's Rod is not altogether lost; the reversed sentence order is most prevalent in the chapter "The Nightmare," and it is used for emphasis and effect, rather than ornamental stylistic variation or confusion. Also, the deleted relative clauses and the appositives are not so consistently displaced as they were in Women in Love, nor do their meanings introduce contradictions into the one sentence: "His old house, rather ramshackle, stood back a little way from the cliffs, where the moor came down savagely to the sea, past a deserted tin mine" (p. 237).

The evasive quality of the prose is not introduced in the complexity, as it is, say, in Women in Love, but in the widespread deletion of necessary words which is approximately three times as great as it is in Women in Love. Even the deletion, however, does not serve to confuse the meaning, but simply to give a brusque tone to the prose. The deletion does not occur in the middle of sentences as it did generally in Women in Love; instead it occurs at the beginning of sentences, and the subject or sometimes the subject and the verb, are totally cut off. Often, sentences begin with a past tense, and combine simplicity of speech with a slightly evasive quality. Examples are peppered throughout the novel: "The day was Friday: they must leave on Monday by the Great Western Express. Started a bitter rush of packing" (p. 250).

At moments of extreme stress, or where special emotional effects are required, Lawrence cuts out both the subject and the verb, and presents sentences which are, on the whole, strings of evocative nouns:

[It was] London -- [it was] mid-war London, [in which there was] nothing but war, [there was nothing but] war. [It was] lovely weather, and [there were] bombs at mid-day in the Strand. It was summery weather. [It was] Berkshire -- [there were] aeroplanes -- [it was] springtime. He was as if [he were] blind; he must hurry the long journey back to Harriet and Cornwall.

Kangaroo, p. 235

The nouns are juxtaposed to emphasize the emotional connotations of each word. "Aeroplanes" and "springtime" gain in intensity by being placed next to each other. But the total effect of the passage is that of evasion. It is as if brevity were used to restrain the emotional impact of the words, an impact which would otherwise be intolerable. The style tries to evade the full meanings of the words just as Somers sees England at war as if he were blind, and evades realization by hurrying back to Cornwall.

The evasive quality of the style may have some connection with the phenomenon of "style attraction" which is first noticeable in Women in Love and becomes a dominant force in Kangaroo. In Women in Love it is noticeable that the style of the characters' speeches tends to approximate the narrative style. This is especially true in the case of Birkin, and often holds with Gudrun, and Ursula as well. In Aaron's Rod, Lawrence still retains a sound ear for the

nuances of childish sententiousness, meaningless small-talk, or cafe banter, but Lilly, the main spokesman, echoes Lawrence the narrator at every turn. Aaron, as his mirror image, is often most obligingly silent, but at Sir William Franks' house at Novara Aaron amazingly becomes articulate in the same style as Lilly, and remarkably repeats many ideas in the cadences Lawrence was using in his letters of the time. In Kangaroo it is almost bizarre to hear Somers, Kangaroo and even Willie Struthers talking in the same periods and repeating ideas which Lawrence either accepts at the moment or has accepted in the past and now wishes to ridicule. More and more the characters tend to become dramatized aspects of Lawrence himself, and the actions a recreation of Lawrence's experiences and an externalization of his internal conflicts; as this happens the style of conversation and the style of the narration merge.

The form of deletion in Kangaroo reflects the merging of style attraction. The deletion concentrates on the deletion of subject or subject and verb in sentences in which the main emotional impact is not carried by these structures. It is reminiscent of the deletion in normal conversation or in talking to oneself, where all

but the significant words are deleted.³

Other transformations reinforce the effect of the conversational style suggested by the straightforwardness of the order and the choice of deleted material. In the first chapter I mentioned that the number of contractions appearing in the narrative gave Kangaroo a conversational flavour. The use of unnecessary conjunction at the beginning of sentences, and the use of sentence fragments and embedded sentences separated by conjoining punctuation also adds to the conversational effect.

The connection between evasive conversation and the increased use of "there" and "it" inversions and passive constructions is also easy to see. Actually Kangaroo simply continues and intensifies a tendency toward increased use of passive and negative construction which was begun in Women in Love. In Kangaroo, however, the statistics are again slightly misleading. The statistics show a slight drop in the use of the "there" inversion, but the implicit use is much higher than the figures. Many of the deleted subjects and verbs are "there was" or "there were," and even the implied use gives a more passive flavour to the deleted sentences.

³Note comments on deletion in conversation in the early novels, above, p. 31. Note also Jacob Kasanin's Language and Thought in Schizophrenia (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1944).

The total stylistic picture in Kangaroo is one of great complexity. Richness is maintained in the variety of transformations used; simplicity and directness is generally fostered in the ordering of the sentences; force is generated in the deletions and contractions. At the same time, however, the high frequency of passives, "there" inversions, negations, and even the deletions, inject a note of passivity and evasion not present in the earlier novels.

The contradictory notions of force and evasion in the style are paralleled by the conceptions of words which in some ways structure the novel. Throughout Kangaroo, Richard Lovat Somers, that hero who is so patently a Lawrence surrogate, uses words to control and to evade. They are his main weapon to keep at bay an environment which would otherwise encroach and absorb. For example, when Jack Callcott tries to tell about the Diggers he threatens Somers by the power of his emotional appeal and by his wordless comprehension of the Englishman. Finding his isolation crumbling, Somers attacks with words in the same way as Gudrun did in Women in Love. Sounding aggressive while trying to hide his weakness, he cries: "But I don't know what it means. . . . Everything! it means so much that it means nothing" (p. 52).

Later, confronted with Jack and Jaz in their enthusiasm, he aggressively uses words to evade:

"Do you yourself really care about anything, Mr. Somers?" [demanded Jack].

Richard turned and looked at him for a moment in the eyes. And then, knowing the two men were trying to corner him, he said coolly:

"Why, yes. I care supremely."

"About what?" Jack's question was soft as a drop of water falling into water, and Richard sat struggling with himself.

"That," he answered, "you either know or don't know. And if you don't know, it would only be words my trying to tell."

There was a silence of check-mate.

Kangaroo, p. 60⁴

In the same way, clipping speech, refusing to answer the questions of others, or refusing to use speech at all is seen as a good way of evading the threat inherent in other's speech. For example, throughout the novel Somers is afraid of Kangaroo's voice which has the ability to enchant the emotions (p. 94). Somers evades the emotional appeal of the voice (and of the words) by refusing to answer. The first example is indicative, but not crucial:

"But is love the only inspiration of creative activity?" he [Somers] asked, rather feebly.

"This is the first time I have heard it questioned. Do you know of any other?" said Kangaroo.

Somers thought he did, but he was not going to give himself away to that sharp weapon of a voice, so he did not answer.

Kangaroo, p. 132

In Somers' last two interviews with the dying Kangaroo the refusal to speak is more critical, and is defended in a way that is more ambiguous. Somers' actions

⁴None of Somers' aggressive retorts are very clever or very powerful but the receptions accorded to them indicate that Lawrence obviously meant them as crushing rejoinders.

in going to the hospital, in bringing the present of shells, and in having a discussion with Kangaroo all show a consideration for the dying man, and an attachment to him. Yet Somers will not say in words that he loves Kangaroo. The first reason that Somers gives seems truthful, though its logic is suspect. He will not say he loves because "it simply makes . . . [him] frantic and murderous to have to feel loving" (p. 333). Somers does not want human connection; he is truthful enough about that. But he is also employing Lawrence's old idea about the identity of action and speech. To say he loved would mean he ~~would~~ have to love, or rather would be forced to be in the rather cannibalistic communion of power which Somers sees as love. But assertion in speech is not the same as compulsion. Not recognizing this, Somers becomes so frightened of Ben Cooley that he secretly wipes his hand to rid it of any taint of the dying man.

At the second meeting Somers discovers at the moment of crisis that he does not love Kangaroo, and he excuses himself from saying the words because they would not be true. In the circumstances, and with the history of his evasions in the rest of the novel behind him, the argument that he must speak the truth seems weak. The argument is further weakened by Somers' actions, for he immediately withdraws from contact with the other. Worse, when Kangaroo makes the immoral yet truthful assertion that

Somers has killed him, Somers protects himself by saying as a talisman "I haven't killed him at all," then putting the thought from his mind. In contrary fashion, Somers is using words as a magic spell with the power to change reality.

The most accurate assessment of the situation is made by Jack in his "rough and ready" condemnation which so angers Somers:

But I suppose some folks is stingy about sixpence, and others is stingy about saying two words that would give another poor devil his peace of mind. . . . But I suppose chaps from the old country are more careful of what they say -- might give themselves away or something of that.

Kangaroo, p. 346

Jack's comment puts Somers' rationalizations into perspective since, according to all the evidence of the book, it seems most true to surmise that Somers, with his fear of communion, refuses to speak simply through fear of literally "giving himself away." Somers presents two apparently moral arguments as a rationale for his actions, but these arguments are revealed as spurious, simply a cover for the real motivation. Somers actually is using speech to protect himself from others and to create a false substitute for the truth of the moment. Somers, and Lawrence, here value words as they can protect the isolation of the individual. Words are seen to some extent as an evasion of human reality, as they were by Gudrun and Loerke, and this is not condemned. When they are valued,

they are accepted as they express the inhuman and impersonal, and are devoid of the human implications of the moment -- emotion and meaning. Somers' relation to the language of the sea is as significant in revealing his attitudes as the Marchesa's reaction to Aaron's flute music in Aaron's Rod:

After all, he knew the endless water would soon make him forget. It had a language which spoke utterly without concern of him, and this utter unconcern gradually soothed him of himself and of his world.

Kangaroo, p. 154

CHAPTER SIX

THE PLUMED SERPENT:

THE ESCAPE TO SOLUTIONS

The Plumed Serpent extends the ideas of words and language presented in Aaron's Rod and Kangaroo. The threat to individual integrity found in communication is evaded, and the theory of words as individual expression is maintained. In some ways theories proposed are evasions; Lawrence limits and distorts his vision in order to achieve partial solutions and to hold two opposed attitudes to words simultaneously. But the evasions and dissociations result in a revitalization of earlier theories of words, and a relative clarity and lack of passivity in the style.

Words are evaluated in two ways in The Plumed Serpent: as social phenomena and as religious phenomena.

The presentation of words as social phenomena is in some ways a repetition of the ideas of Aaron's Rod and Kangaroo, for words are seen as agents which isolate and restrict each individual and threaten individual integrity. The first step in Kate Leslie's development, before she meets Don Ramon, is that she sees the power of words to restrict individual perception and development. Kate recognizes that the people she has known are not complete

individuals; instead, they are

Half-made, like insects that can run fast and be so busy and suddenly grow wings, but which are only winged grubs after all. . . . Spinning a great lot of words, burying themselves inside the cocoons of words and ideas that they spin round themselves, and inside the cocoons, mostly perishing inert and overwhelmed.

The Plumed Serpent, p. 115

Mrs. Norris's party at Tlacolula provides a good illustration of the way in which words and ideas restrict the individual. Almost every person present at the tea is insulated in a tight cocoon of pre-conceptions and pet theories which alter his vision, his response, and his expression of himself. Judge Burlap is unable to admit that jade can be any colour other than green, although he has in front of him examples of jade which are not green. Mrs. Burlap is unable to do anything but make polite social gestures. Even Kate is caught up in the atmosphere of the party and is unable to express her dislike of the American couple until they have left in the tram-car.

Lawrence extends the ideas presented in Aaron's Rod and Kangaroo by suggesting that words are merely surface and restrictive social gestures which are dissociated from the person who uses them. The dissociation is emphasized in his treatment of Don Cipriano, General Viedma. Each time Cipriano appears Lawrence is careful to point out that Cipriano's words are a mere surface accomplishment; they never express the man or communicate his essence.

The first time Kate meets him she admires ". . . his beautiful cultured English, that was nevertheless a tiny bit like a parrot talking." At the same time she decides that "he spoke like a man who had something in reserve, who is only half attending to what he hears, and even to his own answer" (The Plumed Serpent, p. 43). At the second meeting her opinion is reinforced, and she decided that "He wasn't really expressing himself. He was only flapping at the white oil that lay on his surface" (p. 89).

In his relations with others, Cipriano's words mean very little; in fact, he avoids speech whenever he can. Later, when he is married to Kate, she notices that he does not like talking to her in any serious way. When she wants to talk seriously he flashes a cautious, dark look at her, and goes away (p. 438). Kate realizes that "His words said nothing; would never say anything" (p. 335).

Because words are shown as dissociated social gestures the faculty of communication is not associated with them in any way. Communication is instead limited to a psychic realm similar to the "sensual darkness" of The Rainbow or the "vertebral consciousness" of Kangaroo. Like the two previous states, "communication" is associated with individual perception of psychic states and intuition, and is not verifiable by any extra personal criteria. In The Plumed Serpent, moreover, the psychic state facilitating communication is explicitly associated with power -- it is

described as demon-power -- and implicitly, by means of the imagery, connected with aggressive sexuality. In contradiction to all previous theories, however, the power of communication is described as positive, despite its destructive potential.

Communication, divorced from the social sphere of words, and connected with power and sexuality, is described in terms which liken it to a god-like power, removing it from the threatening human world, to a supra-human religious world where communication may be indulged without fear, and uncritically admired:

She knew now what was the black, glinting look in Cipriano's eyes. . . . In the shadowy world where men were visionless, and winds of fury rose up from the earth, Cipriano was still a power. Once you entered his mystery the scale of all things changed, and he became a living male power, undefined and unconfined. The smallness, the limitations ceased to exist. In his black, glinting eyes the power was limitless, and it was as if, from him, from his body of blood could rise up that pillar of cloud which swayed and swung, like a rearing serpent or a rising tree, till it swept the zenith, and all the earth below was dark and prone, and consummated.

The Plumed Serpent, p. 324

The god-like power of silent communication enables Cipriano to transcend humanity, but it also permits him to overwhelm the person he is in rapport with, and destroy the integrity of the individual. In The Plumed Serpent, however, this destruction is not feared, but approved of. Kate's first instinct is to avoid Cipriano to preserve

herself. When she accidentally meets his full force she "[turns] aside her face a little afraid of that flashing primitive gladness, which was so impersonal and beyond her" (p. 335). But, as the description shows, it is the fear that is to be overcome; the force is seen as positive.

To facilitate the positive attitude toward Cipriano's overwhelming power it is simply accepted that only certain people have the power of communication, and that communication is not a two-way process; the hearer is forced to submit and suffer a loss of personality and language, and the submission is conceived as good:

As he sat in silence, casting the old, twilight Pan-power over her, she felt herself submitting, succumbing.

. . . She looked back at him, wordless. Language had abandoned her, and she leaned silent and helpless in the vast, unspoken twilight of the Pan world. Her self had abandoned her, and all her day was gone. Only she said to herself:

'My demon lover!'

The Plumed Serpent, pp. 325-326

Where Birkin's prescription for a "demon lover" and extreme sensual experience is abandoned in Women in Love, it is accepted in The Plumed Serpent; where threatening domination by means of words¹ is opposed in the earlier novel, it is wholeheartedly endorsed in this. In order that Cipriano may communicate with her Kate must be completely silent, and indeed give up her personal identity. She must be "perfect in her proneness," and "consummate in living lifelessness, the sheer solid mystery of

passivity" (p. 325).¹

By insisting that speech have no part in communication, and that one of the two participants be completely passive Lawrence has attempted to cut the Gordian knot in reconciling individual integrity and expression with communication. Cipriano abandons words, as words may be used to falsify expressions and so challenge or evade communication. In the ephemeral form of psychic transmission Cipriano is able to express himself, and, as the other participant is passive, he is not threatened by response or interference. But when Lawrence limits communication to psychic phenomena in order to avoid what he perceives as the threat of words he abandons words, and, indeed, the human integrity of the participants.²

¹ Although the use of oxymoron is invoked to suggest a paradoxical balance of opposites, the reader is at a loss to understand that there are two aspects to Kate's passivity. The oxymoron is part of Lawrence's special pleading.

² Kate's initiation into god-hood is marked by simultaneous rejections of human relationships and of words. As Kate proceeds on her search, she is made to question all the relationships which give her her stature and warmth -- her relationships with her country, her late husband, her mother and her children. It is suggested that Kate abandons human relationships in order to achieve her position as Malintzi, to be able to communicate with Cipriano and to realize the significance of the gods.

While Kate slips away from normal social relationships toward Cipriano's god-like power, she also tries to avoid direct speech with other people:

Kate was bewildered by the mystery of her
(cont'd)

Lawrence reintroduces words into The Plumed Serpent and, indeed, tries to reaffirm their value and significance, by stressing their importance in a religious dimension which is free from the impediments and threats of the human.

In the religion of Quetzacoatl words are vitally important. When the old gods are first discussed, at the dinner party in Tlalpam, it is immediately apparent that, to persons in the cult, words have an extraordinary power, almost a spell-power. A word is not a product of man's conscious training which may be manipulated as a social sign; it is the sign of an Idea having an essential relationship to the thing to which it refers. This notion is made clear in the discussion of the old Aztec gods. Kate is told that the nature of the worship given to a god may not reveal the true nature of the god in the way that the god's name may show forth his power to the man who

²(cont'd)

own elusiveness. . . . She did not want to be talked to, and words addressed straight at her . . . came at her like blows. Ah, the ugly blows of direct, brutal speech! She had suffered so much from them. Now she wanted this veiled elusiveness in herself, she wanted to be addressed in the third person.

The Plumed Serpent, pp. 335-336

The breaking of the bonds of relationship and the rejection of words both occur most noticeably after Kate's recognition of Cipriano's god-like Pan-power, and her entering into passive communication with him.

contemplates its significance:

. . . But if you like the word Quetzalcoatl, don't you think it would be wonderful if he came back again? Ah, the names of the gods! Don't you think the names are like seeds, so full of magic, of the unexplored magic? Huitzilopochtli! -- how wonderful! And Tlaloc! Ah! I love them! I say them over and over, like they say Mani padma Om! in Tibet. I believe in the fertility of sound. Itzpapalotl -- the Obsidian Butterfly! Itzpapalotl! But say it, and you will see it does good to your soul. Itzpapalotl! Tezcatlipoca! They were old when the Spaniards came, they needed the bath of life again. But now, re-bathed in youth, how wonderful they must be! Think of Jehovah! Jehovah! Think of Jesus Christ! How thin and poor they sound! Or Jesus Cristo! They are dead names, all the life withered out of them.

The Plumed Serpent, p. 68

Subsequently, the story emphasizes that the significance of the religion of Quetzalcoatl is seen to rest on an individual perception of the meaning of the name. Lawrence implicitly suggests that any individual may perceive the essential value in Quetzalcoatl's name, and that individuals who do see the value and significance of the name will all see the same thing. No one in the book ever contemplates that the man who truly looks for the essential meaning of a name will not see Quetzalcoatl as life-giving, and Jesus Christ as life-denying. Lawrence accepts that the name represents essential meaning and that all men who seek truth will perceive the same meaning. He implies that a form of communication may occur, but that it is indirect, without compulsion, and rests ultimately on individual perception and choice.

The names of the gods used in the novel have an aura of mystery which accords well with the theory.

Throughout the work the names Quetzalcoatl or Huitzilopochtli are never defined in concrete terms. When Kate asks for further explanation she is given the repeated name as a sufficient basis for understanding:

'What does he mean,' said Kate, 'by, "We will wait till the Morning Star rises"?''

The man smiled slowly.

'It is a name,' he said.

And he seemed to know no more. But the symbolism had evidently the power to soothe and sustain him.

The Plumed Serpent, p. 100³

At one point Kate reproaches Ramon for the use of word symbols and esoterica. Ramon's answer is convoluted; it actually repeats names and symbols as sufficient explanation of themselves:

³ Lawrence does give some aid in limiting the significance of the name in that he surrounds the god-figure with symbols. It is interesting to note that many of the symbols with which Lawrence surrounds the two main figures are "elemental" symbols, that is, symbolic forms which are generally recognized as having similar significances by most peoples of the world. For example, the colour symbols of red, green and blue are accepted almost universally as connected with blood, growth and the sky. Another main group of symbols, as William York Tindall notes, are derived from theosophy and other esoteric cults (D.H. Lawrence and Susan His Cow (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939), p. 119). But the theosophic symbols which Lawrence uses most predominantly such as the number symbols, the circle and the "eye" symbols, are not the sole property of the cults, but are part of folk-lore and superstition in many parts of the world. The significance of the name may be discovered by the individual who uses the symbolic heritage he shares with most of mankind.

The universe is a nest of dragons with a perfectly unfathomable life-mystery at the centre of it. If I call the mystery the Morning Star, surely it doesn't matter! A man's blood can't beat in the abstract.

The Plumed Serpent, p. 285

Ramon's explanation is understandable in terms of Lawrence's theory of words. Quite simply, the word Quetzalcoatl is a deeply felt word-symbol for Ramon's individual perception of the life-mystery. The perception is given expression because such expression in words aids the individual to realize the truth of the life mystery he perceives, which cannot remain abstract and have life.

Implicit in this explanation, however, is the suggestion that the word, although it is an individual expression, partakes of the essence of the thing it represents. Separate individuals may therefore recognize the truth symbolized by the word, and, enlarged by their perception, strive to realize the mystery of the word in themselves.

In some ways, the story of The Plumed Serpent is the story of Kate's gradual perception of "Quetzalcoatl" and "Huitzilopochtli". As she perceives more and more of their significance, she realizes more and more of her own nature as goddess. At the end, able to perceive the god-head of Huitzilopochtli, she truly becomes Malintzi, recognized as a goddess in light and dark. For a similar

reason, Ramon is able to say "I am the first man of Quetzalcoatl. I am Quetzalcoatl himself if you like. A manifestation as well as a man" (p. 330). He is Quetzalcoatl because he has realized the name.

In asserting the value of names in the religion of Quetzalcoatl Lawrence eliminates the threat inherent in words in the same way that he eliminated the threat of communication; he makes the interaction of word and individual subjective, and the speaker almost passive. Words are not really to be spoken by everyone; they are absolutes to be contemplated. As absolutes they are distanced from the worshipper, and each worshipper is free to intuit his own understanding of the "name". In this context it is supposed that words will not impose meanings. Instead, perception of meaning is seen as a free and positive act controlled only by the limitations or the negative will of the individual.

Lawrence utilizes these suggestions of distance, passivity and impersonal contemplation when he suggests that words may be used to communicate insight in the rites of the new religion. In the worship, songs or chants introduce the god, and in these songs the sound unites the audience. In many ways the chants of the ritual are similar to the flute songs of Aaron:

There was no recognizable rhythm, no recognizable emotion, it was hardly music.

Rather a far-off, perfect crying in the night. But it went straight through to the soul, the most ancient and everlasting soul of all men, where alone can the human family assemble in immediate contact.

. . . And one by one, voices in the crowd broke free, like birds launching and coming in from a distance, caught by the spell. The words did not matter. Any verse, any words, no words, the song remained the same: a strong, deep wind rushing from the caverns of the breast, from the everlasting soul!

The Plumed Serpent, p. 136

Like the flute-music in Aaron's Rod, the chanting of the Quetzalcoatl rituals is stripped of immediate intellectual content and emotion. Each person interprets the music in his own way, but since it is devoid of anything which might appeal to the surface layers of personality which alone divide a human being from his neighbour, the music reaches the essence of each man, which is similar. Individuality is satisfied; community is attained; and the songs create a mood of individual dignity and community simultaneously.

Lawrence develops his theory even further when he suggests that the experience of the songs effects a change in the consciousness of the hearers and permits effective, non-threatening communication by means of words. Lawrence describes the songs as evoking another form of consciousness or banishing the daytime consciousness:

One by one the voices of the men joined in, till they were all singing in the strange, blind infallible rhythm of the ancient barbaric world. And all in the small, inward voices, as if they were singing from the oldest, darkest recess of

the soul, not outwards, but inwards, the soul singing back to herself.

They sang for a time in the peculiar unison like a flock of birds that fly in one consciousness. And when the drum shuddered for an end, they all let their voices fade out, with the same broad, clapping sound in the throat.

There was silence. The men turned, speaking to one another, laughing in a quiet way. But their daytime voices, and their daytime eyes had gone.

Then Ramon's voice was heard, and the men were suddenly silent, listening with bent heads. Ramon sat with his face lifted, looking far away in the prayer of pride.

The Plumed Serpent, p. 187

After the preparation of the song comes more concrete teaching in the form of hymns, prayers or sermons. But Lawrence suggests that the songs are necessary to unite the audience in a new form of consciousness before contemplation of the words of instruction can communicate any insight to the worshippers. It is stressed that the new form of consciousness is both inward and communal, and when Ramon teaches in prayer, he speaks inwardly as if merely expressing his ideas to himself, while permitting his "voice of pride" to rise in volume so that all the worshippers may hear, choose to participate, and gain insight.

The emphasis on individual participation and communal closeness is emphasized by the heavy repetition of the names of power and esoteric symbols included in all the chants and the hymns. Neither the chants, nor the hymns, nor the sermons, are logical constructs; they are instead

symbolic constructs which lead the way to individual recognition of the essence of the significant names. Again, the individual must choose to perceive the essence of a word whose meaning is not strictly defined for him. The worship is a communal activity in which individuals participate separately.

It would seem at first glance that in the ritual of Quetzalcoatl Lawrence solves the problem of integrating his idea of individual expression with the necessity of communion. The development of the novel, however, illustrates the implications of this particular solution, for it must be remembered that in order to achieve this balance of individual and communal Lawrence indicates that the ordinary daytime consciousness must be abandoned. In essence, Lawrence is able to resolve his problems with words only by abstracting words from normal human intercourse in the same way as he had solved the problem of communication by making the recipient of the communication passive.

The split between human and divine is central to the working of the novel. As Kate comes to acknowledge the power of Cipriano she recognizes that the split between his god-like power and his human personality is almost the prerequisite to his god-like stature, and she sees that, to him, she is similarly split:

She felt as if, for him, she had some other name, she moved within another species. As if her name were, for example, Itzapapalotl, and she had been born in unknown places, and was a woman unknown to herself.

The Plumed Serpent, p. 249

After "the common threads that bound her to humanity seemed to have snapped" (p. 319) Kate herself recognizes that she has a dual nature in which the social being, Kate Leslie, is completely separate from the woman who recognizes the god-power of Cipriano.

In the action of the novel Lawrence represents the structuring of life through which he believes he can simultaneously attain his ideals of unfettered communication and unthreatening communication; he completely separates the religious or ideal world from the mundane world. The ideal is attained only by means of a retreat into an isolated Eden. Lawrence is aware to an extent that the ideal is only maintained at the expense of ignoring the human, and that this is dangerous. He recognizes that in the effort to avoid seeing the petty mundane world which interferes with the religious dimension, the seeker may end up seeing nothing at all (p. 326). He seems unaware that, as it also leads to the abandonment of fundamental moral concepts, the split may cause indiscriminate destruction (pp. 409-410). Lawrence's separation of the human and the divine, words and names, promises insight into essential truths, and communication,

but in the novel it results in tales of swift cruelty and the stabbing of three helpless peons.

Curiously, in Kate's life as the incarnate goddess Malentzi after her retreat from human relationships and words, there is little evidence of either individual expression, or of communication. Kate's relationship to Cipriano entails her complete passivity whether in speech or sexual intercourse.⁴ She does not feel it necessary to express herself, and indeed it is implied that she would be wrong to do so. Although she is said to have a "mindless communion of the blood" with Cipriano, it is clear that her function in the communion is to accept him "finally and forever as the stranger in whose presence she lived" (p. 440). She is, in fact, a dependent function of Cipriano, not an equal relating to him.

Kate is seen also to be a stranger living on the earth. Her attainment of god-head separates her infinitely from the people she comes in contact with and even her natural surroundings. Kate's perceptions of everyday events may gain an added acuteness through her realization of her god-hood; she may even be transmuted with joy. She

⁴The whole problem of Kate's passivity dominates the latter part of the novel, and her roles in conversation and in sexual intercourse are very closely connected. See The Plumed Serpent, pp. 324ff, 334, 402ff, 438ff and others.

may rejoice as she watches the evading of the young bull on the raft, or the dancing of the young mule (pp. 448-453). Yet all the time she is an onlooker at the activity of life, not a participant. As she herself feels "It was near, yet seemed strange and remote" (p. 448).

Kate does not ~~communicate with anyone save~~ Cipriano, to whom she is completely passive. When she is saluted by the peasants, the act and the speech does not touch her or give her warmth. She recognizes that the salutation is acknowledgment of her stature and her remoteness. She is recognized as a goddess and a queen, and as such is separate from the rest of humanity. Even Ramon emphasizes Kate's separation and recognizes that the acts and speeches are directed at Kate, not given to her. He warns Kate that such worship must be balanced by murder and violation (p. 454). The emphasis on god-hood has separated Kate from the possibility of balanced communication, give and take, between herself and another human being.

Lawrence rejects the mundane world, the social and the human in an attempt to resolve the problems which he saw in word-borne human communication. As a result, The Plumed Serpent moves from the human plane in which social beings in space and time work out situations which may or may not have eternal relevance. Instead, he moves

to myth,⁵ and constructs an Eden in which the characters are aspects of one protocharacter,⁶ and normal human intercourse and society is considered irrelevant.

There is perhaps a connection between the escape to Eden, the evasion of the threats in words by the enforced passivity of the receivers of the word, and the style of The Plumed Serpent. The sense of freedom and power which is given in the book to Ramon and Cipriano is to some extent picked up in the style which is less passive and more straightforward than in the preceding novels. At the same time the expansions are more vague than in the early novels, perhaps in response to the evasions built into the theoretical ~~structure~~. On the whole, however, the passives, the deletions and the distortions

⁵For discussions of The Plumed Serpent as a myth see especially L.D. Clark, The Dark Night of the Body (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1964); James Cowan, D.H. Lawrence's American Journey (Cleveland, Ohio: Case Western Reserve University Press, 1970); Jascha Kessler, "Descent in Darkness: The Myth of The Plumed Serpent," A D.H. Lawrence Miscellany, ed. Harry T. Moore (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1959); and others.

⁶The characters in The Plumed Serpent are particularly good examples of the "style attraction" which becomes a more and more obvious feature of Lawrence's prose after Women in Love. Many critics comment on the way in which Ramon, Teresa, Cipriano and even Kate speak with the same voice, often the voice of Lawrence the narrator. See especially Richard Aldington, "Introduction," The Plumed Serpent (London: Penguin, 1950), p. 9. See also John Stoll, The Novels of D.H. Lawrence, p. 211. Many of the critics who discuss Lawrence's use of myth also talk of this phenomenon.

of the prose are not so much in evidence as in Kangaroo and this novel has an air of direction and openness lacking in those immediately preceding.

One of the causes for this revitalization and openness is found in the proportions of expansion and deletion in this novel. In The Plumed Serpent the difference between the totals of expansion and deletion transformations approximates those of the first novels. There is a significant difference between The Plumed Serpent and the early novels, however, in that the numbers of deletions have been reduced only slightly from Women in Love, Aaron's Rod and Kangaroo; much of the difference is caused by the number of expansions being maintained at a high level. The high numbers of expansions and deletions connect The Plumed Serpent with the overwritten Trespasser rather than any other novel.

Many of the peculiarities introduced into Lawrence's style after Women in Love remain in The Plumed Serpent and give this novel a flavour which is very different from that of the early works. Many of the adjectives used in The Plumed Serpent are those inexact terms first favoured in Women in Love; men and things continue to be "queer," "strange," "weird," and "pure" in a way that is disconcerting. The qualifiers "really," "purely," "utterly" and "perfectly" are also very much in evidence; in accordance with the absolutist bias of the word-theories, however,

these qualifiers have lost the pejorative cast of Women in Love. In this novel they have more the flavour of slang, as they seem used to describe extreme and positive sensations by a narrator who lacks more colourful words.

The Plumed Serpent uses adjectives, especially compared adjectives, in the place of adverbs, and often the adjectives are displaced. The effect of these techniques is, however, quite different from Women in Love as the substitutions and displacements are not used to introduce confusions or ambiguities into the prose. "Men put their serapes over their faces, women clutched their rebozos tighter, and all sat down on the ground" (p. 211) is a perfectly straightforward sentence. In "[It] keeps the soil sweet, that grows your maize" (p. 209), the displacement gives a slightly archaic tone to the sentence, but it does not confuse the sense. The old stylistic tricks are used to different effect.

The total effect of the imprecise adjectives, the adjectival substitutions and the displacements is that of vagueness. This vagueness is repeated in many of the other implementations of expansion transformations. For example, the genitives and "of-phrases" (possessive nominalizations) are often abstract, in the way introduced in Will Brangwen's "seed of procreation in ecstasy." One page reveals many examples of this construction, ranging from "the dark, heavy vibration of his blood, which cast a

spell on her" (p. 324) which, like Will's image, abstracts an originally concrete expression, to "the sheer solid mystery of passivity" which is in no way concrete.

The ephemeral quality of the expansions is encouraged by the relative reduction of the numbers of gerundive and participial adjectives with their sense of immediacy and action, and by the apparent truncation of many of the adjectival expansions. Often, the words "so" and "such" are used as replacements for the intensive "very," and a comparison is implied, yet not given. "Those men who sat there in their dark, physical tenderness, so still and soft, they looked at the same time a little frightening" (p. 130). The softness and stillness seems to be connected with the power to inspire fear, but the syntactic connection is not present, and the construction incomplete; the logic has to be inferred from the position.⁷

Many of the deleting constructions which gave the novels after Women in Love a special stylistic flavour are present, but they are often manipulated so that, in The Plumed Serpent, the effect differs; there is relatively little confusion and ambiguity in the structures. For example, the number of deletions of relative clauses is decreased, but with the deletions that remain there is

⁷ The inference of logical connection between elements that are juxtaposed is encouraged by the use of unnecessary coordination and conjoining punctuation.

very little displacement, and what displacement there is does not confuse the meaning: "Then the voice of Ramon was heard, speaking upwards into the black sky" (p. 210) or "Carlota, who had not been able to hear, drifted up to Kate's side, spellbound by her husband" (p. 210). The displacements here are dictated by the requirements of space and euphony.

Appositives tend to be used as they were in the early novels, to give a pleasing cadence at the end of a sentence, or to give an incantatory ring to the chants. Even when the appositives are split, very little confusion is introduced into the narrative: "They sat in the salon in rocking-chairs, Carlota and Kate, and rocked. . . ." (p. 215).⁸

Other deletions are used to give an off-hand, conversational air to the prose. For example, there is a relatively high incidence of deletion of necessary words, but the deletions tend to occur at the beginnings of sentences, as they do in Kangaroo. This gives a

⁸ The changes in use of deleted relative clauses and appositives have remarkably little effect on rhythm in the novel. Although deleted clauses and appositives placed at the end of a sentence are often used to supply a cursor, the main rhythmic structure in the novel is the sentence. As in The Rainbow rhythm is created by repetition of sentences which are, on the whole, simple and direct (SVO). The sentences, however, tend to be longer than those in The Rainbow, and the parallels not so strict. As a result, the rhythms are much more slack.

conversational impulse to the sentence, and an air of intensity rather than confusion." For example, at the end of the paragraph which describes the wind flattening the garden, a sentence fragment is added: "Some invisible juggernaut car rolling in the dark over the outside world" (p. 214). The fragment adds a striking image to end the description with some force.

Other forms of deletion are still used frequently. The incidence of deletion of common elements is quite high. But the deletion is not used at any time for confusion, and the high use of "and," "but" and "or," and the use of punctuation as conjunction in numerous series are sufficient to explain the figures.⁹

Two transformations should be mentioned in particular to show the differences between the style of Kangaroo and The Plumed Serpent. The first is the noticeable reduction in the passive, it-inversion, and there-inversion transformations. The decline in these three transformations shows an abrupt shift from the more

⁹ The deletion of "with" in adverbial phrases of manner should be mentioned in connection with The Plumed Serpent, even though the transformation is not listed among the stylistic options. The deletion appears very occasionally in all the novels from The White Peacock on, and it is only in The Plumed Serpent that it appears several times. Occasionally the "with" is missed out in a deletion of common elements: "The men . . . ran with bent knees, their serapes blowing" (p. 214). More often it is simply left out of a description: "The white-flowered oleanders in the garden below leaned over quite flat, their white flowers ghostly . . ." (p. 214). In neither case does it introduce ambiguity into the narrative.

passive style which obtained after Women in Love. The verbs are freer and more active, as, in the theory, expression is more free and unthreatened.

The other significant transformation is the imperative. In The Plumed Serpent the imperative occurs twelve times more frequently than in Kangaroo in which Lawrence was concerned with the breaking of individual integrity in communication. It occurs just under twice as frequently as in The White Peacock in which Lawrence was not concerned with communication at all. It is tempting to see the resurgence of the imperative as connected with Lawrence's presentation of one way communication.

Although many of the commands occur in the invocations to the gods in the rites of Quetzalcoatl, the other conversations seem to support the hypothesis. As in The White Peacock, conversation in The Plumed Serpent is mainly composed of command, exclamation and question, and as such is "infelicitous." Even the questions and statements are on the whole infelicitous as many are actually unwarranted assumptions on the part of people not qualified to speak. Cipriano cannot tell Kate what she is, what she thinks, what she feels. Ramon cannot do this either, whether for Kate, Carlota, the peons of Mexico, or mankind. It is not the incomplete statement or the lie which is the index to much of the style and content of

The Plumed Serpent but the unwarranted statement, and the command which shows that one person arrogates himself power over another in speech and in life. It is amusing to notice that Lawrence's style reestablishes the tendency to command and expansion at the same time that the author is showing that communication in speech involves one person having power over another who is passive.

In summary, the style of The Plumed Serpent is an extension of the style of Kangaroo. The Plumed Serpent employs all of the stylistic options and orderings of the earlier novel, yet there are fewer confusions and ambiguities introduced into the text, and the conversational, driving style is somewhat muted by a reduction of deletion and an increase in rather vague and imprecise expansions. The expansions prevail in approximately the same proportion as in the early novels, but, as if shaken by the controversy about communication which has obtained since Women in Love, the expansions are vague and imprecise, less forceful than the deletions.

CHAPTER SEVEN

LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER:

A STEP TOWARD RESOLUTION

The escape into myth which Lawrence effected in The Plumed Serpent is repeated in his last extended work of fiction. In Lady Chatterley's Lover there is an escape from the everyday world into an Eden in which the demands of money, the problems of living, and normal social restrictions are held in abeyance. But the game-woods of Wragby differ from the god-world of Mexico in that this later Eden is seen as a partial creation whose existence is tenuous and momentary. It is not seen as a possibility which may be established and protected socially or politically. As the state is vulnerable, therefore, the inhabitants must face the possibility of establishing and maintaining the values of Eden while exposed to the dangers of the mundane world.

As can be expected, the style of Lady Chatterley's Lover reflects the uncertainty of the Eden in the game-woods of Wragby, and the acknowledgement that words must function as vehicles of expression and communication in the everyday world. The struggle to face the problem of communication without retreating into an Eden is

reflected in the numbers of expansion and deletion transformations used. In Lady Chatterley's Lover the relative totals of the expansions and deletions show very little difference; the use of deletion almost approaches the use of expansion in the way of Women in Love. There are, on the other hand, many fewer transformations used in Lawrence's last novel, so despite the high proportion of deletions, the style of Lady Chatterley's Lover is much more simple and straightforward than that of Women in Love.

As a parallel to the increased tension concerning communication, the style of Lady Chatterley's Lover shows some differences from that of The Plumed Serpent, especially with regard to deletions. Although the deletion of necessary words is reduced considerably, to a level slightly above that of Women in Love, the deletion of common elements is very much higher than in The Plumed Serpent, almost reaching the heights of Women in Love. This rise is not explained by the numbers of coordinating conjunctions used, nor by the numbers of punctuation marks used as conjunctions. The numbers of conjoined sentences is reduced in this novel, and the run-on sentences are almost more common than series or appositives. The statistics are correct in implying that almost every conjunction involves a deletion. Because of the form of deletion, however, the sentences remain, on the whole, simple, straightforward and easily read.

This novel does show some connection with The Plumed Serpent, in that few of the other deletions are used to introduce confusion or ambiguity into the prose. The deletion of necessary words is most common in conversation, and when it is used in the narrative it is usually contrived to give a conversational flavour to the prose. The ease and rapidity of the conversational flow is also encouraged by the use of contractions in the narrative, and by the generally straightforward use of appositives, deleted relative clauses and extended adverbial deletions. Although the incidence of all these deletions, except appositives, is greater than in The Plumed Serpent, they are all used straightforwardly, as in that novel, and do not introduce ambiguities into the prose in the fashion of Women in Love. On the whole, in Lady Chatterley's Lover the deletions add a slangy force and rapidity of movement to the prose.

There is a distinct limitation in the use of rhythmic repetitions and parallelisms in Lady Chatterley's Lover. The deleted relative clauses, extended adverbial deletions and appositives are often used to give a pleasing cursum at the end of individual sentences, as in the early novels and The Plumed Serpent, but extended rhythmic presentations are not a general feature. Occasionally, as in the description of Tevershall (p. 142), they will recur. But, although the balance rhythms do serve to intensify

emotions slightly, they do not lead to the ecstatic escape from meaning which is part of their function in The Rainbow and which they attempt in The Plumed Serpent. In Lady Chatterley's Lover the extremes of emotion are to some extent muted in comparison with earlier novels.

The simple transformations show the same pull between the older style of the novels after Women in Love and the innovations of The Plumed Serpent. The use of passives, for example, is slightly increased from The Plumed Serpent, although it is still well below the incidence in Women in Love. The number of negations is down from Women in Love, although it is still on a level reasonably consistent with the later novels because of the increase in negation of nouns. There is, however, a reduction in the number of reversed sentences, showing that the tendency away from the complexity of Women in Love is here intensified.

The general reduction in expansion transformations parallels the increased tension about communication. Almost all the expansion totals are reduced; in fact, there are fewer expansions in Lady Chatterley's Lover than in any other of Lawrence's novels.

The outstanding exception to the general tendency is the increase in the number of adjectives from The Plumed Serpent. Surprisingly also, although there are many of the vague and imprecise adjectives popular since

Women in Love, they do not dominate the text as they do in The Plumed Serpent. Instead, the more concrete adjectives of the early novels make a tentative reappearance, usually in nature descriptions of the Edenic woods of Wragby. The reappearance of these more lively adjectives is, however, more than offset by the reduction of descriptive relative clauses, compound nouns and possessive nominalizations and the continued low incidence of the gerundive and participial constructions. Vagueness, abstraction and mechanism still reign outside the game-woods.

In general, then, the pattern of stylistic options reflects the over-all tension in the novel between the mechanized, intellectual modern world and the Edenic retreat in the Wragby game-woods in which words are free and honest expressions of the individual, communicating without threat. The pattern of expansions and lack of passives follows The Plumed Serpent in which the threat of communication was reduced by retreat, the deletions echo the novels after Women in Love with their wrestling with the problem of communication. The relative straightforwardness and lack of ambiguity promise some tentative resolution of the conflict.

The stylistic pattern of Lady Chatterley's Lover and the changes between the pattern of this novel and of those previous ones which do not reflect completely the complexities

of the ideas about words put forward in the narrative. The stylistic pattern shows only a broad outline, as Lady Chatterley's Lover discusses complex ideas about words in a way reminiscent of Women in Love. Naturally the ideas of words which Lawrence expresses in this novel have been subject to critical interpretation, but the general tendency has been to simplistic interpretation. In her discussion of this novel in The Appropriate Form, for example, Barbara Hardy comments at some length on the language of Mellors and its relationship to the pattern of the novel. Her comments are interesting because they reflect the generally held evaluation of Mellors' use of dialect and obscenity and of the way in which Lawrence solves the problem of communication:

Before we are allowed to hear the four-letter words, we are confronted with a dead poetic language [Clifford's] which is an evasion of relationships instead of an expression of them.

The obscenities are the linguistic antithesis to this ready-made literary language which comes between her [Connie] and life. The language [dialect] which Mellors teaches her is also new to her, not ready-made. Its rough naming of life is at the opposite pole from Sir Clifford's unresponsive use of literary language, its outrageousness functions like grim satire. The flowers she gives to Mellors are used in their love-making, and when Mellors observes 'Pretty as life' the natural equation is plainly made and the antithesis completed. This part of the sexual ritual may strike us as ludicrous. Both the acts and the words are perilously exposed in literature, and may well fail in public communication, but they are here a consistent

part of a truthful exposure and of a symbolic pattern.¹

Mrs. Hardy seems to accept the fashion of assuming that Mellors is a character who is fully mature and who uniquely solves all problems, and uses words naturally as honest means of self-expression, while communicating his inmost thoughts. Like many others she accepts that Mellors' use of the vernacular indicates warmth of relationship and community and that his lower class origin means ipso facto that he is a man of life and vitality who aggressively speaks the truth.

Perhaps the uncouth speech may seem to connect Mellors with, say, the warm flame of life Lawrence saw in his father, or the vitality which he respected in the colliers of his youth. But Lawrence always associated the lower classes with non-verbal communication, Mellors' history connecting him with Lawrence himself rather than his father, and Lady Chatterley's Lover is set in the England of the 1920's, when Lawrence saw very little that was admirable in the English colliers. Mellors is not the embodiment of the answer to Lawrence's problems with communication; the attitude to words in the novel can not be summed up in a simple antithesis, and the uses of the

¹ Barbara Hardy, The Appropriate Form: An Essay on the Novel (London: Athlone Press, 1964), p. 165.

vernacular are varied.

The problem is given its depth and complexity because all three major characters are products of the modern world with its dissociation between words, truthful expression, and communication. All three are "educated" in the modern sense that they can talk of a wide range of ideas. Even Oliver Mellors has "had a scholarship for Sheffield Grammar School, and learned French and things" (Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 136). He has been abroad, gained an army commission, and joined the society of other educated people.

Although all characters face the problems raised by conditions in the modern world, differences may be perceived between the values of words used by one character and those used by another. There is, however, a unique concept introduced in Lady Chatterley's Lover in that the valuations of the words are not only based on the truthfulness of the expressions, but are explicitly connected with the attitudes to man and to communion held by the characters. In this novel the "felicity" of a character's speech is explicitly shown to mirror his attitude to his fellow man and his desire for community.

Sir Clifford Chatterley is the most easily interpreted character of the three. Clifford is almost a caricature of the man who is a creature of the modern world. He is a member of a generation which loves to

talk, discuss, exchange ideas, and he accepts his generation's standards and makes them his own. But because he merely accepts the standards of his generation and of Wragby, he finds that he has no assurance of his own being. His relationship to Connie is important to him because through her he tries to find the self he does not possess. The narrator comments: ". . . he was absolutely dependent on her, he needed her every moment. . . . alone he was like a lost thing. He needed Connie to be there, to assure him he existed at all" (p. 15).

As Clifford has no self he cannot relate in any balanced way to another person. Although he needs Connie desperately, he does not relate to her as one human being to another. "He worshipped Connie, she was his wife, a higher being, and he worshipped her with a queer craven idolatry, like a ~~savage~~, a worship based on enormous fear, and even hate of the power of the idol, the dread idol" (p. 103). With Connie Clifford resorts to a bullying worship, as with Mrs. Bolton he falls into a worshipping bullying.

Clifford's actual attitude to others is made clear in his feeling for those on whom he does not directly depend emotionally. Immediately before the discussion of Clifford's need for Connie is a description of his relationship with his men:

. . . The miners were, in a sense, his own men; but he saw them as objects rather than men, parts of the pit rather than parts of life, crude raw phenomena rather than human beings along with him.

He was remotely interested; but like a man looking down a microscope or up a telescope. He was not in touch. He was not in actual touch with anybody, save, traditionally, with Wragby, and, through the close bond of family defence, with Emma. Beyond this nothing really touched him; perhaps there was nothing to get at ultimately; just a negation of human contact.

Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 15

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

This parallel between absence of valid speech and absence of relationship is new in Lawrence. It is the first time that the two values have been so explicitly connected, even in negation, although the connection was implicitly present in the theories of words put forward in

the early novels. This connection, however, is an innovation which pervades the novel, and controls all the discussions of words.

Connie's character is delineated by means of the connections she makes between talk, sexual connection and total human relationship. Her early separation of talk and sexual connection in sexual relationship marks her as a product of the modern world, akin to the intellectuals who later haunt Wragby, although the connection she makes between talk and relationship is always emphasized:

Neither Hilda nor Connie was ever in love with a young man unless he and she were verbally very near: that is unless they were profoundly interested in TALKING to one another. The amazing, the profound, the unbelievable thrill there was in passionately talking to some really clever young man by the hour, resuming day after day for months . . . this they had never realized till it happened!

Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 8

At all times Connie sees talk as an expression of a person through which communication, both intellectual and emotional, may occur. She prefers Michaelis to the other men who visit Wragby because he states his own conclusions forthrightly (p. 34). And, especially in her interview with Michaelis, the reader feels that she is interested in talking to a man because she hopes to apprehend some truth of living or achieve some communion by means of words.

The discussions at Wragby show that Connie changes

her early attitudes, perhaps under the pressure of her experiences with Clifford. Her changes in attitude, however, only emphasize the connections which Connie makes between words and relationship. Connie opposes the men at Wragby who see talk and sex as surface exchanges of essentially meaningless commodities. Tommy Dukes sums up the attitude:

It's an amusing idea, Charlie, . . . that sex is just another form of talk, where you act the words instead of saying them. . . I suppose it's quite true. I suppose we might exchange as many sensations and emotions with women as we do ideas about the weather, and so on.

Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 32

Neither ideas nor sensations touch individuals in this group. Again, Tommy Dukes sums up the attitude, "The tie that binds us just now is mental friction on one another" (pp. 35-36).

Dukes is partially free of the Wragby bias as he does not wish sex to be seen as a commodity, although he can only see talk as an isolating attribute of the intellect uniting only by "mental friction." To preserve the value he sees in sexual communion he wishes to separate it entirely from talk. He comments: "A woman wants you to like her and talk to her, and at the same time love her and desire her; and it seems to me the two things are mutually exclusive" (p. 53). Connie, however, disagrees with Dukes because she thinks that the two things should be connected as aspects of communion. She

insists "men can love women and talk to them. I don't see how they can love them without talking, and being friendly and intimate" (p. 53). Connie perceives talking as having the possibility of communication; she does not perceive it as life-denying or as a threat. In the same way she sees that love-making may have the possibility of communion, although she isolates herself in love-making, as from a threat. She also sees the two as connected in communion, as far as her understanding reaches at this point.

Connie, then, is a woman of the modern world, but she is distinct from Clifford in her desire for human relationships and communication, and in her somewhat inarticulate belief that both talk and sexual touch should lead to communion. Again, Lawrence is making a connection between speech and communication that was implicit in his theory, but totally absent from his novels until this time. Connie can not embody the theory, but she is the first to express the desire for communication in speech, and the first to believe in the possibility.²

Oliver Mellors is a mate fitting for Connie in

that he too recognizes the necessity of communication. He is, however, a more complex character in that he is bitterly resentful of his need to be in touch with other people. After his first intercourse with Connie in the hut, Mellors watches her return to Wragby "almost with bitterness" because "she had connected him up again, when he had wanted to be alone" (p. 110). But part of Mellors' reaction away from communication with others is due to his recognition of its value as its peril. As he acknowledges to Connie, "It's life. . . . There's no keeping clear. . . And if you do keep clear you might as well die" (p. 110). Mellors is a figure reminiscent of Birkin, a man who recognizes his limitations are those of his isolating society, who longs for warm human contact, yet who fears the thing he longs for.

The way in which all three characters choose and use words mirrors the way in which they comprehend themselves and others, and the value they put upon words and communication.

Clifford's words express clearly the emptiness of the man. When the men "talk" at Wragby, Clifford very rarely puts forward independent thoughts; Lawrence comments that "his ideas were not vital enough for it, he was too confused and emotional" (p. 33). In the same way, Clifford is unable to use words to express his appreciation of nature or his direct emotional reactions.

When Connie shows him early violets on a spring day full of life and promise, he can only evade the sweetness of the flower and the significance of the time by quoting other people's words: "sweeter than the lids of Juno's eyes." He does not seem to see the aptness of Connie's comment "I don't see a bit of connection with the actual violets. . . . The Elizabethans are rather upholstered" (p. 85). Later, when Connie shows him wood-anemones, he again uses a quotation, and Connie begins to see how Clifford protects himself from life by "turning everything into words," and evades life even further by using the ready-made words of others as his own (p. 87).

Connie's separation from Clifford grows as she slowly realizes that his words contain no real substance and, as a result, communicate nothing. She follows in the footsteps of many of the characters in the earlier novels when she begins to realize that there may be two kinds of words, words that are lying substance, and words that convey the essential reality of the user. She recognizes that:

. . . all the brilliant words seemed like dead leaves, crumpling up and turned to powder, meaning really nothing, blown away on any gust of wind. They were not the leafy words of an effective life, young with energy and belonging to the tree. They were the hosts of fallen leaves of the life that is ineffectual.

Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 47

The difference between the words which are dead and the words which belong to an effective life is slight.

But a comparison of the word-usage of Connie and Clifford at this point reveals some telling differences. Because she has been educated in Clifford's world and has been so close to him, her use of words is often similar at first glance. Immediately before Clifford's attitude to quotation is exposed, Connie's attitude to words is scrutinized. She has recognized the hell of continual rattle of talk (p. 70), and longs for something beyond this. Mrs. Bolton, concerned by her restlessness, urges her "to go for a walk through the wood, and look at the daffs behind the keeper's cottage":

Connie took it all in good part, even daffs for daffodils. Wild daffodils! After all, one should not stew in one's own juice. The Spring came back. . . . "Seasons return, but not to me returns Day, or the sweet approach of Ev'n or Morn."

And the keeper, his thin, white body, like a lonely pistil of an invisible flower! She had forgotten him in her unspeakable depression. But now something roused. . . . "Pale beyond porch and portal" . . . the thing to do was to pass the porches and the portals.

She was stronger, she could walk better, and in the wood the wind would not be so tiring as it was across the park, flattening against her. She wanted to forget, to forget the world and all the dreadful, carrion-bodied people. "Ye must be born again! I believe in the resurrection of the body! Except a grain of wheat fall to the earth and die, it shall by no means bring forth. When the crocus cometh forth I too will emerge and see the sun!" In the wind of March endless phrases swept through her consciousness.

Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 79

The words in Connie's mind seem as much a web of quotations as those in Clifford's, but there are two significant differences between Connie's use of quotations and Clifford's. First, Connie does not limit herself to single quotations or lines of thought, nor does she always quote correctly. She associates many quotations, flowing from one to another as each helps to illuminate a facet of her mood. She juxtaposes many disparate elements to form a new whole. And, secondly, this web of quotations is not formed to protect Connie from experience but rather to form a structure of experiences glimpsed from others on which Connie may build her new perceptions of her state. Out of others' words Connie is moving forward to create her own. The words communicate and help her to realize her position. It is significant, too, that Connie begins to use words to fight toward recognition of her real feelings on the walk which takes her for the first time to the game-keeper's hut in the wood.³

² It is interesting to note that many of the passages in Lady Chatterley's Lover reflect this same technique of using other's words to personal ends. In no other novel but The White Peacock does Lawrence so intersperse his descriptions and comments on society with reinterpretations of other's words. The number of conventional clichés and classical images in the book is enormous. Yet Lawrence integrates the quotations as he never did in The White Peacock, turning them to his own ends by a flippant tone which calls to question the conventional wisdom (see p. 1) or by a complex of image and tone which give another dimension to the images (see especially, pp. 172-173).

Oliver Mellors' use of words is more complex than either Clifford's or Connie's not only because his character is more complex than theirs when he is introduced, but also because he changes and develops in his attitudes as the novel progresses.

When he is introduced Mellors is an educated man who has turned his back on his education and achieved place in society to return to the woods as a game-keeper. It is significant that Mellors sees educated speech as a symbol of his external attainments, and that he turns his back on his educated pronunciation as he turns his back on society.

That Mellors rejects King's English for dialect does not necessarily mean that dialect is a positive way to self-expression, nor does it indicate in any way that dialect is concerned with the warmth of human communication. Mellors uses dialect in various situations and to various ends, but it is not the use of the dialect in itself that gives the words value. Occasionally, the effect of the words in dialect may be positive. Frank Kermode notes that the first time Connie meets Mellors as a meaningful human being he is abusing his daughter in dialect, as a "false little bitch" who cries with dishonest sentiment over the death of the

poaching cat.⁴ The use of the dialect here may indicate some tendency in Mellors to appreciate "true speech," but it is notable that the false, simpering child and the self-conscious subservient grandmother both use the dialect, and both use words falsely. It is really what Mellors says rather than how he says it that is important in this exchange.

In subsequent meetings with Connie Mellors slips into the dialect whenever he wishes to establish his distance from Connie or to mock her by isolating himself. When the two meet in an official capacity, when Connie delivers a message to the cottage, Mellors speaks with her in educated English, but when she interrupts his solitude at the hut he rebuffs her by speaking in broad dialect. Although there is a "winning naivete" and "authority" in the dialect which leads Connie to obey him unquestioningly (pp. 81-82), Lawrence insists that his speech is that wrung out of a man who wishes to preserve his isolation. "He resented the intrusion, he cherished his solitude as his only and last freedom in life" (p. 81). Connie's anger, and her repulsion from the vernacular in this and subsequent meetings, are simply natural reactions from a woman who desperately needs

³Kermode, Lawrence (Bungay, Suffolk: Fontana, 1973), p. 128. Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 55.

contact with another human being, and who is being mockingly rebuffed (pp. 87-89).

In subsequent meetings Mellors' speech in dialect is consistently connected with fear, suspicion, isolation and the rejection of relationship. Even educated English is avoided in the relationship. It is emphasized that "he never really spoke to her" (p. 118) and that "he seemed to have nothing whatsoever to say" (p. 126). His few words of dialect expressing satisfaction at their second sexual encounter does not say as much as his "warm, sure, easy face" and fails to reassure Connie or break into the loneliness of which he is unaware.

The progress of the relationship in the Eden of the Wragby woods seems designed to show the simultaneous progress of Connie and Mellors in learning modes of communion. Connie, for example, learns to forego speech which hitherto had been her main mode of communication (p. 164), and learns the submissive sensuality in which Kate is bound in communion with Cipriano. The progress of Mellors shows an attempt made at expression and communication by means of words.

After the fifth sensual encounter in which Connie relaxes her ego sufficiently to meet Mellors in sensual communion, Connie begins to imitate the dialect and learn Mellors' speech. But the incident is ambiguous in the extreme. Mellors finds Connie's attempts at dialect

"ludicrous" and he even shifts his pronunciation to make Connie appear mistaken. "Why should I say maun when you say mun," Connie protests. "You're not playing fair" (p. 166). It is a perfectly accurate observation. Mellors is trying to prevent Connie from sharing his language.

In a later incident Mellors relaxes enough to attempt communication and teaches Connie his language of four-letter words. Barbara Hardy is correct when she points out that they are new to Connie. But the "Anglo-saxon" words are not particularly the language of love and communication, nor are they particularly "a rough naming of life." Primarily, they are Mellors' way of expressing himself in his chosen personal language. When Mellors teaches Connie the meaning of his words and allows her to copy his pronunciation (albeit after some cheating) he is not necessarily communicating with her on a new plane. He is teaching her to participate in his private language as if he and she were one person. It does not seem the communion of two souls by means of speech, but the assimilation of one soul by another, by sharing the means of private and personal expression.

The impression that Mellors' language at this point is a form of egotism is heightened by an exchange which occurs the next time they meet. Mellors suddenly turns on Connie and tells her that she is not satisfied

with "fucking," that is, his term. Instead, he tells her, she "want[s] it to be called something grand and mysterious, just to flatter . . . [her] own self importance" (pp. 193-194). When Connie retaliates and accuses him of the same thing, actually, of preferring his own expression as a form of egotism, Mellors becomes furious and retreats. The incident is handled very evasively by Mellors, and by Lawrence. Yet the impression remains that Connie's accusation contains more than a grain of truth, and that teaching a private language is actually a form of dominance rather than a liberation. At this point, communication is still associated with domination so that it may be free from threat.

After the communion experienced in the third meeting, there is a great deal of conversation between Mellors and Lady Chatterley. There is no indication, however, that this speech is found to be of value in communication. Mellors' talk gives information as to his background, his earlier sexual experiences, his problems with Bertha Coutts. But it seems more a narrative device than a mode of communion with a beloved. After a particularly long monologue giving background Connie even becomes uneasy. "He had talked so long now, and he was really talking to himself, not to her" (p. 206). It is implied that Connie feels rebuffed when he speaks to her in good English (p. 209), but, on the other hand, she

"never knew how to answer him when he was in this condition of the vernacular" (p. 214).

There is, in fact, only one point in which the language seems to partake of the physical communion they have achieved. Mellors is appreciative of Connie's physical richness as they sit in front of the fire, and as he acts his appreciation, by stroking her, he also speaks it. "Tha's got such a nice tail on thee," he says, and for once in the novel the dialect is described as throaty and caressive (p. 208).

The throaty and caressive dialect which accompanies the love-play is an ambiguous and tentative vindication of Connie's assertion that talk and sex could both be means of communion. The words are frail buds rather than the leafy words of an effective life.

There is only one incident in the novel that points to a revitalization of words and the possibility of words used as communication; at the end of the novel Mellors writes a letter to "keep in touch" with Connie. After a final sensual experience which is thought to complete their initiation into physical communication they are separately forced to leave the Eden of the Wragby woods. In the society which had always threatened to encroach on their temporary retreat they are forced to separate and do without the physical contact which had been the basis of the relationship. In such a situation, as Mellors

points out, chastity is the only possible mode of life, and words are necessary to keep the communion alive.

It would seem, in this last letter, that Lawrence has found some resolution, albeit tentative and ambiguous, of some of the problems that beset his theories of words. Certainly, in the letter, Mellors' words seem to express his individual situation truly; they seem to have emotional resonance which is united with intellectual content. But perhaps more than that, they also seem capable of communicating Mellors' individual experience to Connie.

Connie and Mellors have undergone an initiation and purification in the Eden of the woods at Wragby. In the structuring of the novel Lawrence seems to suggest that with such a preparation, and under the pressure of necessity words may fulfill the double function of expression and communication which he advocates. But Lawrence's conclusions seem tentative and his methods are not completely coherent. The change in Mellors is abrupt and not completely believable. Lawrence is too insistent on the isolating and mocking effect of the dialect for the change to carressive communication to be completely convincing. Speech in Clifford Chatterley's world is condemned to such an extent that the letter almost seems like a mistake; it is hard to believe that the sensual initiation which had so little effect on speech earlier in the novel should suddenly bear such fruit. The tone of

the book suggests a resolution when the structuring of the action does not bring belief.

Nevertheless, it would seem that in this last letter Lawrence believes he has found some resolution, albeit tentative and ambiguous, of some of the problems that beset his theories of words. He has maintained his insistence on individual expression; he has increasingly emphasized the essential relationship of the words to their meaning. In this way he maintains and reinforces the theories put forward in his earlier novels. He has also attempted to incorporate an idea of communication in speech, and solve the problem of communication versus individual expression which has been of such importance since Women in Love.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE THEORETICAL CONSTRUCTS

In the novels of D.H. Lawrence the broad pattern of changes in stylistic options parallels the changes in Lawrence's theories of words. The incidence of expression and deletion varies as words are valued as means of self-expression or considered as possible means of communication. Lawrence's use of expansion as a dominant stylistic device in the first three novels, parallels his evaluation of words as means of self-expression which may be misused, but which are necessary for the full development of the personality. Expansion and deletion are used together most fully in Women in Love in which Lawrence discusses the need for self-expression by means of words, shows that words are valueless in communication, and repudiates the need for communication. In Aaron's Rod and Kangaroo, while Lawrence is most forcefully showing that words are not useful for communication, and, indeed, may be used to destroy communication, deletion is used most widely. Deletion is significantly reduced in The Plumed Serpent, although expansion is vague and imprecise. In this work, however, there is a retreat from the realistic world of

the novel, in which communication is necessary, to the internalized world of myth where characters are aspects of one protocharacter, and communication is presented as the domination and control of one character by another. Deletion and expansion are nearly equal in Lady Chatterley's Lover which attempts to accept both the world of myth and the mundane modern society, truthful self-expression and communication between isolate human beings.

Lawrence's difficulties with the ideas of communication are made more understandable by surveying the theories about words which he puts forward in his non-fictional prose. Lawrence himself insists that there is and should be a close relationship between his intellectual structuring of ideas in his prose metaphysics or philosophies and his incorporation and demonstration of the ideas in the novels.¹ In this particular instance, however, Lawrence's theoretical constructs are of interest, not because they parallel the movements of the novel precisely, but because there are suggestive gaps and omissions. Lawrence structures all of his theories of

¹See especially D.H. Lawrence, Fantasia of the Unconscious and Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious (London: Heinemann, 1961), pp. 9-10, and "Surgery for the Novel -- Or a Bomb," Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence, ed. Edward D. McDonald (New York: Viking Press, 1936), p. 520.

words to present a theory of self-expression. At no time does he ever discuss the way in which communication could be effected. Communication is only mentioned when it is denied that it have any connection with words.

Lawrence seldom discusses his ideas about words in discrete sections; his thoughts are evolved in the course of meditations on diverse subjects, in travel-books, letters, book reviews and articles. Nor are the ideas presented in a straightforward manner. Often, some underlying principle is presented only implicitly, or is discoverable only if two or more statements are compared.

Lawrence's rather complex vision of words is introduced in the "Foreword to Sons and Lovers" which was written in 1913 in Gargano, Italy, after that novel's completion.² Lawrence begins this explanation of his novel by quoting from the first chapter of the Gospel according to St. John, "The Word was made Flesh"; then he creates an entirely new gloss on the text, indeed, an entirely new text.

Lawrence bases his theory of words and their function on his conception of the nature of reality, and

² Throughout this discussion I have followed the dates of composition listed by Keith Sagar in The Art of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1966).

his conception of the nature of man. His understanding of both "reality" and "man" are idiosyncratic. In his exploratory dissertation The Formative Influences on the work of D.H. Lawrence, R.L. Drain suggests that many of Lawrence's more complex ideas were formed as a result of the impact of Lawrence's studies on the beliefs instilled in him during his upbringing. Lawrence's conception of reality suggests just such a derivation. Lawrence was brought up in the popular nineteenth century Non-Conformist tradition influenced by transcendentalist thought. For him, "reality" always presumes some quality above and beyond the mere presence of an object. In his college training, however, Lawrence was exposed to the ideas of the British philosophers Locke and Berkeley and he adopted the idea that only individual perception of an object made that object real. Lawrence seems to have adapted both of those theories, so that at one and the same time the world is seen as valid only in each individual's perception of it, and these perceptions are recognized as valid only if they are seen to contain some transcendental quality, never quite explained but variously referred to as "reality," "livingness" or "being".

The dualistic theory of the nature of man which Lawrence presents in his "Foreword" conforms to his notion of reality in that the categories of being he presents are contained within the individual. The two principles,

in his writings variously termed the Flesh and the Word, the Female and the Male, God the Father and God the Son, Darkness and Light, Self and Not-Self, are opposed aspects of an individual, rather in the way in which Blake's giants and their "wives" are aspects of a faculty. Roughly, the Self or the Flesh, is the unconscious sentient part of a being, equivalent in some ways to the "id" described by Freud. The Not-Self, or the Word, is that conscious part of the personality which is created by the total of the individual's perceptions. It must be stressed, however, that the Not-Self is not moulded by outside influences, but created internally in response to the individual's interpretation of his perceptions. Freud stipulated a somewhat similar process for the formation of what he called the "superego". In a "living" or "real" individual the Self, or Flesh, interacts smoothly with the spirit, with the unconscious Self participating in the moment, and the consciousness, the separating power, understanding and expressing the significance of the moment.

In the "Foreword to Sons and Lovers" Lawrence identifies words with the consciousness. The idea of the function of consciousness in defining the individual is connected to all of Lawrence's comments on the function of the Word. If this one point is kept in mind, it becomes understandable why Lawrence should reverse the

quotation from St. John, and say that "the Flesh was made Word" instead of "the Word was made Flesh." Out of the individual's unconscious participation in life comes the conscious recognition of individual meaning which is expressed in words:

. . . The Father was Flesh -- and the Son, who in himself was finite and had form, became Word. For form is the uttered Word, and the Son is the Flesh as it utters the Word but the unutterable Flesh is the Father.³

From this assertion comes the corollary that conscious recognition (the Word) must always spring from an experience of the unconscious Self, expressing that Self: "Out of the Flesh hath come every Word, and in the Flesh lies every Word that will be uttered" (Letters, p. 96). The word is the individual product of individual experience.

In this theory of words of 1913, Lawrence formulates the basic notion about words which is implicit in the three early novels: the idea of the word as necessary to self-expression in the individual. Present in this conception also is the rationale for Lawrence's distrust of words. Lawrence extends his idea of the dual nature of man with the notion that the unconscious Flesh

³D.H. Lawrence, "Foreword to Sons and Lovers," The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, ed. Aldous Huxley (London: Heinemann, 1932), p. 97. All subsequent quotations will be taken from this edition.

(or the Self, or God) is the primary and permanent principle since it is that from which all else derives. Thus the Word, since it is merely derived from the Flesh moment by moment, can not participate in the same infinite nature. Lawrence comments: "Out of the Flesh cometh the Word, and the word is finite, as a piece of carpentry, and hath an end. . . . Out of the Flesh cometh the Word, which blossoms for a moment and is no more" (Letters, p. 96). Although the word may express individual truth, the word itself is true for that person and for that moment only and can not be used arbitrarily as a truth for any other person or moment.

Although Lawrence draws the basic outline of his ideas on the function of words in the "Foreword," the ideas are not clearly systematized until the intensive revisions of Twilight in Italy for publication in the autumn of 1915. Even here, the meanings which Lawrence attaches to words are only discoverable if the metaphorical references are analyzed. For example, in his first comment on the word Lawrence is actually discussing another matter, and casually states: "The Word of the tiger is: my senses are supremely Me, and my senses are God in Me."⁴ On analysis,

⁴D.H. Lawrence, Twilight in Italy (New York: Viking-Compass, 1962), p. 48. All subsequent quotations will be cited from this edition.

it is easy enough to see that in this connection Lawrence implicitly associates words with the essential meaning of the thing in question. The Word of the thing obviously contains in some fashion the essential nature of the thing in itself.

The second basic characteristic of words present in Twilight in Italy is an extension of the above idea. A few pages before the reference to the tiger, Lawrence discusses the aspirations of man in the Middle Ages and comments: "Man wanted more and more to become purely free and abstract. Pure freedom was in pure abstraction. The Word was absolute. When man became as the Word, a pure law, then he was free" (Twilight in Italy, p. 42).

Although this passage seems to repeat the idea of the word equalling the essence of meaning, the interpretation is made more complex by the connections between the images expressed in this passage and those which are developed slightly earlier in the text. For example, when Lawrence speaks of the pure Word as "abstract" or "a pure law" the reader immediately remembers the discussion of the law in the previous chapter. In this passage Lawrence describes two monks as they "paced the narrow path of the twilight, treading in the neutrality of the law. Neither the blood nor the spirit spoke in them, only the law, the abstraction of the average. The infinite is positive and negative. But the average is

only neutral. And the monks trod backwards and forwards down the line of neutrality" (p. 36).

From the comments on the "neutrality" of the law and its "abstraction," we gather that, to Lawrence, the law of the average is essentially unliving. As it is abstract it is separated from the flux of living createdness. As it is neutral it is the "quenched ash" which Lawrence says later is the result of mixing the two principles on whose integrity, opposition and balance depend the "livingness" of the individual.

Lawrence seems always to have accepted implicitly the two ideas of words presented above, that words equal the essence of a thing, and that the essence, because it is abstract, is dead. These two notions, in addition to the fundamental conception that words must be the product of the interaction of the Self and the Not-Self, help account for the attitudes to words which Lawrence displays in the early novels. Words are the signs of livingness, and in themselves establish that livingness in man when they express the truth of the individual experience, because they have an essential relationship to the thing or idea expressed. At the same time, words without the experience of the Self to prompt them are dead, as they are when they are treated as abstractions, generalizations and "ideas" true of all time rather than as expressions of momentary living experiences.

Two further developments of Lawrence's ideas of words are important to Lawrence's later handling of words, though the concepts are not of primary importance to the early novels. In discussing the response of the Italians to D'Annunzio's plays, Lawrence treats the word as a temporal and sensual entity, appealing to the ear rather than the understanding.

It was the language which did it. It was the Italian passion for rhetoric, for the speech which appeals to the senses and makes no demand on the mind. When an Englishman listens to a speech he wants, at least to imagine that he understands thoroughly and impersonally what is meant. But an Italian only cares about the emotion. It is the movement, the physical effect of the language upon the blood which gives him supreme satisfaction. His mind is scarcely engaged at all. He is like a child, hearing and feeling without understanding.

Twilight in Italy,^c p. 80

If what Lawrence implies about words in this rather elliptical comment is correlated with what he says of the nature of livingness, a parallel can be grasped, and a structure created which would give words life. Words, it seems, are made up of two components, sound and meaning, which, united, should form the whole word. Abstracted meaning is neutral and lifeless; sound itself is vitiating. Together they form the totality of the word, which, because of its dual nature, parallels the creative interaction of Self and Not-Self and establishes a moment within time. Words, too, can participate in the livingness of the moment.

Further on in the book Lawrence seems to substantiate this hypothesis when he talks of the word in connection with the Holy Spirit, or that third thing which is created, both temporal and eternal, in the necessary clash of opposites. Speaking of marriage, he says:

. . . in the spirit my conjunction with [the woman] . . . creates a third thing, an absolute, a Word, which is neither me nor her, nor of me, nor of her, but which is absolute.

Twilight in Italy, p. 141

In Twilight in Italy Lawrence establishes the four main aspects of his ideas on words. Lawrence maintains all four throughout his subsequent discussions, first combining and expanding them into a system, afterwards emphasizing one or another as his temper led him, but always maintaining one of the four ideas, which are so contradictory seen in juxtaposition: that words are essences, that meaning is abstraction and therefore dead, that the sound of words gives a sensory and emotional component, and that words, as the "third thing" can establish the livingness of man.

The fascinating point about Twilight in Italy is that although it was written and revised during the times of composition of Sons and Lovers, The Rainbow and Women in Love it reflects only the positive ideas about words as self-expression contained in these novels. The energetic

criticism of words in the novels is never hinted at. The attempt to confront the problem of communication, so important in The Rainbow and Women in Love, is totally ignored.

Slightly after he had completed the third version of what was to be The Rainbow Lawrence undertook a Study of Thomas Hardy. He worked on this novelist, whom he greatly admired, from July to November 1914, but he never fully revised his essay for publication. Although Lawrence does give some perceptive insights into Hardy, in the main he uses him as a jumping off point for his own theories.

In Study of Thomas Hardy Lawrence does not develop his ideas of the nature of words further. He emphasizes the parallels he has drawn between the nature of the word and the structure of reality, he discusses more fully the function of the word in creating "livingness" in each individual, and, by implication, he restricts the usefulness and function of words in communication.

In addition to re-establishing his old alignment of Word and Flesh, with Man and Woman, the Not-Self and the Self, Lawrence, in this essay, talks more specifically of the role which he believes words should play in a man's life. He asserts, following John 3:3-7, that to be fully alive man must be not born once, but born twice. In his first birth he is born physically from his parents, the man of the Flesh, the old Adam. In the second birth he is

born into his own consciousness, born into knowledge of himself, born spiritually, if you will, as well as physically.

The problem before each person is, of course, how this second birth is to be accomplished:

And we, who imagine we live by knowledge, imagine that the impetus for our second birth must come from knowledge, that the germ, the sperm impulse, can come out of some utterance only.⁵

This idea tallies with Lawrence's theory of the creation of the real and living individual from the interaction of the Word and the Flesh. But he points out that most people misconceive the role or identity of the Word at this point in their search. ". . . when I am young," he says "at eighteen, twenty, twenty-three, when the anguish of desire comes upon me, as I lie in the womb of my times, to receive the quickening, the impetus, I send forth all my calls and call hither and thither, asking for the Word, the Word which is the spermatozoan which shall come and fertilize me and set me free" (Phoenix, pp. 433-434).

The problem that Lawrence sees here is that the young are searching for the "Uttered Word," some other's words which have already been said, established, and set down. But it may be that the Words which will set a

⁵D.H. Lawrence, "Study of Thomas Hardy," Phoenix, p. 433.

particular individual free may not have been uttered yet, and the soul searches futilely through the religious and established beliefs for that which will "deliver him unto his own being." "Therefore the unsatisfied soul remains unsatisfied, and chooses Work, maybe Good Works, for its incomplete action. It thinks that in work it has being, in knowledge it has gained its distinct self" (Phoenix, p. 434).

In choosing good works, or knowledge, the unsatisfied soul repeats precisely the same mistake it made in trying to quicken its being by means of words uttered by others. For, although men are correct in connecting words with the quickening of the self and in seeing works as the fruit of truly being alive, they have separated words and works so entirely from the individual Self that the fruitful interaction is impossible. "But all that will be uttered lies potent in life," says Lawrence. "The fools do not know this. They think the fruit of knowledge is found only in shops. They will go anywhere to find it, save to the Tree. For the Tree is so obvious, and seems so played out" (p. 434). In order that words quicken a man and make him fully alive they must be expression of his deepest Self. In uttering himself, a man participates in the interaction of the Self and the Not-Self, the Flesh and the Word, so that the words he utters are at one time a means to his attaining his own livingness, and in themselves the establishment of that condition.

If this double role of the word in forging human consciousness and human livingness is accepted, the word gains in importance. The word is obviously both the instrument and the end of consciousness, and the degree of man's expression of himself in words that are true to his own experience of the Self must be some indication of the true livingness of that man.

On the other hand, establishing the importance of words in creating the individual, Lawrence subtly dismisses the value of words as means of communication. The words of others can have no permanent influence on the development of the living individual; in fact, they may limit or distort the development of the individual. It is interesting to note that Lawrence was evolving this attitude to communication in his theoretical writings at the same time that he was subtly suggesting the necessity of communication in The Rainbow.

Although Lawrence firmly establishes the nature and role of words in the three essays of 1912-14 which I have considered, the essays for five years after say very little about words. The reason is difficult to ascertain, since in most of the major essays Lawrence does speak of one aspect or another of his theory of the real, and in the novels, especially in Women in Love he considers at length the role of words in communication.

In the earlier essays Lawrence deals extensively with the ways in which man should attempt to create his own living reality, but in the fewer discussions of words in later essays he tends to concentrate on those conditions in man and society which hinder full development. For example, in "The Crown" (1915) Lawrence speaks of the fruitful strife between opposites which goes to produce the Crown of Livingness. He speaks of creation as divine; he speaks also of destruction as divine⁶ and he even speaks of the divinity of corruption. But it is on destruction that he speaks most. And he introduces the new idea, that for many people caught in "single vision," creative reality is impossible (Phoenix II, pp. 376-377). Later Lawrence devotes several passages to descriptions of these people caught inside a hard shell of a created personality, in the condition of egoism, who are safely preserved from life and from death, whose words signify nothing.

Despite the darker notes introduced after 1915 Lawrence seems to adhere to his basic ideas of the roles and values of words throughout the years. That his theory meant a great deal to Lawrence is witnessed by the energy of his assertions in the "Foreword to Women in Love"

⁶D.H. Lawrence, "The Crown," Phoenix II: Uncollected, Unpublished and Other Prose Works by D.H. Lawrence, eds. Warren Roberts and Harry T. Moore (New York: Viking Press, 1959), p. 402.

dated September 12, 1919, in which he implicitly affirms the theoretic structure he has previously presented:

Man struggles with his unborn needs and fulfilment. New unfoldings struggle up in torment in him, as buds struggle forth from the midst of a plant. Any man of real individuality tries to know and to understand what is happening, even in himself, as he goes along. This struggle for verbal consciousness should not be left out in art. It is a very great part of life. It is not superimposition of a theory. It is the passionate struggle into conscious being.

We are now in a period of crisis. Every man who is acutely alive is acutely wrestling with his own soul. The people that can bring forth the new passion, the new idea, this people will endure. Those others, that fix themselves in the old idea, will perish with the new life strangled unborn within them. Men must speak out to one another.

Phoenix II, p. 276

In this "Foreword" Lawrence combines implicitly in one structure all of the ideas of words hitherto presented. But it must be noted that the introduction to Women in Love mentions words only as means of individual expression; it does not touch, even tangentially, on any idea of communication. Yet the problem of communication is one of the main focal points of the novel.

The "Foreword to Women in Love" is the culminating point of Lawrence's early theories of the function of words. In all of the letters and essays written between 1919 and 1930, there is a definite change in Lawrence's attitude to words. In none of these later works, however, does he ever explore the relation of words to human

communication except tangentially and in a negative way.

Lawrence's changed ideas about words parallel a change in Lawrence's treatment of his "metaphysic," a change that was heralded in the pessimism of "The Crown." In the next major essay, "Democracy," the emphasis on the unlivingness of people and society is even further intensified. Lawrence seems obsessed by the idea of society as a false and mechanical imposition of the mind on living man. Often, he traces the ills of society to a misuse of words, which are employed to create a world divorced from the principle of the Flesh, and therefore dead:

The vital universe was never created from any Logos; but the ideal universe of man was certainly so invented. Man's overweening mind uttered the Word, and the Word was God. So that the world exists today as a flesh-and-blood-and-iron substantiation of this uttered world. This is all the trouble: that the invented ideal world of man is superimposed upon living men and women, and men and women are thus turned into abstracted, functioning, mechanical units. . . .

Phoenix, pp. 704-705

The idea that words might distort reality instead of mirroring it is implicit in Lawrence's separation of the Word and the Flesh. But it fascinated and horrified him to think that the distortion might actually occur. In "Democracy" for the first time in his theoretical writings, Lawrence seems to recognize that words can exist in isolation with no reference to some "truth" or meaning. At

one point he comments: "Our way of State-ownership is merely a farcical exchange of words, not of ways" (Phoenix, p. 717), and his bitterness is apparent. The bitterness, as well as the idea of the separation of words and truth, is, of course, reflected in the novel of this time, Aaron's Rod.

An interesting sidelight on Lawrence's development of his theory of words is found in his Studies in Classic American Literature. This work is hard to place chronologically; it was published in 1923 and largely revised in the winter 1922-23, but Lawrence had been reading American literature with a view to this collection since 1915. The first version of the essays was begun in August 1917, after the completion of Women in Love, under the tentative title of The Transcendental Element in American Literature.

Studies is significant in that in it Lawrence first discusses the truth of the artist's words. He is extraordinarily severe with Crèvecoeur, Cooper, Poe, Hawthorne, calling them liars, their artistry mere wish-fulfilment. Lawrence's treatment of Cooper is a good example of his general attitude; he says: "Fenimore Cooper has probably done more than any writer to present the Red Man to the White Man. / But Cooper's presentation

is indeed a wish-fulfilment."⁷ And then Lawrence goes on to show that Cooper's picture of the Red Indian, is not at all true to fact or true to intuitive reality. Crèvecoeur's Nature, Poe's Love, and Hawthorne's Sin receive the same treatment.

Lawrence surprisingly does not damn this practice, which is a total contradiction of the theories he has proposed. Instead, in this tolerant summation Lawrence suddenly asserts that "out of a pattern of lies art weaves the truth," and says that although the artist says he is painting one moral which is a lie, the tale itself will reveal the truth of a situation, especially by means of its emotional impact. Unfortunately, Lawrence's own analyses of Franklin, Crèvecoeur, Cooper, and especially Poe, do not show that the truth is anywhere within the tale. He does not indicate where or how Cooper reveals that his support of the Red Man or of Democracy is a sham, or where Cooper's moral is undermined and the truth revealed. Hawthorne and Melville fare a little better, but the frank dishonesty revealed in the first four writers undermines Lawrence's thesis. Lawrence may say that "we can see through the subterfuge" of art "if we

⁷D.H. Lawrence, Studies in Classic American Literature (Garden City, New York: Doubleday-Anchor, 1951), p. 46. All subsequent quotations will be cited from this edition.

choose," but truly it is difficult to see Lawrence's truth in Franklin. The suspicion remains that Lawrence recognizes that art-speech may not represent the intellectual/emotional truth of a time, a place or a person, but that he accepts the evasion.

Surprisingly, Lawrence does not dismiss these artists' art out of hand because their words did not mirror their experience of the world. His treatment of Cooper is again indicative of his attitude to the others:

He hated democracy. So he evaded it, and had a nice dream of something beyond democracy. But he belonged to democracy all the while.

Evasion! -- Yet even that doesn't make the dream worthless.

Studies, p. 63

The tale is worthwhile, Lawrence suggests, because the tale as a dream or evasion of reality, may embody some truth. "You have got to pull the democratic and idealistic clothes off the American utterance, and see what you can of the dusky body of IT underneath" (Studies, p. 18).

In this work Lawrence accepts lies and evasions as he does at no other point in his writing. "The curious thing about art-speech is that it prevaricates so terribly, I mean it tells such lies. I suppose because we all the time tell ourselves lies" (Studies, p. 12). It is notable that Studies in Classic American Literature was finally revised about the time of Kangaroo in which

evasion in speech is advocated for the preservation of individual integrity.

For the next six years in his discussion of words Lawrence seems obsessed by the idea that words and meanings may have no intrinsic connection and may exist independently of one another. But he does not accept the situation, as he does in Studies. In his letters and articles he advocates many methods to remedy the situation, for he never seems to have given up the belief that words and meanings were intrinsically related, and must be related by each individual, in order to promote true livingness. As late as 1929 in the introduction to the privately printed edition of Pansies, he repeats that "In the beginning was the Word," and asserts that all words are God-like and of intrinsic value, unless their meanings are perverted in the minds of people (Phoenix, p. 280).

Between 1921 and 1925 Lawrence's remarks on words seem to show a general dissatisfaction with the way words are used in the world. It must be remembered that, to Lawrence, words are highly personal instruments which must be flexible enough to render meaning through each changing moment. If words are used to express the unreal, the ego created by society, or the abstract ideal of the mind, they are dead. As Lawrence recognized words as personal instruments only, he reacted when he saw them as socially controlled modes of communication. Lawrence

implies, during those years, that used in a general or social context, words are instruments of death, and at this point the theoretical writings reflect and reinforce the message of the novels. Implicitly, Lawrence is condemning any form of attempted verbal communication.

Lawrence attacks the way words are used in society in several ways. For example, in a letter to Earl Brewster in May 1921 Lawrence refutes the notion that one word may have a meaning which is generally understood by all men. He argues:

Ambition, avarice, self-love, vanity, friendship, generosity, public-spirit: the words are all the same: the actuality is so different in each individual, as to make the statement feeble. You need only to translate generosity into German or Russian, and you'll see that Mr. Hume knew nothing about it. As for liebe, Minne, l'amour, love, l'amore, Amor, and the two blessed Greek words we pretend stand for love: look at 'em. But I believe there is a certain life concord. But life expressions are so different, it is idiocy to count 'em like cash. Give me differences.⁸

Lawrence's argument here is cloudy and confused, but certain ideas stand forth. To take the last point first, Lawrence seems to agree to a similarity in the essential nature of all people, but he suggests that different peoples choose to express different facets of their emotions in the words they create. Liebe and

⁸D.H. Lawrence, The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence, II, ed. Harry Moore (New York: Viking, 1962), 652.

Minne are only two facets of the general emotional experience of love. At the same time he says that the words chosen to represent the complex emotion called love, cannot possibly convey the particular balance and complexity of each individual. Thus words as counters, as mediums of exchange between people, fail because of their very nature of belonging to many people and many experiences. Words, because of their general and social nature, completely fail to express the individual, and, as an extension, to participate in felicitous communication.

Lawrence most pointedly argues against communication in his "Foreword" to Fantasia of the Unconscious (May-July, 1921). In sections of this article Lawrence seems to support the attitude to words slowly evolved between 1913 and 1915:

I believe I am only trying to stammer out the first terms of a forgotten knowledge. . . . The soul must take the hint from the relics our scientists have so marvellously gathered out of the forgotten past, and from the hint develop a new living utterance. The spark is from dead wisdom, but the fire is life.

Fantasia, p. 8

On the previous pages, however, Lawrence has insisted on the personal nature of this "living utterance," and his highly idiosyncratic attitudes vitiate the brave speech about rediscovering forgotten knowledge for humanity. Lawrence is not writing for mankind, or even for "the

generality of readers." He implies that most people are not capable of understanding his book, and will regard it as "a rather . . . revolting mass of wordy nonsense"

(Fantasia, p. 5). He is sure that only "a limited few" will understand his words, and even further than that, he notes:

As for the limited few, in whom one must perforce find an answerer, I may as well say straight off that I stick to the solar plexus. That statement alone, I hope, will thin their numbers considerably.

Fantasia, p. 5

To me, this statement implies that Lawrence is quite consciously trying to distort any communication he may inadvertently establish by a highly personal and ambiguous use of words.

Idiosyncratic use of language and insistence on the limited nature of communications are simply extensions of Lawrence's theory of the completely individual nature of living language. In the "Foreword" to the Fantasia, however, what emerges from the context is not merely that Lawrence wants to preserve the individual quality of living language, but that he wishes to insist on human isolation and deny that language has any social, communicative functions.

Lawrence's denial of the social and communicative nature of language is, of course, the central reason for his dissatisfaction with words. It is generally agreed today that words tend to change meaning as the meaning

attached to them is changed gradually by a social milieu. In general, words and their meanings are controlled by society; they are not individual nor are they God-given absolutes. Given this basis, all Lawrence's dissatisfactions with the word are quite logical. No man knows if a word with a socially recognized meaning adequately describes a feeling which he himself experiences. Words may distort an individual emotion into that range which is commonly understood and communicated. By extension, a man speaking a language held in common with other men may feel that he is never able to express his individual Self.

In the essays written after 1921, Lawrence is generally preoccupied with the problem of the Word failing in its function toward the individual because of its general and social nature. In fact, he often seems pessimistic about the ability of the word to function at all. Many of the articles seem to repeat, in their several ways, Lawrence's despairing cry in "On Being Religious" (February, 1924): "There is no way. There is no Word. There is no light" (Phoenix, p. 724).

For example, in "Pan in America" (1924), Lawrence speaks of the God at the heart of all nature, and of the beauties of the individual manifestations of Nature. He describes an old Indian sitting by the campfire recognizing the beauty of each individual thing, and feeling the kinship of all. And then he continues:

So the old man says [these things about Nature], with his lightless Indian eyes. But he is careful never to utter one word of the mystery. Speech is the death of Pan, who can but laugh and sound the reed-flute.

Phoenix, p. 27

In this passage the word is no longer that which will react against the unconscious Self, the God within us, in order to establish it in the temporal realm as the spoken act. Nor is the word seen as any product of the unconscious God and the conscious Word. Instead the word is seen as a potential killer of the unconscious Self, destroyer of the God which only seems to exist in ". . . the Pan silence, that is so full of unutterable things" (p. 27). Under the impact of his fear of the social function of words Lawrence is driven to repudiate words altogether and find value in that silence which is praised in Kangaroo and The Plumed Serpent.

At times, in these later essays, Lawrence also repeats his warnings about the destructive power of the individual word. For example, in "Why the Novel Matters" (1925) Lawrence repeats the warnings against attributing absolute values to words which he had sounded early in Twilight in Italy and in the three early novels:

I don't believe in any dazzling revelation, or in any supreme Word. "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the Word of the Lord shall stand forever." That's the kind of stuff we've drugged ourselves with. As a matter of fact, the grass withereth, but comes up all the greener for that reason, after the rains. The

flower fadeth, and therefore the bud opens. But the Word of the Lord, being man-uttered and a mere vibration on the ether, becomes staler and staler, more and more boring, till at last we turn a deaf ear and it ceases to exist, far more finally than any withered grass. It is grass that renews its youth like the eagle, not any Word.

Phoenix, p. 536

In general, however, Lawrence's attacks on the word between 1925 and 1930 proceed through three categories which extend logically from one another. From despair about the function and nature of words Lawrence moves to explore the results if it is accepted that words have no intrinsic meaning. Secondly, Lawrence explores the significance of the sounds of words, and the instinctive emotional meanings conveyed in sounds. Lastly, he points out how social meanings and emotions tend to distort and corrupt words.

In 1927, for example, many of Lawrence's comments on words express the general dissatisfaction common in the previous years. In a letter to Aldous Huxley he confesses that he criticized Huxley's writing because "I myself am in a state of despair about the Word either written or spoken seriously" (Collected Letters, p. 1020). But, more particularly, his comments seem to centre on the word as lie. For example, in September, 1927, Lawrence published a short article "The Nightingale" in which he criticizes words more specifically: "You can say to somebody: 'I like you awfully, you look so beautiful this

morning, and she will believe it utterly, though your voice may really be vibrating with mortal hatred. The ear is so stupid, it will accept any amount of false money in words" (Phoenix, pp. 41-42).

This ability of words to lend themselves to lies bespeaks the essential falsity of words. This perception of the falseness of the Word leads in turn to Lawrence's seeing the word, not just as incomplete, but as an essentially negative mask which man creates and places over the physical universe, just as, in Kangaroo, he presents the power of words to mask and protect the vulnerability of Richard Lovat Somers. Lawrence completes this last section of the argument in Etruscan Places, written by October, 1927, when he comments:

. . . the Etruscan religion is concerned with all those physical and creative powers and forces which go to the building up and destroying of the soul: . . . We, on the contrary, say: In the beginning was the Word! -- and deny the physical universe true existence. We exist only in the Word, which is beaten out thin to cover, gild and hide all things.

Lawrence's dissatisfaction at the power of the word to lie about or deny the physical universe led him to explore another aspect of the word in the hope of finding a remedy. The further explorations are foreshadowed

⁹D.H. Lawrence, Etruscan Places (New York: Knopf, 1957), p. 110. All subsequent quotations will be cited from this edition.

in Etruscan Places when Lawrence, talking of the eternal quality of the nightingale's song, adds: "And in the beginning was not a Word, but a Chirrup" (Etruscan Places, p. 53). In the next few years Lawrence turned his attention to the actual sounds of words, to physical properties instead of mental.¹⁰

The sound of words had actually been of interest to Lawrence for a long time. In Twilight in Italy, as I mentioned above, the mindless power of the sensuous sound of words is seen as one of the four aspects of words. Earlier, in his comments on poetry in his letters, he makes much of the sound-music and rhythm of words. Indeed, as early as 1910, Lawrence had written to Rachel Annand Taylor commenting on the respective powers of consonantal and vowel music. After 1913, however, Lawrence does not again touch on the power or function of the physical sound of words until 1928. And at this later date he seems to return to the earlier idea with the hope that a thorough exploration could reveal some way to vitalize words that they perform their function according to the dictates of his philosophy.

The first clear indication of Lawrence's ideas in

¹⁰ Echoes of Lawrence's explorations on the sound of words can be found in his interest in music as pure sound, without intellectual content. In the novels, however, he demands that music avoid personal emotional content also. He insists that Aaron's flute songs and the chants in The Plumed Serpent be unemotional and impersonal.

this direction is found in the preface which he wrote for Harry Crosby's book of poems Chariot of the Sun in late April, 1928. In this preface Lawrence quotes a poem by Crosby called "Néant," and then comments:

It is a tissue of incongruity, in sound and sense. It means nothing, and it says nothing. And yet it has something to say. It even carries a dim suggestion of that which refuses to be said.

And therein lies the charm. It is a glimpse of chaos not reduced to order. But the chaos alive, not the chaos of matter. A glimpse of the living, untamed chaos. For the grand chaos is all alive, and everlasting. From it we draw our breath of life. If we shut ourselves off from it we stifle.

Phoenix, p. 258

and a few pages later he continues:

And in the chaotic re-echoing of the soul, wisps of sound curl round with curious soothing. . . .
. . . a vagueness and a suffusion which liberates the soul, and lets a new flame of desire flicker delicately up from the numbed body.

The suffused fragments are the best, those that are only comprehensible with the senses, with visions passing into touch and to sound. . . . The poetry of a regulated cosmos is nothing but a wire birdcage. Because in all living poetry the living chaos stirs, sun-suffused and sun-impulsive, and most subtly chaotic.

Phoenix, p. 260

The same desire for vagueness in words is apparent in other reviews written at this time. Lawrence almost seems to wish to escape from meaning altogether, to shut off the conscious mental processes and revel in

unthinking instinct.¹¹ His review of The Mother by Grazia Deledda is a curious reflection of his attitude. Lawrence's criticisms of the book are sharp: the writer becomes fascinated by background and forgets her theme; she keeps switching her sympathy from one person to another in her treatment of the story; she lacks courage to work out the theme she has set herself. It is not until the last paragraph that any positive enthusiasm is felt.

Lawrence writes about the inadequacy of the translation and the beauty of the original Italian. Then he digresses:

In the mouths of the simple people, Italian is a purely instinctive language, with the rhythm of instinctive rather than mental processes. There are also many instinct words with meanings never clearly mentally defined. In fact, nothing is brought to real mental clearness, everything goes by in a stream of more or less vague, more or less realized, feeling, with a natural mist or glow of sensation over everything, that counts more than the actual words said; and which, alas, it is almost impossible to reproduce in the more cut-and-dried northern languages, where every word has its fixed value and meaning, like so much coinage. A language can be killed by over-precision, killed especially as an effective medium for the conveyance of instinctive passion and instinctive emotion.¹²

Phoenix, pp. 265-266

¹¹This attitude may have some connection with Lawrence's fondness for vague and imprecise adjectives. The vague adjectives are a dominant factor in Women in Love, continue to a lesser degree in Aaron's Rod and Kangaroo, are again a strong factor in the expansions of The Plumed Serpent, and, to a lesser extent, in Lady Chatterley's Lover.

¹²This is one of the few times that Lawrence intimates that language has to "convey" anything.

Again and again in 1928 Lawrence writes about the power of instinctive or incantatory speech which is uncontrolled by the conscious intelligence. For example, when speaking of the Congregationalist hymns he loved as a child he says: "I don't know what 'the beauty of holiness' is exactly. It easily becomes cant, or nonsense. But if you don't think about it -- and why should you? -- it has a magic" (Phoenix II, p. 600). It is this incantatory speech with magic sound and little meaning which dominates the religious ritual in The Plumed Serpent.

It is rather difficult to follow the way in which Lawrence's ideas developed between 1928 and 1930. Obviously, as a starting point, Lawrence saw man's effective language reduced to that stream of sound which could best express the Self. It did not matter if the sounds were semi-instinctive, or if the conscious meanings were ambiguous or lacking. Man must attempt to express the Self without the trammelling of meaning imposed by society. Man was to "stammer out a new language" with a vengeance, to free his perceptions of his Self from the restrictions imposed by society.

A comment from "The Good Man" (October, 1926) shows how clearly Lawrence connected language with the predicament of man trapped and smothered in a restrictive society:

This is the agony of our human existence, that we can only feel things in conventional feeling-patterns. Because when these feeling-patterns become inadequate, when they will no longer body forth the workings of the yeasty soul, then we are in torture. It is like a deaf-mute trying to speak. Something is inadequate in the expression-apparatus, and we hear strange howlings. So are we now howling inarticulate, because what is yeastily working within us has no voice and no language.

Phoenix, p. 753

Lawrence seems to suggest here that if man tries to express himself in the modern age he will be inarticulate because of the incapacity of words. Presumably if man continued to express himself in inarticulate outpourings he would become slowly less and less unintelligible. A new community of language would be created as more and more men recognized and expressed the Self.¹³

In 1929 and 1930 Lawrence continued to point out the failure of modern man's use of words. He repeatedly encouraged men to be aware of their feelings and use any outpourings, however inarticulate, in order to express themselves. However, in 1929 Lawrence returned again to

¹³ It must be remembered that Lawrence believed in "a certain life concord" as he wrote to Earl Brewster (p. 250 above), and so men who were truly expressing themselves would presumably be able to recognize others who were doing the same, even though they were "intrinsically other." The implications of this argument, which inevitably extend toward communication, are totally ignored by Lawrence. This is one more indication of the way in which Lawrence almost compulsively avoided consideration of verbal communication.

attempt to correct the misuse of words by exposing the power of the Not-Self to exploit words and to destroy the individual response by this means. In these particular passages the Not-Self is seen to be to a large extent created and controlled by the individual's perception of "society."

Early in discussing his theory of "livingness" Lawrence had pointed out that, to him, man in society loses his individuality and becomes a mere puppet. The attack on social meanings of words is simply an extension of this personal belief, albeit a more heated and more forcible extension. In his discussion "Pornography and Obscenity" (August-September, 1929) Lawrence writes:

. . . every man has a mob-self and an individual self, in varying proportions, . . . The mass is forever vulgar, because it can't distinguish between its own original feelings and feelings which are diddled into existence by the exploiter. The public is always profane, because it is controlled from the outside, by the trickster, and never from the inside, by its own sincerity. The mob is always obscene, because it is always secondhand.

Phoenix, p. 172¹⁴

Having established the opposition of the mob and the Self, Lawrence points out the manner in which the mob-mind and the individual mind control words:

¹⁴ Compare Clifford's "second hand" language, above, pp. 216-217.

When it comes to the meaning of anything, even the simplest word, then you must pause. Because there are two great categories of meaning, for ever separate. There is mob-meaning, and there is individual meaning. Take even the word bread. The mob-meaning is merely: stuff made with white flour into loaves that you eat. But take the individual meaning of the word bread: the white, the brown, the corn-pone . . . -- there is no end to it all, and the word bread will take you to the ends of time and space, far-off down avenues of memory. But this is individual. The word bread will take the individual off on his own journey, and its meaning will be his own meaning, based on his own genuine imagination reactions. And when a word comes to us in its individual character, and starts in us the individual responses, it is great pleasure to us.

Phoenix, p. 171

The full implications of the above passage are not readily discernible. It helps to compare it with Lawrence's last pronouncement on words, found in his review of Eric Gill's Art Nonsense and Other Essays, written by Lawrence in late February 1930, shortly before his death. In this essay Lawrence comments:

It all depends what you make of the word God. To most of us today it is a fetish-word, dead, yet useful for invocation. It is not a question of Jesus. It is a question of God. Almighty God. We have to square ourselves with the very words. And to do so, we must rid them of their maddening moral import, and give them back -- Almighty God -- the old vital meaning: strength and glory and honour and might and beauty and wisdom.

Phoenix, p. 396.

Obviously the passage from the review reaffirms most explicitly the idea that I have suggested is implicit in all of Lawrence's thoughts on words, that is, that each

word has an intrinsic "true" meaning. Implicit in this passage is a second axiom which Lawrence accepts: that each man in his true self is able to recognize this "true" meaning and affirm it. As he had said in the essay "On Being Religious" (1924): "Man is so made, that the word God has a special effect on him, even if only to afford a safety-valve for his feelings when he must swear or burst" (Phoenix, p. 724).

If the idea of a "true" meaning which all men may recognize is kept in mind while reading the passages quoted from "Pornography and Obscenity," a difficulty is immediately apparent. According to this article the mob-meaning or general meaning of a word must be immediately rejected as only the individual meaning is true. But at the same time each word has a true meaning which all men will recognize because of the underlying truth of Self. The question arises then, "What is the difference between the "general" meaning and the "true" individual meaning which is recognized by everyone?"

Lawrence did not work out the apparent contradictions in his theoretical writings, although his attempts to do so are obvious in his handling of dialect and obscenity in Lady Chatterley's Lover. But working from data already given one can hypothesize. Presumably man must speak according to the living God-flame within himself. The "general" meaning of a word is to be avoided; it may be

mentally accurate or "correct," but as it is abstract and divorced from living experience, it is dead, it has no emotional vitality, and will help separate man from the vital emotional Self which gives man life. "General" meanings, presumably, are perfectly acceptable if they have the "liveliness" of individual experience behind them. The implications of the theory, however, totally ignore the reality of private language and the imposition of one person's private language on another.

Even to the end Lawrence is a consistent proponent of individual vitality or "livingness," and always he hopes to promote the furtherance of man's "livingness" by means of words. That there are problems raised by Lawrence's theories is undeniable, even if they are for the most part evaded in the theoretical writings and, to a slightly lesser extent, in the novels. The problem of verbal communication, for example, is avoided as much as possible. What is remarkable, however, is the consistency with which Lawrence maintains the early insights into the nature of the word given in "Foreword to Sons and Lovers" and in Twilight in Italy while he builds up his theories, and then wrestles with disintegrated fragments. The patterns he creates may be different but his ideas on the nature and function of words are consistently the same.

To Lawrence words are always part of the conscious function of man which can be used to express man's

wholeness, or misused, to smother the Self. Words themselves are composed of two parts, the meaning and the sound, structures which parallel the conscious Not-Self and the unconscious Self in man, and which must be brought into as precarious a balance. But words which balance sound and meaning and are used by man to express his Self, establish the "truth" of the Self, the truth of the Word, moment by moment, and add one flickering living tongue to the fire of life.

By emphasizing the role of words in establishing the individual Lawrence consistently avoids coming to grips with the whole problem of verbal and interpersonal communication. To be sure he touches on the notion of conveying emotion by the sound of words, but this idea is little developed, even in novels such as Aaron's Rod or The Plumed Serpent. The concept of exchanging ideas by means of words is rejected as false, destructive, and in some way threatening.

Part of the reason for Lawrence's inability to confront the notion of verbal communication is found in his highly personal and idiosyncratic notion of the nature of communication. From the writings it may be hypothesized that Lawrence's experience of communication leads him to desire a psychic rapport between human beings who almost merge identities in the experience. Lawrence both desires this rapport and fears the vulnerability of the close

union. Words and ideas expressed in the ecstasy of this bond seem to him to have almost overwhelming power of persuasion. As a result, in his discussions of words Lawrence seems to seek ways of establishing and preserving his own identity so that he may enjoy such an emotional rapport without fear. As he sees words as a threat, with coercive and dissociative powers, he also attempts to encourage the emotional union fostered by the sounds of words, while suppressing threatening intellectual content. At no time, however, can he consider ~~fully and dispassionately~~ the role of words in communicating both emotional and intellectual content to self-sustaining individuals who maintain separate identities while enjoying the rapport. Only in the novels is there a vague suggestion that such a form of communication may be possible. In The Rainbow the possibility is glimpsed and longed for; in Women in Love the possibility is described and the attempt to attain it abandoned.

It is reasonable to assume that Lawrence's theories about words are simply further and more extreme manifestations of the desire to establish individual identity and the fear of communication which are incorporated in the novels. The fears about communication presented in the novels are never fully explored in his theories. Thought about communication is evaded, although the desires for self-expression are discussed exhaustively.

It is no accident, therefore, that there tends to be a high incidence of deletion in those novels which treat the threatening notion of verbal communication which Lawrence attempts to evade. Nor is it unusual that expansion transformations should dominate the prose of those novels which deal with words as vehicles of self-expression.

Transformations per 1000 Words	White Peacock	Trespasser	Sons Lovers	The Rainbow	Women in Love	Aaron's Rod	Kangaroo	Plumed Serpent	Lady Chatterley
Noun Expansion									
-1 Noun Phrase Complementizer	-	-	1.300	.326	.870	1.520	1.440	-	-
1 Relative Clause (be)	1.600	.766	1.540	.652	1.960	1.520	1.910	1.000	-
2 Adjective	28.000	35.400	22.300	35.200	42.000	31.600	38.900	30.800	39.500
3 Relative Clause (have)	-	-	-	.489	.217	.254	-	-	.260
4 With - Phrase	.800	.383	1.020	.978	1.300	1.270	1.440	2.600	2.340
5 Relative Clause	3.400	3.420	4.610	3.100	4.570	2.540	4.780	6.400	2.860
6a Gerundive Adjective	7.600	4.930	3.590	6.200	2.170	2.030	1.910	3.800	4.400
6b Participial Adjective	2.000	2.650	3.340	2.900	4.120	4.560	2.870	2.400	2.070
7 Compound Nouns	4.600	6.840	9.220	4.700	6.950	6.950	10.000	10.000	5.450
8 Genitives or Of-Phrases	16.200	16.750	17.400	16.900	11.600	16.040	6.930	16.800	3.120
	64.200	71.139	64.320	71.445	75.757	67.924	70.180	73.800	60.000
Noun Replacement									
9 That + S (As Subject)	.200	.383	.256	-	.434	.508	.478	.200	.520
D10a (That) + S (As Object)	4.000	3.420	6.660	1.304	4.120	4.300	4.060	4.000	3.900
10b That + S (As Object)	.200	1.140	.512	.326	1.540	2.030	2.390	.200	.520
11 WH + S (Subject)	-	.383	-	.489	.434	.254	.239	.800	-
12 WH + S (Object)	1.000	2.650	1.540	.489	.651	1.770	1.670	.400	.520
13 WH + Infinitive (Subject)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14 WH + Infinitive (Object)	-	-	-	.326	-	.508	-	-	.260
15 Nominal Infinitive of Obligation	.400	-	.256	-	.217	1.020	.239	.200	.260
16 Infinitive As Subject	-	-	-	-	.434	1.270	.478	-	.520
17 Infinitive As Object	1.000	2.280	4.870	2.900	3.080	.762	.956	.800	1.560

Transformations per 1000 Words	White Peacock	Trespasser	Sons Lovers	The Rainbow	Women in Love	Aaron's Rod	Kangaroo	Plumed Serpent	Lady Chatterley
Noun Replacement, cont'd									
18 Infinitive of Purpose	2.800	.766	3.070	2.380	1.730	1.520	3.100	3.400	.520
19 Gerundive Nominal	.400	-	.256	.326	-	.506	-	.800	.260
20 Gerundive Nominal of Purpose	-	-	.512	-	.434	-	-	.200	-
21 Abstractive Nominal	.600	-	-	.103	.217	.254	-	-	.780
	10.600	11.022	17.932	8.643	13.291	14.702	13.610	1.000	9.620
Adjective Expansion									
22 Adjective + Infinitive	.800	2.280	2.046	1.140	1.960	1.020	1.190	1.400	.780
23 Adjective + That Clause	-	.383	-	-	.217	.254	-	.400	-
24a Adjective + Gerundive	-	-	.768	-	-	.254	.478	-	.260
24b Adjective + Prepositional Phrase	2.400	2.280	2.050	1.300	2.820	.254	1.440	1.400	.280
24c Compared Adjectives	2.200	3.830	2.050	1.300	4.340	3.036	4.320	6.010	2.600
	5.400	8.773	6.914	3.740	9.337	4.818	7.428	9.210	3.920

Transformations per 1000 Words	White Peacock	Trespasser	Sons Lovers	The Rainbow	Women in Love	Aaron's Rod	Kangaroo	Plumed Serpent	Lady Chatterley
Verb Expansion									
D25 Telescoped Progressive	1.600	3.020	1.788	.163	.217	7.620	.418	.400	.780
D26 Telescoped Progressive (With Two Word Verb + Gerund)	.400	.383	.256	-	-	-	.478	-	-
D27 Telescoped Future	.400	1.140	-	.163	2.170	-	.956	.200	.260
D28 Insert Infinitive Complement	.200	-	.768	-	2.170	.254	-	-	-
D29 Unmarked Infinitive Complement	1.200	1.140	3.070	.489	1.540	1.270	1.670	2.000	1.300
30 Telescoped Copular Complement	4.000	-	-	-	-	.254	-	-	-
31 Telescoped Adjective Complement	.200	-	1.280	.163	-	.506	-	1.800	1.040
32 Telescoped Locative Complement	.800	1.900	2.300	-	.870	-	.717	2.000	.520
33a Telescoped -Ing Complement	1.200	1.140	1.280	.489	.434	-	2.870	1.600	2.260
33b Verb Phrase Complement	3.600	4.170	5.120	2.770	2.390	4.550	6.700	2.600	3.640
	13.600	12.893	15.862	4.237	9.791	14.454	13.809	10.600	9.800
Adverbial Replacements									
34a Adverbial Replacement (Reverse)	11.800	9.500	11.150	3.980	7.600	6.100	4.540	4.600	6.500
34b Adverbial Replacement	3.600	5.680	3.580	3.100	3.910	2.010	2.890	3.400	3.120
35a Adverbial (Causal) Replacement Reversed	1.400	.766	3.300	1.500	1.740	2.530	3.590	2.400	5.450
35b Adverbial (Causal) Replacement	2.000	3.030	3.840	5.000	2.630	3.036	5.030	6.000	3.120
	18.800	18.976	21.870	13.580	15.880	13.676	16.050	16.400	18.190

Transformations per 1000 Words	White Peacock	Tres- passer	Sons Lovers	The Rainbow	Women in Love	Aaron's Rod	Kangaroo	Plumed Serpent	Lady Chatterley
Adverbial Expansion									
36a Adverbial Expansion of Man.	.600	2.270	3.300	-	.434	.254	.478	.400	1.018
36b Compared Adverbs	.200	1.140	.769	.163	.434	1.236	1.190	-	.776
36c Adverb + Prepositional Phrase	2.000	1.510	.256	.163	1.090	.254	1.910	1.200	.518
	2.800	4.920	4.325	.326	1.958	1.744	3.578	1.600	2.312
Conjoining Transformations									
37a And, But, Or, etc.	40.400	33.500	30.300	31.400	30.400	30.980	31.600	39.200	33.200
37b Punctuation ; , : -	18.000	15.100	8.200	23.000	33.000	18.500	22.800	16.000	14.000
37c Unnecessary Conjunction	3.000	3.030	8.720	12.600	10.000	9.630	14.100	10.800	11.400
	61.400	51.630	47.220	67.000	73.400	59.110	68.500	66.000	58.600
Deleting Transformations									
D38a Deleting Common Elements	31.200	29.500	26.400	31.240	42.100	30.730	27.500	33.400	40.000
D38b Deleting Necessary Words	2.600	5.300	1.290	2.630	6.080	11.453	18.200	12.400	7.500
D39a WH + Be Deletion in Rel. Clauses	6.200	15.500	5.640	7.520	19.150	5.820	14.600	8.200	9.600
D39b WH + Deletion in Relative Clauses	.200	1.140	.769	.815	1.740	1.020	1.430	.800	-
D40a Adverbial Embedment Deletion	.600	-	-	-	-	.254	-	.200	.260
D40b Extended Adverbial Deletion	15.000	13.250	6.920	12.600	10.200	3.540	7.650	6.600	8.050
D41 Subject or Object in Apposition	4.000	1.900	2.560	9.140	8.480	5.080	7.650	6.800	4.660
	59.800	66.590	43.579	63.945	87.750	57.897	77.030	68.400	70.070

Transformations per 1000 Words	White Peacock	Trespasser	Sons Lovers	The Rainbow	Women in Love	Aaron's Rod	Kangaroo	Plumed Serpent	Lady Chatterley
Simple Transformations									
42 Passive Transformation	1.420	1.510	2.560	2.440	2.190	2.060	3.830	1.800	2.080
43 It Inversion	.607	1.510	1.020	.906	1.080	.254	.717	.400	.520
44 There Inversion	3.600	2.270	3.300	2.440	4.780	4.550	4.070	.800	2.860
45 Question Transformation	5.400	6.050	5.380	6.200	11.950	8.100	5.980	7.800	7.530
46 Negation of Simple or Complex Sentences	7.850	8.330	11.280	9.770	13.690	15.190	12.201	12.320	10.900
47 Negation of Nouns	2.400	2.650	2.310	1.790	7.390	5.820	2.390	3.230	5.450
48 Imperative	6.200	2.650	3.800	1.630	2.820	3.800	.956	11.900	1.040
49 Cleft Sentence	.403	-	-	.326	.651	.254	.950	.404	.520
50 Contraction	7.400	4.550	8.460	2.650	7.830	11.900	10.300	5.400	9.350
51 Exclamation	4.000	3.030	3.080	2.570	3.700	1.270	2.630	1.200	4.660
52a Reversed Sentence Order	5.630	5.300	3.840	2.110	1.090	3.653	5.740	2.000	.779
	44.910	37.850	45.030	32.832	57.161	56.851	49.764	47.254	45.689
(Following Included in Above) (52a)									
52b Reversed Sentences Minus Introduction to Conversation	.603	2.690	.513	.977	1.090	.758	1.435	.888	.779

	White Peacock	Trespasser	Sons & Lovers	The Rainbow	Women in Love	Aaron's Rod	Kangaroo	Plumed Serpent	Lady Chatterley
	----- T O T A L S -----								
Noun Expan.	64.200	71.139	64.320	71.445	75.757	67.924	70.180	73.800	60.000
Noun Rep.	10.600	11.022	17.932	8.643	13.291	14.702	13.610	11.000	9.620
Adj. Ex.	5.400	8.773	6.914	3.740	9.337	4.818	7.428	9.210	3.920
Verb Ex.	13.600	12.893	15.862	4.237	9.791	14.454	13.809	10.600	9.800
Adv. Rep.	18.800	18.976	21.870	13.580	15.880	13.676	16.050	16.400	18.190
Adv. Ex.	2.800	4.920	4.325	.326	1.958	1.744	3.578	1.600	2.312
Conjoin	61.400	51.630	47.220	67.000	73.400	59.110	68.500	66.000	58.600
Del't.	59.800	66.590	43.579	63.945	87.750	57.897	77.030	68.400	70.070
Sim. Tr.	44.910	37.850	45.030	32.832	57.161	56.851	49.764	47.254	45.689
	281.510	283.793	267.052	265.748	344.325	291.176	319.949	304.264	278.201

Deletions	White Peacock	Trespasser	Sons & Lovers	The Rainbow	Women in Love	Aaron's Rod	Kangaroo	Plumed Serpent	Lady Chatterley
D-10a	4.000	3.420	6.660	1.304	4.120	4.300	4.060	4.000	3.900
D 25	1.600	3.020	1.788	.163	.217	7.620	.418	.400	.780
D 26	.400	.383	.256	-	-	-	.478	-	-
D 27	.400	1.140	-	.163	2.170	-	.956	.200	.260
D 28	.200	-	.768	-	2.170	.254	-	-	-
D 29	1.200	1.140	3.070	.489	1.540	1.270	1.670	2.000	1.300
D 38a to 41	59.800	66.590	43.579	63.945	87.750	57.897	77.030	68.400	70.070
TOTAL	67.600	75.693	56.121	66.064	97.967	71.341	84.612	75.000	76.310

	White Peacock	Trespasser	Sons & Lovers	The Rainbow	Women in Love	Aaron's Rod	Kangaroo	Plumed Serpent	Lady Chatterley
Noun Expansion	64.200	71.139	64.320	71.445	75.757	67.924	70.180	73.800	60.000
Noun Replacement Less - 10a	6.600	7.602	11.272	7.339	9.171	10.402	9.550	7.000	5.720
Adjective Expansion	5.400	8.773	6.914	3.740	9.337	4.818	7.428	9.210	3.920
Verb Expansion Less - 25 - 26 - 27 - 28 - 29	9.800	7.210	9.980	3.422	3.694	5.310	10.287	8.000	7.460
Adverbial Expansion	2.800	4.920	4.325	.326	1.958	1.744	3.578	1.600	2.312
	88.800	99.644	96.811	86.272	99.917	90.198	101.023	99.610	79.412
Less Deletions (Extract 2)	67.600	75.693	56.121	66.064	97.967	71.341	84.612	75.000	76.310
Difference	21.200	23.951	39.690	20.208	1.950	18.857	16.411	24.610	3.102

Transformations per 1000 Words	Lawrence The Rainbow	Virginia Woolf	Arnold Bennett	Thomas Hardy	Joseph Conrad	Lawrence Women in Love
<hr/> Noun Expansion <hr/>						
-1 Noun Phrase Complementizer	.326	-	.794	.858	-	.870
1 Relative Clause (Be)	.652	-	1.588	.858	-	1.960
2 Adjective	35.200	25.839	42.850	32.600	60.140	42.000
3 Relative Clause (Have)	.489	.957	-	-	-	.217
4 With - Phrase	.978	.957	2.382	.858	4.850	1.300
5 Relative Clause	3.100	15.310	11.116	9.440	1.940	4.570
6a Gerundive Adjective	6.200	.957	2.382	.858	3.880	2.170
6b Participial Adjective	2.900	1.914	1.588	2.574	2.910	4.120
7 Compound Nouns	4.700	8.613	1.588	11.233	14.550	6.950
8 Genitives and Of - Phrases	16.900	16.260	22.232	21.420	27.160	11.600
	71.445	70.807	86.520	80.699	115.430	75.757

--- Noun Replacement ---

9 That + S (As Subject)	-	-	.794	.858	-	.434
10a (That) + S (As Object)	1.304	4.785	4.764	8.580	5.820	4.120
10b That + S (As Object)	.326	3.828	2.382	.858	.970	1.540
11 WH + S (As Subject)	.489	-	-	1.716	-	.434
12 WH + S (As Object)	.489	2.871	.794	4.290	2.910	.651
13 WH + Infinitive (Subject)	-	-	-	-	-	-
14 WH + Infinitive (Object)	.326	-	-	-	-	-
15 Nom. Infinitive of Obligation	-	-	-	-	-	.217

cont'd.

Transformations per 1000 Words	Lawrence The Rainbow	Virginia Woolf	Arnold Bennett	Thomas Hardy	Joseph Conrad	Lawrence Women in Lov
Noun Replacement, cont'd						
16 Infinitive as Subject	-	.957	2.382	-	.970	.434
17 Infinitive as Object	2.900	.957	2.382	-	-	3.080
18 Infinitive of Purpose	2.380	2.871	.794	3.432	3.880	1.730
19 Gerundive Nominal	.326	.957	3.970	4.290	.970	-
20 Gerundive Nominal of Purpose	-	-	-	.858	-	.434
21 Abstractive Nominal	.103	-	-	-	-	.217
	8.643	17.226	18.262	24.882	15.520	13.291
Adjective Expansion						
22 Adjective + Infinitive	1.140	.957	2.382	-	3.880	1.960
23 Adjective + That - Clause	-	-	1.588	1.716	-	.217
24a Adjective + Gerundive	-	-	-	-	-	-
24b Adjective + Prepositional Phrase	1.300	-	.794	-	.970	2.820
24c Compared Adjectives	1.300	8.613	5.558	2.574	4.850	4.340
	3.740	9.570	10.322	4.290	9.700	9.337

Transformations per 1000 Words	Lawrence The Rainbow	Virginia Woolf	Arnold Bennett	Thomas Hardy	Joseph Conrad	Lawrence Women in Love
--------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	------------------	---------------------------

Verb Expansion

D 25	Telescoped Progressive	.163	.957	-	.858	.970	.217
D 26	Telescoped Progressive with Two Word Verb and Gerund	-	.957	-	-	-	-
D 27	Telescoped Future	.163	.957	1.588	.858	-	2.170
D 28	Insert Infinitive Complement	-	2.871	-	.858	.970	2.170
D 29	Unmarked Infinitive Complement	.489	1.914	-	-	-	1.540
30	Telescoped Copular Complement	-	-	-	1.716	-	-
31	Telescoped Adjective Complement	.163	1.914	.794	-	-	-
32	Telescoped Locative Complement	-	-	1.588	-	-	.870
33a	Telescoped Ing - Complement	.489	-	.794	1.716	2.910	.434
33b	Verb Phrase Complement	2.770	4.785	7.156	7.725	6.790	2.390
		4.237	14.355	11.920	13.731	11.640	9.791

Adverbial Replacement

34a	Adverbial Replacement (Reverse)	3.980	.957	3.970	6.000	5.820	7.600
34b	Adverbial Replacement	3.100	1.914	2.382	8.580	2.910	3.910
35a	Adverbial (Causal) Replacement (Reverse)	1.500	.957	.794	2.574	.970	1.740
35b	Adverbial (Causal) Replacement	5.000	4.785	3.176	5.174	-	2.630
		13.580	8.613	10.322	22.328	9.700	15.880

Transformations per 1000 Words	Lawrence The Rainbow	Virginia Woolf	Arnold Bennett	Thomas Hardy	Joseph Conrad	Lawrence Women in Love
<hr/>						
Adverbial Expansion						
<hr/>						
36a Adverbial Expansion of Manner	-	-	.794	1.716	.970	.434
36b Compared Adverbs	.163	-	-	.858	-	.434
36c Adverb + Prepositional Phrase	.163	-	-	.858	-	1.090
	.326	-	.794	3.432	.970	1.958
<hr/>						
Conjoining Transformations						
<hr/>						
37a And, But, Or, etc.	31.400	27.700	37.350	31.750	29.100	30.400
37b Punctuation ; , : --	23.000	46.950	10.600	23.190	41.710	33.000
37c Unnecessary Conjunction	12.600	3.828	2.382	7.725	.970	10.000
	67.000	78.478	50.332	62.665	71.780	73.400
<hr/>						
Deleting Transformations						
<hr/>						
38a Deleting Common Elements	31.240	44.000	32.554	24.880	32.010	42.100
38b Deleting Necessary Words	2.630	17.230	10.600	11.150	24.250	6.080
39a WH + Be Deletion in Rel. Clause	7.520	18.180	13.500	12.880	35.890	19.150
39b WH Deletion in Rel. Clause	.815	5.742	2.382	2.574	-	1.750
40a Adverbial Embedment Deletion	-	-	.794	2.574	1.940	-
cont'd.						

Transformations per 1000 Words	Lawrence The Rainbow	Virginia Woolf	Arnold Bennett	Thomas Hardy	Joseph Conrad	Lawrence Women in Love
Deleting Transformations, cont'd.						
D 40b Extended Adverbial Embedment Deletion	12.600	5.742	3.970	4.290	3.880	10.200
D 41 Subject or Object in Apposition	9.140	7.656	.794	4.290	6.790	8.480
	63.945	98.550	64.594	62.638	104.760	87.750

Simple Transformations

42 Passive Transformation	2.440	6.700	8.725	13.700	4.850	2.190
43 It - Inversion	.906	.957	3.176	.858	-	1.080
44 There - Inversion	2.440	3.828	.794	1.716	3.880	4.780
45 Question Transformation	6.200	5.742	7.146	8.580	.970	11.950
46 Negation of Simple or Complex Sentences	9.770	6.700	14.312	21.420	17.460	13.690
47 Negation of Nouns	1.790	.957	1.588	-	-	7.390
48 Imperative	1.630	1.914	-	.858	-	2.820
49 Cleft Sentence	.326	.957	-	2.574	4.850	.651
50 Contraction	2.650	5.742	10.600	12.870	4.850	7.820
51 Exclamation	2.570	1.914	.794	1.716	1.940	3.700
52a Reversed Sentence Order	2.110	9.570	4.764	12.014	-	1.090
	32.832	44.981	51.899	76.406	38.900	57.161

(Extract From the Above)

52b Reversed Sentence Order Less Introductions to	.977	4.785	1.588	2.576	-	1.090
--	------	-------	-------	-------	---	-------

	Lawrence The Rainbow	Virginia Woolf	Arnold Bennett	Thomas Hardy	Joseph Conrad	Lawrence Women in Love
Noun Expan.	71.445	70.807	86.520	80.699	115.430	75.757
Noun Rep.	8.643	17.226	18.262	24.882	15.520	13.291
Adj. Exp.	3.740	9.570	10.322	4.290	9.700	9.337
Verb Exp.	4.237	14.355	11.920	13.731	11.640	9.791
Adverb Rep.	13.580	8.613	10.322	22.328	9.700	15.880
Adverb Exp.	.326	-	.794	3.432	.970	1.958
Conjoin	67.000	78.478	50.332	62.665	71.780	73.400
Del. - Tr.	63.945	95.550	64.594	62.638	104.760	87.750
Sim. - Tr.	32.832	44.981	51.899	76.406	38.900	57.161
	265.748	339.580	294.965	351.071	378.400	344.325

Deletions	Lawrence The Rainbow	Virginia Woolf	Arnold Bennett	Thomas Hardy	Joseph Conrad	Lawrence Women in Love
D - 10a	1.304	4.785	4.764	8.580	5.820	4.120
D 25	.163	.957	-	.858	.970	.217
26	-	.957	-	-	-	-
27	.163	.957	1.588	.858	-	2.170
28	-	2.871	-	.858	.970	2.170
29	.489	1.914	-	-	-	1.540
D - 38a to 41	63.945	98.550	64.594	62.638	104.760	87.750
TOTALS	66.064	110.991	70.946	73.792	112.520	97.967

Expansion Totals	Lawrence The Rainbow	Virginia Woolf	Arnold Bennett	Thomas Hardy	Joseph Conrad	Lawrence Women in Love
Noun Expansion	71.445	70.807	86.520	80.699	115.430	75.757
Noun Replacement Less 10a	7.339	12.441	13.498	16.302	9.700	9.171
Adjective Expansion	3.740	9.570	10.322	4.290	9.700	9.337
Verb Expansion Less - 25, 26, 27, 28, 29	3.422	8.699	10.332	9.441	9.700	3.694
Adverbial Expansion	.326	-	.794	3.432	.970	1.958
Total	86.272	101.517	121.466	114.164	145.500	99.917
Less Deletions (Extract 2)	66.064	110.991	70.946	73.792	112.520	97.967
Difference	20.208	-(9.474)	50.520	40.372	32.980	1.950

Francis Kucera Word Frequency Tables

Total Words 1,014,232 = 8.1288%

Cannot 250-14-150

Never 698-15-307

No 2,201-15-469

Nobody 74-12-052

Not 4,609-15-495

Nothing 412-15-219

8,244

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aldington, Richard. D.H. Lawrence: Portrait of a Genius but. . . . New York: Collier Books, 1961.

Alexander, Edward. "Thomas Carlyle and D.H. Lawrence: A Parallel." University of Toronto Quarterly, XXVII (1967-8), 248-280.

Alldrift, Keith. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. London: Edward Arnold, 1971.

Anshen, Ruth Nanda. Language: An Enquiry into its Meaning and Function. New York: Harper and Bros., 1957.

Arnold, Armin. D.H. Lawrence and America. London: The Linden Press, 1958.

Auerbach, Erich. Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature. Trans. Willard Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.

Austin, J.L. How to do Things with Words: The William James Lectures. Harvard, 1955. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Bach, Emmon. An Introduction to Transformational Grammars. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Baker, William E. Syntax in English Poetry: 1870-1930. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Baldanza, Frank. "D.H. Lawrence's Song of Songs." Modern Fiction Studies, VII (1961), 106-114.

Bateman, Donald R., and Frank J. Zidonis. The Effect of a Study of Transformational Grammar on the Working of Ninth and Tenth Graders. National Council of Teachers of English Research Report No. 6. Champaign, Illinois, 1966.

Baum, Paull Franklin. . . . The Other Harmony of Prose. . . . : An Essay in English Prose Rhythm. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1952.

Beach, Joseph Warren. The Twentieth Century Novel. New York: Century, 1932.

- Beal, Anthony. D.H. Lawrence. Glasgow: Olive and Boyd, 1961.
- Beare, William. Latin Verse and European Song: A Study in Accent and Rhythm. London: Methuen, 1957.
- Bedient, Calvin. The Architects of the Self: George Eliot, D.H. Lawrence and E.M. Forster. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
- Beker, Miroslav. "'The Crown,' 'The Reality of Peace' and Women in Love." D.H. Lawrence Review, II (1969), 254-263.
- Beliaeva, L.J. "On the Inter-relation of Meaning and Rhythm in the Process of Reading." Psychological Abstracts, IV, iv (1958), 70-84.
- Bentley, Eric. A Century of Hero Worship: A Study of the Ideas of Heroism in Carlyle and Nietzsche with notes on Wagner, Spengler, Stephan George and D.H. Lawrence. 2nd edition. Boston: Beacon Press, 1944.
- Bergson, Henri. Creative Evolution. Trans. Arthur Mitchell. New York: Modern Library, 1944.
- Bickerton, Derek. "The Language of Women in Love." Review of English Literature, VIII, ii (1967), 56-67.
- Blackmur, R.P. "D.H. Lawrence and Expressive Form." Form and Value in Modern Poetry. New York: Doubleday, 1967, pp. 260-261.
- Bodkin, Maud. Archetypal Patterns in Literature: Psychological Studies of the Imagination. New York: Vintage Books, 1958.
- Booth, Wayne C. The Rhetoric of Fiction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Bradbury, Malcolm. The Social Context of Modern English Literature. Toronto: Copp Clark, 1971.
- Branda, Eldon S. "Textual Changes in Women in Love." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, VI (1965), 306-21.
- Brown, Edward Killoran. Rhythm in the Novel. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950.

- Brown, Huntingdon. Prose Styles: Five Primary Types. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1966.
- Burnet, John. Early Greek Philosophers. 4th edition. New York: Meridian, 1957.
- Burrow, Trigant. The Social Basis of Consciousness: A Study in Organic Psychology Based upon a Synthetic and Societal Concept of Neurosis. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1927.
- Burwell, Rose Marie. "A Catalogue of D.H. Lawrence's Reading from Early Childhood." D.H. Lawrence Review, III, iii (Fall, 1970), 201-294.
- Carr, H. Wildon. Henri Bergson: the Philosophy of Change. London, 1912.
- Carswell, Catherine. The Savage Pilgrimage: A Narrative of D.H. Lawrence. London: Chatto and Windus, 1932.
- Carter, Frederick. D. H. Lawrence and the Body Mystical. London: D. Carter, [1932].
- Casey, John. The Language of Criticism. London: Methuen, 1966.
- Caudwell, Christopher. Studies in a Dying Culture. London: John Lane, 1938.
- Cavitch, David. D.H. Lawrence and the New World. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Chambers, Jessie. D.H. Lawrence: A Personal Record by E.T. 2nd edition. London: Jonathan Cape, 1935.
- Chatman, Seymour and Samuel Levin, eds. Essays on the Language of Literature. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967.
- _____, eds. Literary Style: A Symposium. Oxford: University Press, 1971.
- Chomsky, Noam. Syntactic Structures. The Hague: Mouton, 1957.
- Clark, Ada Lawrence and G. Stuart Gelder. Young Lorenzo: The Early Life of D.H. Lawrence. Florence: Oriolo, 1931.

- Clark, L.D. Dark Night of the Body: D.H. Lawrence's "The Plumed Serpent." Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1964.
- Clarke, Colin, ed. "The Rainbow" and "Women in Love": A Casebook. London: Macmillan, 1969.
- _____. The River of Dissolution: D.H. Lawrence and English Romanticism. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Clements, A.L. "The Oquest for the Self: D.H. Lawrence's The Rainbow." Thoth, III (Spring, 1962), 90-100.
- Corke, Helen. D.H. Lawrence: The Croydon Years. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1965.
- Cowan, James C. D.H. Lawrence's American Journey: A Study in Literature and Myth. Cleveland, Ohio: Case Western Reserve University Press, 1970.
- Cowell, Catherine R. The Lawrentian Philosophy of Communication: An Analysis of Selected Essays of D.H. Lawrence. Diss. University of Denver, 1972.
- Daleski, H.M. The Forked Flame. London: Faber and Faber, 1965.
- Davie, Donald. Articulate Energy: An Enquiry into the Syntax of English Poetry. London: Routledge, 1955.
- Delavenay, Emile. D.H. Lawrence and Edward Carpenter: A Study in Edwardian Transition. London: Heinemann, 1971.
- _____. D.H. Lawrence: L'Homme et la Genèse de son Oeuvre. Les Années de Formation, 1885-1919. 2 vols. Paris: Klincksieck, 1969.
- Drain, Richard Leslie. Formative Influences on the Work of D.H. Lawrence. Diss. Cambridge, 1962.
- Draper, Ronald P. D.H. Lawrence. New York: Twayne, 1964.
- _____, ed. D.H. Lawrence: The Critical Heritage. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1970.
- _____. "Form and Tone in the Poetry of D.H. Lawrence." English Studies, XLIX (1968), 498-508.
- Ellmann, Richard. "Introduction." The Symbolist Movement in Literature by Arthur Symons. New York: Dutton, 1958.

Ellmann, Richard and Charles Feidelson, Jr., eds. The Modern Tradition: Backgrounds of Modern Literature. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Empson, William. Seven Types of Ambiguity. 3rd edition. New York: Meridian, 1955.

Englander, Ann. D.H. Lawrence: Technique as Evasion. Diss. Northwestern, 1966.

Fann, K.T. Wittgenstein's Conception of Philosophy. Oxford: Blackwell, 1969.

Fay, Eliot. Lorenzo in Search of the Sun: D.H. Lawrence in Italy, Mexico and the American South-West. London: Vision Press, 1955.

Fisher, William J. "Peace and Passivity: The Poetry of D.H. Lawrence." The South Atlantic Quarterly, LV (July, 1956), 337-348.

Fodor, Jerry A. and Jerrold J. Katz, eds. The Structure of Language: Readings in the Philosophy of Language. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Ford, George H. Double Measure: A Study of the Novels and Stories of D.H. Lawrence. New York: Holt, 1965.

_____, ed. "Prologue to Women in Love." Texas Quarterly, VI, 1 (1963), 98-111.

_____, ed. "'The Wedding' Chapter of Women in Love." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, VI (1964), 134-47.

Forrest, William Craig. Literary Kinesthesia: The Artistic Import of Sensuous Perception Concerned with the Articulatory Stratum of Literature. Diss. St. Louis, 1961.

Fowler, Roger, ed. Essays on Style and Language: Linguistic and Critical Approaches to Literary Style. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.

_____. An Introduction to Transformational Syntax. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.

_____. The Languages of Literature. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.

Frazer, James George. The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion. Abridged edition. New York: Macmillan, 1963.

Freeman, Mary. D.H. Lawrence: A Basic Study of his Ideas. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1955.

Freud, Sigmund. The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud. Ed. and trans. A.A. Brill. New York: Modern Library, 1938.

Friedman, Alan. "The Other Lawrence." Partisan Review, XXXVII, 11 (1970), 239-253.

Garcia, Reloy, and James Karabatsos. A Concordance to the Poetry of D.H. Lawrence. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1971.

_____. A Concordance to the Short Fiction of D.H. Lawrence. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1972.

Gellner, Ernest. Words and Things. London: Pellican, 1959

Gessman, Albert M. "An Introduction to Prosodics: Second Installment." Language Quarterly, II, 11 (1964), 2 - 10.

Goldin, Frederick. The Mirror of Narcissus in the Courtly Love Lyric. New York: Cornell University Press, 1967.

Goldman-Eisler, Frieda. "The Distributions of Pause Durations in Speech." Language and Speech, III-IV (1960-61), 232-237.

Goodheart, Eugene. The Utopian Vision of D.H. Lawrence. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Gordon, David J. D.H. Lawrence as a Literary Critic. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1966.

Gordon, George N. The Languages of Communication: A Logical and Psychological Examination. New York: Hastings House, 1969.

Gregory, Horace. D.H. Lawrence, Pilgrim of the Apocalypse: A Critical Study. New York: Martin Secker, 1933.

- Guntrip, Harry J.S. Psychoanalytic Theory, Therapy and the Self. New York: Basic Books, 1971.
- Gurko, Jane. The Flesh Made Word: A Study of Narrative and Stylistic Techniques in Five Novels by D.H. Lawrence. Diss. University of California, Berkeley, 1971.
- Haufmann, Eugenia, and Jacob Kasinin. Conceptual Thinking in Schizophrenia. New York: Nervous and Mental Diseases Monographs, 1942.
- Hardy, Barbara. The Appropriate Form: An Essay on the Novel. London: Athlone Press, 1964.
- Harrison, Jane Ellen. Ancient Art and Ritual. New York: Holt, 1913.
- Heidegger, Martin. An Introduction to Metaphysics. Trans. Ralph Manheim. Garden City, New York: Anchor, 1961.
- Heilbut, Anthony Otto. The Prose Style of D.H. Lawrence. Diss. Harvard, 1966.
- Heinemann, F.H. Existentialism and the Modern Predicament. New York: Harper, 1953.
- Hochman, Baruch. Another Ego: The Changing View of Self and Society in the Works of D.H. Lawrence. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1970.
- Hoffman, Frederick J., and Harry T. Moore, eds. The Achievement of D.H. Lawrence. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1953.
- Hormann, Hans. Psycholinguistics: An Introduction to Research and Theory. Trans. H.H. Stern. Berlin: Springer Verlag, 1971.
- Hough, Graham. The Dark Sun: A Study of D.H. Lawrence. New York: Capricorn Books, 1956.
- Hügel, Friedrich von. The Mystical Element of Religion as Studied in St. Catherine of Genoa and her Friends. 2nd edition. 2 vols. London: Dent, 1961.
- Jacobs, Roderick A., and Peter S. Rosenbaum. Transformations, Style, and Meaning. Waltham, Massachusetts: Xerox College Publishing, 1971.
- James, William. Some Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1920.

Jarrett-Kerr, Martin. D.H. Lawrence and Human Existence.
London: SCM Press, 1961.

Jaspers, Karl. Nietzsche: An Introduction to the Understanding of his Philosophical Activity. Trans. Charles F. Wallraff and Frederick J. Schmitz.
Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press, 1965.

Jastrow, Joseph. Notes in Psychology: James' Psychology.
Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1912.

Jespersen, Otto. Growth and Structure of the English Language. 9th edition. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1956.

Jong, J.P.B. de Josselin de. Lévi-Strauss's Theory on Kinship and Marriage. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1952.

Joost, Nicholas, and Alvin Sullivan. D.H. Lawrence and "The Dial". Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970.

Jung, Carl Gustav. Collected Works. Ed. Herbert Read, Michael Forham, Gerhard Adler. Trans. diverse. 17 vols. Bollingen Series. New York: Pantheon Books, 1953-1973.

Kasanin, Jacob. Language and Thought in Schizophrenia. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1944.

Katz, Jerrold J. The Philosophy of Language. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Kaufmann, Walter, ed. Existentialism: from Dostoevsky to Sartre. New York: Meridian, 1956.

_____. Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist. 3rd edition. Princeton, New Jersey: University Press, 1968.

Kermode, Frank. Lawrence. Bungay, Suffolk: Fontana, 1973.

_____. "Lawrence and the Apocalyptic Types." Critical Quarterly, X (1968), 14-38.

Klein, Sheldon. "Control of Style with a Generative Grammar." Language, XXXI, iv (1965), 619-631.

5

Kleinbard, David J. "Laing, Lawrence and the Maternal Cannibal." Psychoanalytic Review, LVIII (Spring, 1971), 5-13.

_____. "D.H. Lawrence and Ontological Insecurity." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXXIX, 1 (1974), 154-163.

Krishnamurthi, M.G. D.H. Lawrence: Tale as Medium. Mysore: Rao and Raghavan, 1970.

Kučera, Henry, and W. Nelson Francis. Computational Analysis of Present-Day American English. Providence, Rhode Island: Brown University Press, 1967.

Laffal, Julius. Pathological and Normal Language. New York: Atherton Press, 1965.

Laing, R.D. The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness. London: Pelican, 1960.

_____. The Self and Others: Further Studies in Sanity and Madness. London: Tavistock Publications, 1961.

_____. The Politics of Experience. London: Penguin, 1967.

Langer, Susanne K. Feeling and Form: A Theory of Art. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953.

_____. Philosophy in A New Key: A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948.

Lanier, Sidney. The Science of English Verse. London: Scribner, 1922.

_____. Music and Poetry: Essays upon some Aspects and Inter-relations of the Two Arts. New York: C. Scribner, 1924.

Lanz, Henry. The Physical Basis of Rime: An Essay on the Aesthetics of Sound. New York: Greenwood, 1968.

Lawrence, David Herbert. Aaron's Rod. London: T. Seltzer, 1922.

_____. Aaron's Rod. New York: Viking Compass, 1961.

- Lawrence, David Herbert. Apocalypse. Florence: G. Orioli, 1931.
- _____. The Centaur Letters. Ed. Edward D. McDonald. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1970.
- _____. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence. Ed. Harry T. Moore. New York: Viking, 1932.
- _____. The Complete Poems. Eds. V. de Sola Pinto and Warren Roberts. New York: Heineman, 1964.
- _____. D.H. Lawrence's Letters to Bertrand Russell. Ed. Harry T. Moore. New York: Gotham Books, 1948.
- _____. England, My England. London: Penguin, 1960.
- _____. The Escaped Cock. Paris: Black Sun Press, 1931.
- _____. Fantasia of the Unconscious and Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious. London: Heinemann, 1961.
- _____. The First Lady Chatterley. London: Penguin, 1972.
- _____. John Thomas and Lady Jane. London: Penguin, 1973.
- _____. Kangaroo. New York: Viking-Compass, 1960.
- _____. Lady Chatterley's Lover. New York: Grove Press, 1957.
- _____. Lawrence in Love: Letters to Louie Burrows. Ed. James T. Boulton. Nottingham: University of Nottingham Press, 1968.
- _____. The Letters of D.H. Lawrence. Ed. Aldous Huxley. London: Heinemann, 1932.
- _____. The Lost Girl. London: Heinemann, 1920.
- _____. Love Among the Haystacks. London: Penguin, 1960.
- _____. The Man Who Died. London: M. Secker, 1931.
- _____. Mornings in Mexico and Etruscan Places. London: Penguin, 1956.

Lawrence, David Herbert. Movements of European History.
Pseud. Lawrence H. Davison. Oxford: Oxford
University Press, 1925.

_____. Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H.
Lawrence. Ed. Edward D. McDonald. New York:
Viking Press, 1936.

_____. Phoenix II: Uncollected, Unpublished and
Other Prose Works. Ed. Warren Roberts and Harry T.
Moore. New York: Viking Press, 1968.

_____. The Plumed Serpent. London: Penguin, 1950.

_____. The Quest for Rananim: D.H. Lawrence's Letters
to S.S. Koteliensky, 1914-1933. Ed. George Zytaruk.
Montreal: McGill-Queens Press, 1970.

_____. The Rainbow. London: Penguin, 1949.

_____. The Rainbow. New York: Viking, 1960.

_____. Sea and Sardinia. New York: Viking Press,
1963.

_____. Sex, Literature and Censorship. Ed. Harry T.
Moore. New York: Viking-Compass, 1953.

_____. Sons and Lovers. New York: Viking-Compass,
1958.

_____. Sons and Lovers: Text, Background and
Criticism. Ed. Julian Moynahan. New York: Viking
Press, 1968.

_____. Studies in Classic American Literature. Garden
City, New York: Doubleday-Anchor, 1951.

_____. The Symbolic Meaning: The Uncollected Versions
of "Studies in Classic American Literature." Ed.
Armin Arnold. Fontwell, Arundel: Centaur Press,
1962.

_____. The Trespasser. London: Martin Secker, 1929.

_____. Twilight in Italy. London: Duckworth, 1916.

_____. Twilight in Italy. New York: Viking-Compass,
1962.

_____. The White Peacock. London: Heinemann, 1911.

Lawrence, David Herbert. The White Peacock. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1966.

_____. The Woman Who Rode Away. London: Penguin, 1961.

_____. Women in Love. London: Martin Secker, 1921.

_____. Women in Love. New York: Viking, 1960.

Lawrence, Frieda. Frieda Lawrence: the Memoirs and Correspondence. Ed. E.W. Tedlock, Jr. London: Heinemann, 1961.

_____. "Not I But the Wind. . . ." New York: Knopf, 1934.

Leavis, F.R. D.H. Lawrence: Novelist. London: Penguin, 1955.

Lehiste, Ilse. Supra-Segmentals. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1970.

Lerner, Lawrence. The Truth Tellers: Jane Austen, George Eliot, D.H. Lawrence. London: Chatto and Windus, 1967.

Lester, Mark, ed. Readings in Applied Transformational Grammar. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. Totemism. Trans. Rodney Needham. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

Levin, S.R. "Linguistic Structures in Poetry." Janua Linguarum, XXIII (1962).

Lewis, C. Day. The Poetic Image. London: Jonathan Cape, 1947.

Luhan, Mabel Dodge. Lorenzo in Taos. London: Martin Secker, 1933.

Mack, Maynard, and Ian Gregor, eds. Imagined Worlds: Essays on Some English Novels and Novelists in Honour of John Butts. London: Methuen, 1968.

Markel, Norman N., ed. Psycholinguistics: An Introduction to the Study of Speech and Personality. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1969.

Mayhall, Jane. "D.H. Lawrence: The Triumph of Texture." Western Humanities Review, XIX (1965), 161-174.

McCabe, Thomas H. Rhythm in D.H. Lawrence's Short Stories. Diss. Wisconsin, 1968.

Merrild, Knud. With D.H. Lawrence in New Mexico: A Memoir of D.H. Lawrence. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.

Miko, Stephen. Toward "Women in Love": The Emergence of a Lawrentian Esthetic. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1971.

_____, ed. Twentieth Century Interpretations of "Women in Love": A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Moore, Harry T., ed. A D.H. Lawrence Miscellany. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1959.

_____. The Intelligent Heart: The Story of D.H. Lawrence. New York: Heinemann, 1955.

_____. The Life and Works of D.H. Lawrence. New York: Twayne, 1957.

_____. "The Prose Style of D.H. Lawrence." Langue et Littérature, VIII (1961), 317-318.

_____, and Warren Roberts. D.H. Lawrence and his World. New York: Viking Press, 1966.

Moynahan, Julian. The Deed of Life. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Murray, Gilbert. Four Stages of Greek Religion. New York: Columbia University Press, 1912.

Murry, John Middleton. The Autobiography of J.M. Murry: Between Two Worlds. London: Julia Messner, 1936.

_____. Poets, Critics, Mystics: A Selection of Criticisms Written Between 1919 and 1955. Ed. Richard Rees. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Ill. University Press, 1970.

_____. The Problem of Style. Oxford: Humphrey Milford, 1922.

_____. Reminiscences of D.H. Lawrence. London: Jonathan Cape, 1933.

- Murry, John Middleton. Son of Woman: The Story of D.H. Lawrence. London: Jonathan Cape, 1931.
- Nehls, Edward, ed. D.H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography. 3 vols. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957-1959.
- Neumann, Erich. The Origins and History of Consciousness. Trans. R.E.C. Hall. New York: Pantheon, 1954.
- Newby, Frank Sheldon. Dialectical Form in "The Rainbow" and "Women in Love". Diss. Berkeley, 1966.
- Nichols, Ann Eljenholm. "Syntax and Style: Ambiguities in Lawrence's Twilight in Italy," College Composition and Communication, XVI (December, 1965), 261-6.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche. Ed. Oscar Levy. rpt. 1911 ed. New York: Russell and Russell, 1964.
- Nin, Anais. D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study. London: Spearman, 1961.
- Nowattney, Winifred. The Language Poets Use. London: Athlone Press, 1962.
- Ogden, C.K., and I.A. Richards. The Meaning of Meaning. 8th edition. London: Routledge and Paul, 1946.
- Ohmann, Richard M. Prolegomena to the Analysis of Prose Style. 1959.
- _____. Shaw: The Style and the Man. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1962.
- Ong, Walter J. The Presence of the Word: Some Prolegomena for Cultural and Religious History. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1967.
- Osgood, Charles E., and Thomas A. Sebeok, eds. Psycholinguistics: A Survey of Theory and Research Problems. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1965.
- Panichas, George A. Adventure in Consciousness: The Meaning of D.H. Lawrence's Religious Quest. The Hague, 1964.

Patterson, William Morrison. The Rhythm of Prose.
London, 1917.

Peckham, Morse. Beyond the Tragic Vision: The Quest for Identity in the Nineteenth Century. New York: George Braziller, 1962.

_____. Man's Rage for Chaos: Biology, Behaviour and the Arts. New York: Schocken Books, 1965.

Pitcher, George, ed. Wittgenstein: The Philosophical Investigations: A Collection of Critical Essays. Garden City, New York: Doubleday-Anchor, 1966.

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

Ringbom, Hakan. George Orwell as Essayist: A Stylistic Study. Abo, Finland: Acta Academiae Aboensis, 1973.

Roberts, Paul. Modern Grammar. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1967.

Roberts, Warren. A Bibliography of D.H. Lawrence. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1963.

Rosenbaum, Peter S. The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions. Research Monograph 47. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1967.

Rosenberg, Jay F., and Charles Travis, eds. Readings in the Philosophy of Language. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Sagar, Keith. The Art of D.H. Lawrence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

_____. "The Genesis of The Rainbow and Women in Love." D.H. Lawrence Review, I, 1 (1968), 179-199.

Saintsbury, George. A History of English Prose Rhythm. Bloomington, Indiana: University of Indiana Press, 1912.

Sale, Roger. Modern Heroism: Essays on D.H. Lawrence, William Empson and J.R.R. Tolkien. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1973.

_____. "The Narrative Technique of The Rainbow." Modern Fiction Studies, V (1959), 29-38.

- Sandoval, Patricia A. D.H. Lawrence: A Study of his Poetic Theories. Diss. Michigan, 1968.
- Sapir, Edward. Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1921.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. Course in General Linguistics. Eds. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye. Trans. Wade Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959.
- Schilpp, Paul Arthur. The Philosophy of Ernst Cassirer. New York: Tudor Publishing Co., 1949.
- Schopenhauer, Arthur. The Essential Schopenhauer. London: Unwin Books, [1962].
- _____. The Will to Live: Selected Writings of Arthur Schopenhauer. Ed. Richard Taylor. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1967.
- Scott, J.H. Rhythmic Prose. Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa Press, 1925.
- Sebeok, Thomas A., ed. Myth: A Symposium. Bloomington, Indiana: University of Indiana Press, 1958.
- _____, ed. Style in Language. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1960.
- Sewell, Elizabeth. The Orphic Voice. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1960.
- _____. The Structure of Poetry. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952.
- Shumaker, Wayne. Literature and the Irrational. New York: Washington Square Press, 1960.
- Sinha, R.K. Literary Influences in the Novels and Poems of D.H. Lawrence. Diss. Oxford, 1950.
- Smith, Barbara Hernstein. Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Snyder, Edward D. Hypnotic Poetry: A Study of Trance-Inducing Technique in Certain Poems and its Literary Significance. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1930.

Sontag, Frederick. "Mythical Thought and Metaphysical Language." Journal of Religion, XLI (1961), 109-117.

Spencer, John, and Nils Erik Enkvist and Michael Gregory. Linguistics and Style. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Spilka, Mark, ed. D.H. Lawrence: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, [1963].

_____. The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1955.

_____. "Was D.H. Lawrence A Symbolist?" Accent, XV (Winter, 1955), 49-60.

Stace, Walter Terence. Mysticism and Philosophy. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1960.

_____. The Teachings of the Mystics. New York: New American Library, 1960.

Stoll, John E. D.H. Lawrence's "Sons and Lovers": Self-encounter and Unknown Self. Muncie, Indiana: Ball State University Press, 1968.

_____. The Novels of D.H. Lawrence: A Search for Integration. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1971.

Tedlock, E.W. D.H. Lawrence, Artist and Rebel: A Study of Lawrence's Fiction. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1963.

Thatcher, David S. Nietzsche in England, 1890-1914. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

Tindall, William York. D.H. Lawrence and Susan His Cow. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939.

_____. Forces in Modern British Literature, 1885-1956. New York: Vintage Books, 1956.

Trager, George L., and Henry Lee Smith, Jr. An Outline of English Structure. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1951.

Turner, Ronald C. "Rhythmical Ordering as a Parameter of Linguistic Style." Pacific Coast Philology, V (April, 1970), 67-72.

Uitti, Karl D. Linguistics and Literary Theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Ullman, Stephen. The Image in the Modern French Novel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Unamuno, Miguel de. The Tragic Sense of Life. London: Fontana, 1962.

Underhill, Evelyn. Mysticism: A Study in the Nature of Development of Man's Spiritual Consciousness. New York: Dutton, 1961.

Vivas, Elise. D.H. Lawrence: The Failure and Triumph of Art. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1960.

Wallin, J.E. Wallace. "Researches on the Rhythm of Speech." Studies from the Yale Psychological Laboratory, IX (1901).

Weekley, Ernest. Adjectives and Other Words. London: John Murray, 1930.

_____. Cruelty to Words or First Aid for the Best-Seller. New York: Dutton, 1931.

_____. The English Language. London: Ernest Benn, 1928.

_____. Jack and Jill. London: John Murray, 1939.

_____. The Romance of Names. London: John Murray, 1914.

_____. The Romance of Words. London: John Murray, 1912.

_____. Surnames. London: John Murray, 1916.

Weiss, Daniel A. Oedipus in Nottingham. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 1962.

Werner, Heinz, and Bernard Kaplan. Symbol Formation: An Organismic-Developmental Approach to Language and the Expression of Thought. London: John Wiley and Sons, 1963.

Widmer, Kingsley. The Art of Perversity: D.H. Lawrence's Shorter Fictions. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 1962.

Williams, C.B. "A Note on the Statistical Analysis of Sentence-Length as a Criterion of Literary Style." Biometrika, XXXI (1940), 356-61.

Williams, Herbertien H. D.H. Lawrence: The Making of a Poet. Diss. Bowling Green, Indiana, 1968.

Williams, Raymond. Culture and Society (1780-1950). London: Chatto and Windus, 1958.

Yudhishta. Conflict in the Novels of D.H. Lawrence. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1969.

Yuen, Ren Chao. Language and Symbolic Systems. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.