



Evaluation Of Creativity And Originality Through Morality With Special Focus On D.H. Lawrence

Jyoti Gupta ¹, Dr. Babina Bohra ²

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

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

Abstract:

D.H. Lawrence's ethics underline adjustment of acts to ends i.e., adjustment of internal to external relations and all adjustment of one individual with another individual. It is the same with justice, the right of each man to do, as he pleases so long, he does not trespass upon the equal freedom of every other man. In this article, evaluation of creativity and originality through morality with special focus on D.H. Lawrence has been discussed.

Keywords: Creativity, Originality, Morality, D.H. Lawrence.

Introduction:

Lawrence's works have been the subject of contradictory and ambivalent criticism throughout history. For the consideration of his works, New Criticism, which favored in-depth textual research over biographical and ideological studies, was helpful. Lawrence, however, disagreed with the New Critics' preference for tradition. He was labelled a heretic as a result. Lawrence was criticized by Blackmur for valuing inspiration over art in his poetry, which he refers to as the error of faith in expressive form. It implies that if something is simply felt strongly enough, just putting it into words will give it a form that is satisfying. Sola Pinto defended Lawrence against Blackmur's criticism, claiming that his poetry was more than just an expression of his emotions. But the truth is that Lawrence held the opinion that the writer's passion must be spontaneously communicated in writing and that the form will come into being naturally from the force of the emotion that is trying to be represented.

The White Peacock:

It deals with the first phase of Lawrence's creative career from 1906 to 1913. The White Peacock, The Trespasser and Sons and Lovers are taken up for consideration. As all

Lawrence's works constitute one bulk, most of issues touched upon in the earliest novels are dealt in detail by Lawrence in his later mature fiction. "The White Peacock is like a dream before it is interpreted, or before the possibilities of interpretation has been entertained. Many of classic Laurentian motives which he was later to drag out into consciousness and expound and comment on here appear unanalyzed and unaware of their own significance." (Hough 26) It can be called a novel of exploration. Despite its technical faults from very beginning, Lawrence very clearly "establishes himself as a novelist absorbed in the interior life of his characters, yet accurately observant of appearances." (Niven, The Novels 10) In his early works while he grappled with the problem of personal relationships, it seems Lawrence was not quite sure about the cause of the conflicts.

Lawrence's morality in relationships as we have known from his essay "Morality and the Novel" centers around equitable relationship of sexes. This, he finds, is the only way to having freedom from conflicts, or to sublimate sex, or to be conscious whether they are spiritual or sensual. That is why he seeks a balance between the two. However, he feels that there is no norm; a norm is merely an abstraction. There is no such thing in human relations that we may call ought to be. Suffice is to say that the equilibrium is never perfect. In the present novel too, Lawrence searches for this equilibrium but finds no actual norm, a living norm. In chapter one, Lawrence searches for a girl for George. The narrator's sister and his mother are of the view that nobody will ever be good for George. The narrator, however, is sympathetic to his friend. We learn that George is rather good looking, though is a spoiled child. As we move into the second chapter, we learn that George is unsympathetic to animals, to their miseries. For Lawrence, love and life are the same, for both spring from the deep source of life or call it love. Therefore, when we torture animals or even destroy plants we hurt ourselves, for the same life flows in all organic and inorganic life. Emily comments on her brother's callousness saying: "He fills me with disgust." (WP 14)

The title of his next novel is not only significant but in fact it is the *leit-motif* of all his novels. The White Peacock is also a novel of human adjustments, or better maladjustments. We confirm from maladjusted relationship of our narrator's parents. One day his mother receives a letter that her father will not last a day or two because his kidneys are nearly gone. The parents parted long back. Cyril can hardly remember his father— a tall, handsome, dark man. The marriage had been none happy. What Cyril remembers, is that his father was vulgar — a liar, one who deceived his mother. Whether his father was a cheat or not, this was what he remembered. The old man now dying after eighteen years of broken marriage. He wanted to live with the family but Cyril's mother kept him away. The mother now feels sorry. She wants to see him at the earliest, accompanied by her son she leaves for the destination. But by that time he is dead. Frank lived all alone. He lived poorly. They learnt that he was very down at last. Though a generous fellow, he was always hated as people could not get to the bottom of him. As Spilka writes, "life takes place in the individual. The central law of all

organic life is that each organic intrinsically isolate and single in itself. But the secondary law of life is this: that the individual can only be fulfilled through contact and communion with his fellow men and women.”(Love Ethic 127) Lawrence evolved his ethics. The death of Cyril’s father changes their lives. It is not that the family suffered a great grief; the chief trouble is the same question: Why do human relationships fail? Meanwhile, other relationships are developing for sometimes. Cyril’s sister is being wooed by Leslie. Leslie has that fine physique; he has much animal vigor. He is exceedingly attractive, though he is not handsome but he had frank wholesome laugh. He pays frequent visits to show his love. Lettie also feels attracted towards Leslie. They sometime quarrel, but mostly they love each other.

Another young man is George, Emily’s brother. George and Cyril are also friends and lives not a great distance from each other. George is happy to be a farmer. He often talks about sex and farming life. He loves his comfort more than anything else. That is why he cannot find a girl. He wants to marry someone with fortune. It is for this reason he wants Lettie to be his wife. He makes advances towards her, even when the girl is engaged to Leslie.

Lawrence is of the view as the case of George suggests, the education and upbringing of a child should be towards the full end and harmonious development. The final aim is not to know, as he put it in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, “but to be.”(FU 200) Know thyself, the Socratic formulation is a more risky motto than “to be.” For Lawrence knowledge is not for the sake of knowing. It is awakening to primal consciousness being. That is the last motto for Lawrence and it is not purely mental. Human development rests on full development in terms of full adjustment with others, not self-assertion, but self-adjustment. For Lawrence a more adjusted man is a more developed person. And although he is aware that in human relationships this is an abstraction, an ideal more aspired for, less achieved. That is why this ideal is always a trembling balance, like *The Rainbow*. “Morality for him is a delicate act of adjustment on the soul’s part,” (FU 41) as he says in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. An adjustment that Lawrence claims is the highest achievement of the human race — the individual adjusted with other individual. That is all through his fiction he is concerned with establishing this equilibrium. Love is one aspect in human life which can bring two people together, but Lawrence cautions, that this relationship can’t be forced into the old mould.

Lawrence feels it necessary to bring about a balance between the two opposites to achieve fulfillment in life. But in *The White Peacock* almost all the characters fail to achieve this balance, all the female characters lead thwarted lives because of the male they choose. None of the characters achieve self - fulfillment which is essential to make marriage a success. The Lettie-Leslie- George triangle is at the heart of the book. “In *The White Peacock* Lawrence creates the fully engaging girl Lettie, whose fully calculating choice of Leslie as a socially valuable husband destroys her own integrity and breaks the spirit of her more sensual lover, George.” (Cavitch 19)

Lettie's relationship to George is anchored in the blood, seeming at times to obliterate mental consciousness. When they look at each other, their veins are filled with "fiery electricity" and both feel "the blood beating madly in their necks." (WP 44) But Lettie is not willing to submit to the call of blood - consciousness. Her resistance to instinct shows her willfulness to resist the natural flow of her life resulting in disillusionment after she marries Leslie. What really kindles Lettie is not the male in Leslie, but the flattering positions he commands through his social position. Even after her marriage, she remains divided about the choice she has made. The error of Lettie's decision lies in the fact that by rejecting George, she has denied the fundamental needs within herself. After her marriage, she becomes absorbed in her children and bourgeois world of surface values.

Lawrence makes it clear that Lettie falls apart at the innermost core of her being. She begins the willed negation of one half of her being and allows to lapse in the life of her children. Such a sacrifice of her own "self" is a denial of the responsibility of her own development. Unlike Ursula and Constance Chatterley, Lettie lacks the courage to be herself. Through Lettie's mistakes, Lawrence illustrates a general principle that concerned him throughout his life that fulfillment of self is more important than winning success, or finding economic security or satisfying oneself at the procreative level. He declared: "The final aim of every living thing, creature, or being is the full achievement of itself." (P 403) Lettie's life becomes a "barren futility", for she reduced herself to "a small indoor existence." Only occasionally did she hear the "winds of life outside." Sometimes she crawled to be out in the "black keen storm," and was driven to the door. But "feminine caution kept her from stepping over the threshold." (WP 331) Frank Kermode writes: "The sexual act is the leap into the unknown; the deposition of seed for continuance of the race is a consequence, not a cause, of this poppy like-fulfillment. That she bears children is not a woman's significance. But she bears herself that is her supreme and risky fate." (Lawrence 39)

George's own marriage to Meg also proves disastrous. They have children but George shirks his responsibilities. Meg, who has her own money, assumes the role of the dominating female thwarting the natural male. Meg is the prototype of Mrs. Morel in *Sons and Lovers*. George complains that Meg never found any "pleasure" in him as she does in her "children." (WP 317) Their marriage is "more of a dual than a duet" (WP 342). As Schopenhauer writes: "Happy marriages are well known to be rare; just because it lies in the very nature of marriage that its chief end is not present, but the coming generation." (Schopenhauer 377) Meg wins because she has the support of her children. Lawrence very pertinently remarks, "a woman who has her child in her arms is a tower of strength." (WP 332) But for this failure, the fault also lies in George who by denying the "responsibilities" is also denying his "profoundest impulse" or "his deepest soul." (FU100) He is incapable of giving himself to his wife that "vital part that she wants." (WP 343) What man in her reckoning, requires of the woman is no more than the satisfaction of sexual instinct. Thus, she rejects. Lawrence

remarks:

A woman is so ready to disclaim the body of a man's love; she yields him her own soft beauty with so much gentle patience and regret; she clings to his neck, to his head and his cheeks, fondling them for the soul's meaning that is there, and shrinking from his passionate limbs and his body... (WP 317)

The world of *The White Peacock* is "dark," "grey," full of "gloom" (WP 13) offering a sharp contrast with the exquisite description of the beauties of the nature to the human world. Lawrence believed that the "mission of art" is to "bring us into sympathy with as many men, as many objects, as many phenomena as possible. We are forever trying to unite ourselves with the universe." (PII226) The mechanistic tendencies in the modern civilization are destroying the spontaneous creative being of man making him incapable of achieving self-fulfillment.

Although Lawrence is not yet certain, he is trying to find out the cause of maladjustment in life. "Life is blighted, because men and women have been driven far apart and have no getting together again." (Moynahan 10) unfulfilled by man, woman becomes the white peacock, whereas unfulfilled by woman; man gives way to the anti-social destructiveness of an Annabel or self-destructiveness drunkenness of George. The remedy is suggested vaguely when Annabel says: "Tell a woman no to come in a wood till she can look at natural thing—she might see something." (WP 157) That is to say, a woman should accept natural, instinctive and sensual life in its wholeness, untrammelled by spirituality or idealism. Only then she can come in close contact and achieve self-fulfillment. It is this quest for "the instinctive awareness" which Lawrence continues in his other novels also and which is necessary for a fulfilled life on this earth.

Annabel is Lawrence's weapon against *The White Peacock*. It is he, who in rejecting all, towards which Lawrence's own mother, Lettie and Emily strive—culture, wealth and matriarchal domination symbolizes Lawrence's as yet unconscious rejection of these. Like Lawrence, Cyril's resentment against woman is rooted in his deep need for coming to terms with life, not with one part or another, but with the whole living composite. At the end we see Emily retired to her house and garden, George degenerated past individuality, Lettie wealthy but bored and Cyril in some no man's land waiting. All the relations are away from notion of perfected relations. Thus, in the very first novel,

Lawrence put his morality so clearly and perhaps so nicely that there is no mistaking it in his novels to come. Moynahan calls this novel "a stagnant pool." (Ibid 8) dimly reflecting some of important issues, Lawrence was later to take up. Despite criticism it can be said that the *White Peacock* is an important work as it points towards the direction. Lawrence's art was to take later. In the novels to follow Lawrence grows subtlest in his critique of human follies more particularly when sex goes into the mind.

The Trespasser:

The Trespasser is Lawrence's second novel, the shortest of all his novels. It is considered the worst of all his novels. It was published in 1912.

The Trespasser is definitely an advance over the first novel and makes a crucial stage in the development of Lawrence's creative genius. In *The White Peacock*, Lawrence is unsure about his vision of life. The Trespasser can be seen as his agonized search to realize his vision. But one can see that he still did not grasp it fully. Lawrence himself described the first two novels as "a florid prose poem, or a decorated idyll running to seed in realism." (CL 66-67) John Worthen considered the novel as "something of a living fossil." (Idea of Novel 22) The Trespasser deals implicitly with the question of conflicts in relations. No attempt has been made on the part of the novelist to reconcile the two opposites into oneness. Perhaps Lawrence himself was in the process of knowing the cause of this conflict and its resultant effects on the human psyche. At the end of 1909, shortly after Lawrence had finished *The White Peacock*, Hueffer, at the strength of "Odour of Chrysanthemums," had prescribed for him a course of workingman novels. But his next novel *The Trespasser* is ever farther from his family experience and the mining background than *The White Peacock*, being about a tragic love affair between middle-class people, in London and Isle of Wight.

It is based on Helen Corke's affair with an older married man, at Freshwater, Isle of Wight, who had hanged himself shortly after his return. The Saga of Siegmund was Lawrence's original title for *The Trespasser*. Helen Corke was amazed that Lawrence, never having met her lover, and with so little help from her, could enter so deeply into the relationship. Lawrence was able to identify so closely with Siegmund not only because he was falling in love with Helen, but — also because the pressure which had driven Siegmund to his death was primarily the same frustrations, Lawrence was suffering at hand of all his girl friend's Agnes Holt, Jessie Chambers, and now Helen herself. As David Daiches writes "How is love possible in a world of individuals imprisoned by their own private and unique consciousness? Loneliness is great reality, love the great necessity, how can the two be brought together?" (Modern World 141)

The protagonist Siegmund, who is a married man, has no fulfillment in his life. For years, he has "suppressed his soul, in a kind of mechanical despair doing his duty" (T 13) to his wife and children, what he gets in return is alienation. Siegmund wants to "break free" from the dull mechanical routine life in London. He wants to escape with Helena on the Isle of Wight to have a few days of joy. But it is no easy task for him, for it meant "breaking of bond, a severing of blood ties" and yet at the same times "a sort of new birth." (T13)

Lawrence probably searches for the cause of human struggle. For Helena love is nearly pure passion, a half-dream, but for Siegmund it is nothing sort of bodily passions. Like Miriam, "she wanted to sacrifice to him, make herself a burning altar to him and she wanted to

possess him.” (T 48) During the first night of their holiday she meets his passion and love. It is not his passion she wants. But she desires that he should want her madly, and that he should have her all everything. Then Lawrence finds out the cause of human satisfaction and dissatisfaction all at once, as he writes: “It was a wonderful night to him. It restored to him the full will to live. But she felt it destroyed her. Her soul seemed blasted.” (T 48)

Siegmund looks at himself with disapproval, though his body is full of delight. This means his mind disapproves the act. Helena feels it more acutely. Hence while their bodies approve, their minds feel the remorse of it. As Keith Sagar writes: “All Lawrence’s hatred of the dreaming woman; his sense of her destructiveness went into his work. In *The White Peacock* it was Lettie, in *The Trespasser* Helena.” (Lzfe into Art 89).

Nevertheless, they continue to drag during the rest of their holiday in between the phrases of happiness; we can see the distance between them.

While she kisses him swiftly, he lays still, his heart beating heavily; “he was almost afraid of the strange ecstasy she concentrated on him...” looking at him, her heart melted with sorrowful pity. Lawrence’s reading of human psyche with reference to human sexuality is Pre -Freudian. In his book *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, he traces the unconscious from the earliest time. This enables Lawrence to focus on the source of life, mysterious though, is the spring of all life calls it solar-plexes or carbon in the coal. Lawrence wants parents to tell their children after puberty what it means to be the sexual, so that they know that sex is but the source of life. That is why he does not want sex in the head, but rather in the body.

Commenting on nature of their relationship, Lawrence writes that such women who lead a mental life of abstractions suppress the “gross and animal” in man. Such women, who want the “flower of spirit” and the soul, “destroy the natural man.” (T 84) They love their men madly only to “possess” them completely. They are not like an ordinary woman who is “a great potential force” springing up from the “soul of life.” (T 84) Helena wants Siegmund’s “vitality” to “infuse” her and make her “live” but he should not demand “the return of the female impulse into him.” (P 498) Siegmund wants “consummation” “that deepest experience” with her which will connect him with “the unknown and undiscovered which lies in the body of man and woman.” He wants to receive from her “the quickening, the primitive seed and impulse which should start him to a new birth.” (P 503) But he fails to get this fulfillment because there is no “dynamic polarity” (FU 106) in this relationship.

Siegmund also is responsible for this failure of relationship. He could never act spontaneously: “The centre of sensual, manly independence, of exultation in the sturdy, defiant self-willfulness, masterfulness and pride lay suppressed in him.”(FU 117) He lacks the courage to be himself and face reality. Living his life from sympathetic mode only and the failure to balance him, leads to disaster. Thus we have seen that the basic conflict is responsible for the failure of any meaningful relationship between Siegmund and Helena and

also with others.

Both set judgment on each other. In this triangle of love Siegmund has two women, and he hates both of them. But he does not want himself to be judged by either of them. In fact, he recognizes in them the source of life — great and impersonal. He will like to live alone, away from Helena but the very next moment he would desire for her. Regarding children, Siegmund feels that if he has one, he should be damned by the thought of the other. The guilt that burdens his mind is on account of his wife and children—she will be in endless difficulty. She will keep a red shore inflamed against him. So he thinks that thing will go from bad to worse; it will be gangrene of shame. With regard to Helena, as he says: “I should have nothing but mortification. When she was asleep I could not look at her...” (T 120)

Turning to Siegmund’s state of mind we learn that he remains in a sort of stupor the whole afternoon. Seeking him in this state, his wife’s restraining gives way to an outburst of angry hysteria. Her first concern is about money. She knows that he is no more interested in work. And then she blames him by saying that he has his fling and that he will want to keep on. She reminds him that he has his children back home: “Whose are they? You talk about shirking the engagement, but who is going to be responsible for your children, do you think?” (T 144) In reply he says that he is not shirking the engagement but what it amounts to, she asks when he sulks all day. As a mother she says, she will not leave little children — to the workhouse or anything. And though he assures her that there is no need for children to labor, Beatrice is in a terrible mood. She calls him a coward — a miserable coward. It is thus she tortures him. He can bear her but not the way his children look at him. As Lawrence writes in *Fantasia of the Unconscious* that: “The woman is now the responsible party, the law-giver, the culture bearer. She is the conscious guide and director of the man. She bears his soul between two hands. And her sex is just a function or an instrument of power.” (FU107)

We may think we marry because we are in love; sex is rather “nasty fiasco.” (FU 95) We may still keep up a pretense of being friends and nice love. But sex spins wilder in the head than ever. There is either a family of the children whom the dissatisfied parents can devote them to ... or else there is a divorce. This shows Lawrence’s distaste for sex because it produces generation of children — the more they are, the unhappy mankind feels. The parents sacrifice their personal happiness in the grip of sexuality: “And the great dynamic centers nothing has happened at all. Blank nothing. There has been no vital interchange at all in the whole of this beautiful marriage affair.” (FU 94) Siegmund and Beatrice though not divorced live virtually separate lives. While she continues to drudge for her children, Siegmund seeks happiness elsewhere. As Lawrence writes this is the case of the parents: “They are criminal trespasser in that field.” The title of the novel is suggested in this regard. It may be Helena refer to as the trespasser but on another level both Siegmund and Beatrice are each a trespasser in each other’s life. They establish a circle to be broken either by divorce or by death. Siegmund choose the later course.

This is the same situation in which Paul found himself. Lawrence wrote to his friend that Paul was moving towards death, as part of his dilemma. But Lawrence would not have him commit suicide. As we have already seen that suicide offers no solution, neither to the person dying nor to those living after him. Siegmund is presently in a frame of mind to take death as a refuge from pain. It is in this conflict that Siegmund ends his life. The Trespasser brings to a tragic conclusion the conflicts introduced in *The White Peacock*. Siegmund kills himself because he cannot resolve the situation between himself and two women. Due to this imbalance both the relation tends to become immoral and ends with immoral act of suicide. Siegmund failed to recognize what Lawrence puts in *Apocalypse*:

For man, the vast marvel is to be alive. For man, as for flower and beast and bird, the supreme triumph is to be most vividly, most perfectly alive. (A 199)

Sons And Lovers:

With the death of Siegmund in *The Trespasser*, Lawrence's quest for the resolution of conflicts does not end; rather it begins afresh in *Sons and Lovers*. The original title of this novel was *Paul Morel*, which it long retained.

Lawrence writes about the novel: "Paul Morel will be a novel — not a florid prose poem, or a decorated idyll, running to seed in realism." (CL 66) Our reading shows, as we have seen in the first two novels that sexual life remains impure, and so do human relationships, so long sex is diverted from its primary function. That is why Lawrence has been reminding us not to read the novel merely as an autobiography. There is something of the philosophical in it. Therefore, he asked us to trust the tale and not the teller. The conflicts which shortly develop between them is to be seen in Lawrence's moral context that sex has to be pure, which means that it has to be for the sake of the sex and for the sake of relationships on an even keel. So that mankind might live happily. David Daiches while discussing *Sons and Lovers* rightly observes: "Insistently like a drum beat in the background of novel runs the question: What is, what ought to be the most vital relation between man and woman?" (*New World* 145) The first part of the novel deals with the maladjustment of the Morels. In 1912 Lawrence penned his own analysis of *Sons and Lovers* in a letter written to a friend, Edward Garnett:

A woman of character and refinement goes into the lower class and has not satisfaction in her own life. She has had a passion for her husband. But as her sons grow up, she selects them as lovers... when they come to manhood, they can't love, because their mother is the strongest power in their lives and holds them. As soon as the young man come into contact with women there is split. All the sons hate and are jealous of the father. The battle goes on between the mother and girl with the son as object. (CL 160)

The novel begins with early married life of Morels. At the age of twenty-three, Miss Gertrude Coppard met, at a Christmas party, a young man by the name Walter Morel. The young man

at the time was twenty-seven years old. He had an excellent physique. Heat once became interested in Gertrude and she was attracted by him. She thought him rather wonderful, never having met anyone like him. This is despite the fact, that she with a Puritanical mind was rather contemptuous of dancing; she had not slightest inclined ion towards that accomplishment. Such is nature's doing that a high minded lady melt for a dusky miner; as reconciliation of opposites is the law of nature. "There the dusky, golden softness of this man's sensuous flame of life, that flowed off his flesh like the flame from a candle, not baffled and gripped into incandescence by thought and spirit as her life was, seemed to her something wonderful, beyond her." (SL 13)

This shows Lawrence's concern for the blood-consciousness, where the human character is composed, not in the mind, in the consciousness, but in the depth of the unconscious, the carbon in the coal. The ordinary novel of sexes, traces the history of the diamond but Lawrence would say diamond is carbon. We look at the coal but that burns are the carbon. So his diamond might be the coal but his theme is carbon the inner reality. The voice of the self in its wholeness, to guide us in the course of our life and this wholeness of our being is the "Holy Ghost." The true unconscious is the first bubbling of life in us, the will to live; and is prior to any mentality. It is spontaneous life motive in every organism or may be called blood-consciousness.

After their marriage, they shifted to Bottoms. Mrs. Morel was not anxious to move into the Bottoms but it was the best she could do. Moreover, she had an end house in one of the top blocks. She felt superior to other collier housewives but even this satisfaction was not lasting. She was thirty-one-year-old and had been married eight years. As Lawrence states: "Nowadays, alas, we start off self-conscious, with sex in the head... we marry because we are 'pals': the sex is a rather nasty fiasco." (FU 96) We keep up a pretense of "pals" and nice love. Sex spins wilder in the head than ever. There is either a family of children whom the dissatisfied parents can devote themselves to, thereby perverting the miserable little creatures: or else there is a divorce. There has been no vital interchange at all in the whole of this beautiful marriage affair.

And the first thing happens in case of Mrs. Morel. Human relationships could form a rainbow only when the sexual parameters wake up to reality, that they should live their own lives. Within six months the battle between Gertrude and Walter started. The same happy spirit of Walter now became a thorn in her flesh; she could not tolerate his merry-making. She found it immoral.

The conflict and tension of married life began out of her disillusionment. Mrs. Morel was shocked when she came to know that Walter told her lie, that he owned the house and furniture, which had virtually been taken on rent. She had come from a rich middle-class family, so the poverty of miner's life was so much for her. This is how an economic conflict

started between them.

Secondly, the mutual incompatibility of their temperaments was also a cause of their marital antagonism. "The next Christmas they were married, and for those months she was perfectly happy: for six months she was very happy." (SL 11) But happiness continuous to dwindle. David Cavitch writes: "For month after their marriage, Gertrude was thoroughly happy with Walter, but when she discovers how much of his cheer masks an attitude of irresponsibility for his family and even for his own pride and manhood, her love turns to hostility which in time burns down to a foundation of habitual resentment." (Cavitch 22) Mrs. Morel soon emerged as an egoistic and wilful woman with a sense of superiority. She was a very high minded and intellectual lady, for whom mental consciousness was the goal of life, not the means to understand the 'otherness' of her life partner and adjust with him. On the other hand, Morel was humble and tender at heart, though violent sometimes in quarrels. That's why they often quarreled: "The house is filthy with you," she cried.

She tried her best to mould her husband according to her own middle-class standards of refinement and culture. And he was incapable of refinement and sophistication, she began to despise and humiliate him. There began a battle between the husband and wife — a fearful bloody battle that ended only with death of one. She fought to make him undertake his responsibilities, to him fulfill his obligations. But he was too different from her. His nature was purely sensual, and she strove to make him moral, religious. She tried to force him to face things. He could not endure it - "it drove him out of mind." (SL 2223) In his essay "Morality and the Novel," Lawrence has warned us against two facts, that either the relationship end in the death of one or one sacrifices oneself to the other. In either case the loss is human happiness. Birkin says: "Fusion, fusion, this horrible Fusion of two beings, which every woman and most men insisted on. Why they couldn't remain individuals, limited by their own limits? Why not leave the other being free, why try to absorb, or melt, or merge?" (WL 353)

It always happens in Lawrence that one wins the battle, as it happens in the animal world. The vanquished take s the defeat as part of the battle. Walter now made his own breakfast. He rose early and had plenty of time. Lawrence, indeed says, that this is a form of sacrifice. It is a form of old relationship that he wants to condemn as immoral. He seems to ask whet her all our love comes to this. Within two years their love cools down. She said very little to her husband, but her manner had changed towards him. It happened within one year. Last year she had married him and this Christmas she would bear him a child. And that was the end of it, as if she needed him for the child. She was intellectual. She loved ideas. However, the father's physical gusto, simplicity and humanity are brought out in many scenes of the descriptions of his noisy washing, his soldering, his account of life down the mine; his loneliness is also apparent, in his solitary happiness in the early morning before the others get up. While Morel's coarsening is revealed, it is clear that this partly caused by his family's

hostility. His child like attempt to run away was an unconscious plea for sympathy, but Mrs. Morel had little sympathy for his agonies, mental or physical. When he was seriously injured, the main concern of his wife and son is for each other; when Paul was ill, Morel was tender and anxious for him, but the child only wanted the mother. "He frequently feels guilty after their quarrels; she never does, but returns in renewed strength and self assertion." (Pritchard, *Body of Darkness* 37)

The birth of Paul did not bring them any closer than they were before. She turned to religion, would discuss finer points with a priest Mr. Heaton. Occasionally the minister stayed it to tea with Mrs. Morel and she hoped Walter would not come too soon. She didn't like to bring Paul into the world. She had seemed this baby like a catastrophe, because of her feeling for her husband. She no longer loved her husband and she had not wanted this child to come. "She felt as if the naval string had connected its frail body with hers, had not been broken." (SL 35) A wave of hot love went over her to the infant. She holds the child close to her face and breast. With all her soul, she would make up to it for having brought it into the world unloved. She would love all the more, now it was here: carry it in her love. She was anxious about Paul's frail body. She named him Paul knowing not why, perhaps after Saint Paul. Lawrence felt that mother's love is the most dangerous to children, not for any Freudian reason, but because our new deadly idealism insists on idealizing every relationship particularly that of mother and child. As a Magna Mater, mother in her new role of idealized and life Managers never for one single moment gives her child "the unthinking response from deep dynamic centers." (FU 142) Child becomes his mother's ideal and she continuous her ideal shoving of it through all stages of an ideal upbringing. Baby does not even for a single moment draw a breath free from imposition of pure unselfish and detestable love will directed by the mother. Lawrence held that "there is no mother's milk today, save in tiger's udders, and in the udders of sea whales, our children drink a decoction of ideal love, at the breast." (FU142) And this is what happens with William and Paul later in the course.

Conclusion:

Lawrence believed that it was more important than ever to affirm human nature and fortify it against the moral decay of the times because civilization appeared to be collapsing. Because even if civilization has found a solution to the "bread and butter" dilemma, man has actually gone hungry. Either these starving people generated the current mechanical society, or this civilization gave rise to these starving people. They might work together in a symbiotic way. Lawrence made it his life's work to demonstrate how this materialistic civilization has been impacted by science and industry in countless negative ways that have resulted in the irreversible loss of human instinct. Lawrence was sure that science was against life and that if people followed its rules, life would lose all of its wonder and mystery, making it too boring to live.

References:

Primary Sources

Lawrence, D.H.

—. *The White Peacock*, 1911; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1981.

—. *The Trespasser*, 1912; United States: Myna Classic Books, 2008.

—. *Sons and Lovers*, 1913; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 2010.

Secondary Sources

Ingram, Allen. *The Language of D.H. Lawrence*. London: The Macmillan Press, 1990.

Kalnins, Mara ed. *D.H. Lawrence: Centenary Essays*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press. 1986.

Lerner, Laurence. *Love and Marriage: Literature and its Social Contents*. London: Edward Arnold, 1979.

Mailer, Norman. *The Prisoner of Sex*. Boston: Little Brown, 1971.

Nahal, Chaman. *D.H. Lawrence: An Eastern View*. London: Barends and Co., 1970.

Peter Preston, Peter Hoare. *D. H. Lawrence in the Modern World*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Ralph, C.H. *The Trail of Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1961.

Sagar, Keith. *The Art of D.H. Lawrence*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2010.