International Advance Journal of Engineering, Science and Management (IAJESM)
ISSN -2393-8048, Juanuary-June 2015, Submitted in February 2015, iajesm2014@gmail.com

Study on Novel of D. H. Lawrence: Sons and Lovers

Dr. Seema Chauhan, Assistant Professor, R.L.S Memorial Degree College, Jaspur U. S. Nagar (Uttarakhand)

Abstract

Sons and Lovers**,** semiautobiographical novel by D.H. Lawrence, published in 1913. His first mature novel, it is a psychological study of the familial and love relationships of a working-class English family. D.H. Lawrence is considered one of the greatest English writers of modernity. His novel *Sons and Lovers* (1913) was derided upon publication, but today is often considered his best work. Gertrude Morel, a young woman full of life and ambition, struggles to self-actualize in the early twentieth-century society of Britain, which squelches discourse between women. Morel reacts by becoming a highly perceptive wallflower, pretending to enjoy a trivial social existence in order to observe guests at parties. When Morel commits to a relationship, she learns about the many pitfalls and limitations of claiming and becoming accountable to a life path. She ages and has several sons who, in their relationships with her, both repeat and create their own problematic patterns. The novel begins by introducing Morel, who begins as the unmarried Gertrude Coppard. At a dance on Christmas, she meets Walter Morel and begins a romance that is driven mainly by physical passion. Not long after, she marries him and begins to question her decision as she feels the limiting impact of his small salary, about which he omitted the truth, on her own life's possibilities. They begin to quarrel and grow apart; Walter opts to go straight to the bar after each workday. In response, Morel turns to her sons, namely, William, the eldest, thinking of him as a model that she can enrich to play out her own destroyed ambitions.

Keywords: NOVEL, D. H. LAWRENCE, SONS AND LOVERS

Introduction:

The World War - I broke out in 1914 but the year 1913 saw the publication of Lawrence's first masterpiece *Sons and Lovers*. The novel was much more directly autobiographical then his first novel, *The White Peacock* published in 1911. Therefore, one does not see the shadows of war on the horizon of the novel, though we do find the signs of ruin of the provincial culture, the repository of the organic community, following industrialization. The novel, in fact, begins with Lawrence's critique of industrial society of England, not because it offered community to the individual in which one could live his whole self in harmony with others, but because it frustrated it. He started the novel by picturing how industrialization has reduced workers or farmers, to colliers; the England countryside was now striven with coal pits around which lived the colliers who worked in the little gin-pits. The Morels—Walter Morel and Gertrude Morel—came from Bestwood to what symbolically is block of cottages called the Bottoms. The place was good to look at from the front, but the dwelling room, the kitchen, was at the back of the house, facing inward between the blocks, looking at the ash-pits. So the actual conditions of living in the Bottom that was so well built and that looked so nice, were quite unsavory because people must live in the kitchen and the kitchens on to that nasty alley of ashpits.[1] This is the first indication that the old provincial life which was available to him rich and exciting was lost instead man became a commodity put on sale. It is uprooted from its soil and taken to where its labour is needed. Raymond Williams[2] drew our attention to the real tragedy of England, which Lawrence also emphasizes—the tragedy of ugliness. Lawrence generally bewailed that so lovely a country is made ugly and vile by industrialization. It was ugliness which betrayed the spirit of man. According to Lawrence, the great crime which the moneyed classes and promoters of industry committed in the palmy Victorian days was the condemning of the workers to live and work in ugliness. Mrs. Morel was not anxious to move to the Bottoms, when she came to it from Bestwood. But it was the only option she could take. That is not the only irony of the workers. She prided herself on having an end house in one of the top blocks and thus had only one neighbour; on the other side, she had an extra strip of garden. And, in having an end house, "she enjoyed a kind of aristocracy among the others women.…"[3] But "this superiority," Lawrence

writes, "was not much of a consolation to Mrs. Morel" (514).
She was thirty-one year old, and had been married eight years. Her husband was a miner, one who loved to drink and make merry. By this time, they had two children, William, a boy of seven and a daughter, younger to William. But Mrs. Morel was not happy, though theirs was a love marriage. She had come from a better family, both financially and in sophistication. In the opening scene itself, her frustration becomes visible. She waited for her husband late in the night, as he had gone to a fair. She was alone but she, during these eight years, had become used to her loneliness. Lawrence seems to blame the industrial life which had broken the old social and familiar bonds, affecting family life adversely. Colliers, like other working class people, took to drinking in the absence of cohesion in family and social life. In place of organic society, a pure mechanization or materialism had set in, resulting in disintegration of whole, organic solidarity among people. Away from their roots, workers lived a nucleus family life. Lawrence was deeply concerned with the onset of industrialism. For him, it was something unfortunate that the tradition was lost.
As a consequence of the loss of organic society, colliers were left to somehow, live on meagre resources. Mrs. Morel felt wretched in bringing up the family on scanty resources. She was already pregnant with the third child in her womb. The world seemed to her a “dreary place, where nothing else would happen for her—at least until William grew up" (516).
It is a significant pointer to Mrs. Morel's state of mind. She had started looking forward to the day when William would earn. She did not want the third child. She could imagine Walter Morel serving bear in a public house, "swilling himself drunk. She despised him, and was tied to him"(516). She had already cast off her husband, at least in her mind. Her struggle with poverty and ugliness and meanness had left no romance in her life.

SONS AND LOVERS

There is no need of critics to tell that *Sons and Lovers* is Lawrence's most autobiographical novel, for his own father was a collier and that there was no love lost between his parents. Critics like Mark Schorer have taken exception to the autobiographical strain in *Sons and Lovers*. His main argument in his essay "Technique As Discovery"[4] Schorer has affinities with New Criticism. He is a formalist in this regard. He thinks that form or technique not only discovers but also develops and evaluates a text. He thus makes a difference between content and achieved content. In his view, Lawrence remained stuck with his life and therefore failed to rise above the raw content of his life. Technique, according to Schorer, "alone objectifies the material of art".[5] Since Lawrence wrote his own life in *Sons and Lovers*, he could not objective his material. Hence- Morel and Lawrence were never separated. The third child threatening to come in the world, as Mrs. Morel felt, was Paul Morel. After the early death of William, Mrs. Morel was left with the hope that Paul would grow and earn and thus improve the financial position of the family.
One of the banes of New Criticism is that in searching for objectification, it forgets that it sacrifices the value of content. Lawrence's purpose in telling this tale was not whether it was his own life or not, but that he had an intimate understanding how the loss of cohesiveness of organic society created problems for family bonds. These bonds could no longer hold the family together. William had to go to London for a better job and eventually lost his contact back at Bestwood. Lawrence hoped to recover the organic society and within it the organic family. As Scharer himself concedes in another essay "Lawrence and The Spirit of the Place",[6] "War, the dehumanizing process of society in the destructive mass, always seemed to him (Lawrence), a portion of the industrial process, and it is not accidental that Lawrence's hatred of industrial England seemed to have reached its height during the war years".[7] Indeed Lawrence, like Mrs. Morel felt during the war years, sick. In a letter to Catherine Carswell, he wrote that he finds it difficult to live in England, that he would die of foul inward poison. It is the same sickness and nausea that Mrs. Morel had felt living on the pit-ash of Bestwood.

Gertrude Morel was very ill when the boy Paul was born. Her husband was good to her, but she felt very lonely, "miles away from her own people. She felt lonely now, and his presence only made it more tense."(522) In these early intimations, Lawrence underlines the loss of family life-her people and his people. She was utterly alone, more so when he was around. She searched for others and found none. The image of a woman absolutely alone is the one that Lawrence underlines “He (Paul) came just when her own bitterness of disillusion was hardest to bear; when her faith in life was shaken, and her soul felt dreary and lonely. She made much of the child, and the father was jealous” (522).

Her longing to belong was most acute at this moment-to have the power of communicating with others, "identifying and defining the individuated quality of life, the physical essences of things outside the personality, the notme, the very ding an sich."8 Gertrude Morel searched for an organic relationship in marrying Walter Morel, she was unable to remove her loneliness. It not only persisted, but even grew many fold in his company. The Freudian is wrong in saying that marriage removes endemic loneliness of mankind. This is what happened with her as it also happened with Walter Morel. If ever we are able to overcome our alienations, it is only in the organic social order, a kind of community which Lawrence envisaged. Lawrence wished to establish his identity not only with the social order but also with the whole universe which he called circumambient universe. One of his chief motives of artistic creation was the need for feeling that we are in relationship to the whole world. It is in such a relationship that one feels at home. Mrs. Gertrude could not feel at home with her husband: “There began a battle between the husband and wife--a fearful, bloody battle that ended only with the death of the one. She fought to make him undertake his own responsibilities, to make him fulfill his obligations. But he was too different from her. His nature was purely sensuous, 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 her mind” (522).

Lawrence's quest to harmonize all disagreeable will come to fruition only in a communal world. Bereft of it, people would clash for supremacy. Mrs. Morel considered herself superior to other Collier's wives, because she occupied an end house, though it was a poor consolation. She also found her husband negligent of his duties and responsibilities. In addition she had a better background. She came of a good old burgher family. Her grandfather had, however, gone bankrupt. Her father was an engineer — "a large, handsome, naughty man, proud of his fair skin and blue eyes, but more proud still of his integrity."[9] Gertrude resembled her mother in her small built. But her temper, proud and unyielding, she had from her mother's family. She loved her mother. She remembered to had hated her father's overbearing manner towards her gentle, humorous, kindlysouled mother. Since she had affinity with her mother, she hated her father.

As is evident Mrs. Morel had religious and moral disposition while Walter Morel loved good things of life. And though they married for love, they began fighting early in their married life. It was because they had no family or society to iron out their differences nor had they courage and discipline to balance their relationship. So they indulged in objectifying each other, that is, making each other objects and things, robbing each other's identity. When they first met at a Christmas party, they ironically felt for each other's opposite nature. Gertrude watched the young miner as he danced. "She thought him rather wonderful, never having met anyone like him"(519). Gertrude herself was rather contemptuous of dancing. She was a puritan, like her father, high-minded. Therefore "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"(5l9).

Walter came and bowed before her; he seemed melted away before her. But this romance soon evaporated. She even liked his job, to begin with, for she thought, he risked his life daily and with gaity. The next Christmas they were married and for three months she was perfectly happy: for six months she was very happy. Afterwards, she started finding faults with him. Whenever

she tried to open her heart seriously to him, he seemed to listen but without understanding. This killed her efforts at finer intimacy and she had flashes of fear.
But Gertrude felt that this was what she lacked in him. And finally when one day she found out an unpaid bill in his pocket, her reservations against her husband burst open into a fight into death. She said very little to her husband, but as Lawrence records, "her manner had changed towards him. Something in her proud, honourable soul had crystallized as hard as rock" (521).
Walter Morel henceforth lost his true relationship. He did no longer belong to either her or his family. As Lawrence writes: “The estrangement between them caused him, knowingly or unknowingly grossly to offend her where he would not have done (522). Thus alienation is the last word in Lawrence's fiction. Walter looses his subjectivity on the one hand but he tries to regain it by offending her where perhaps she more felt hurt. There was no mutual respect for each other left to bring them together. He was now a subdued man. He would creep into the house, eats his dinner all alone. He tried to offend her, at times, by hurting the small boy, Paul, when he burnt his hair. This act of "masculine clumsiness was the spear through the side of her love for Morel"(523). She could bear him no more but then she ceased to fret for his love: "He was an outsider for her"(523).
Thus the two fell asunder. They had no cementing family or society around them. They thought that this made life much more bearable. Nonetheless, she would still want him. She still had her high moral sense. After all, she inherited it from generations of Puritans. Perhaps she felt guilty because she loved him or she had loved him but at the same time she continued to torture him for his alleged sins. As we have noted earlier, she wanted to re-form him in her own image by annihilating his subjectivity. That was a cruder way of reforming or re-forming but this is what Lawrence feels we do to each other when our aspirations are not met with. If
he drank, and lied, he was often given a lash unmercifully.

What Lawrence emphasized in this man-woman relationship, and for that matter, any man-woman relationship was that the man and wife struggle for their survival, their existence; their subjectivity; they feel threatened in the presence of each other's subjectivity. The other in Walter Morel was seen as a liar, a drunkard, an irresponsible husband and father. To her high moral sense essentially puritanical, she felt as if he was allowed to have his being, he would destabilize her world. The pity was, as Lawrence wrote, "She was too much his opposite. She could not be content with the little he might be; she would have him the much that he ought to be"(523). So, in seeking to make him "nobler than he could be, she destroyed him"(523).
In the process of destroying him, Gertrude ironically also injured and destroyed herself. She lost her husband but she had the consolation that she had the children eventually to destroy in case they do not come up to her expectations. Walter Morel started drinking heavily, though not more than other miners; his wages fell off. He became a loud-mouth. The authorities did not like him. He became abusive. In short, he was reduced to a non-entity. He became an object among other objects. He fell under the slavery of others. He brought home, reduced salary, keeping, of course, some part of it for himself. Mrs. Morel continued to hate him. Each forgot everything else-love or affection accept the hatred of the other and the battle between them. Both fought fiercely, calling each other liars.
The first chapter of the novel is given to their frequent battles. They shamed each other but regained their selves for another battle. Now he made his own breakfast. The only real rest seemed to be when he was out of the house. Meanwhile Mrs. Morel took care of her family besides devoting herself to religion. She had a visit everyday from a clergyman Mr. Heatan. The young man often stayed to tea with Mrs. Morel. In such moments, she would not wish her husband to come too soon. She hated his presence. She also did not like the new baby because the battle had started by the time he was conceived. Paul was also a delicate baby. She had not wanted this child to come because of her feeling for her husband. She was apprehensive regarding the child's survival. In case he survived, what would become of him, she often thought.

She even wished him dead for his weak constitution.
Lawrence, thus, looked at the breakdown of all communication with dismay. Walter would come home, unwanted and unloved. But he would not take it lying down. He would growl, would wish to be waited on by his wife. He refused to be a dog spurned at the door. The battle would ensue. In the process she was hurt one day. As a result of these fights, "The family life withdrew, shrank away, and became hushed as he entered. But he cared no longer about his alienation."(541). Even his children withdrew from his presence; they felt that he injured their mother. But men and women are curious creatures. They would not live with or without each other. She would always fear the possibility of his going to some other pit: “One part of her said it would be a relief to see the last of him; another part fretted because of keeping the children; and inside her yet, she could not quite let him go. At the bottom, she knew very well, he could not go (542).
That is what Lawrence would call the variety of human wishes. However, the final casting off Walter Morel begins in chapter-III. Caught between loving and hating him, Gertrude Morel remained in a dilemma for quite sometime. Perhaps she hoped that she would finally cast him off after William's coming of an age. She had already arrived at a point when she thought that there was a limit. Up till this time, in spite of all, he had been her husband and man. She had felt that more or less, for all that he did to himself or did to her, her living depended on him: "There were many, many stages in the ebbing of her love for him, but it was always ebbing"(544).

Almost as soon as *Sons and Lovers* appeared, there were critics, said Jemini Salgado, the editor of Case Book on D.H. Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers* who saw in it a startling endorsement of Freudian theme about the Oedipus complex. We have earlier noted that Lawrence is not a Freudian in that his psycho-analysis is existential. Moreover, Lawrence had not read Freud by the time he wrote this novel, though, he might have heard about his theories from Frieda. The fact is that Gertrude Morel's dependence on her sons, in terms of her financial well-being cannot be said to be Freudian by any stretch of imagination. She has been slowly casting off her husband is the hope that her son would grow and start earning. We must look in a different direction for Gertrude Morel's slow but steady rejection of Walter Morel. But criticism of the novel continues to harp on the novel being Oedipal in its nature. Lawrence own objections to the psycho-analytical approach are important in this regard. As Salgado in his introduction to the Case-Book on *Sons and Lovers* but it that the psycho analytical criticism "ignores the palpable surface of the novel...it smoothes awkward details in its efforts to cut the novel into the size and shape that fits the theory. "[10]
Lawrence also felt that the psycho-analytical critics falsified the truth of the novel in the name of half truths of intellectual schematizing. Nevertheless, *Sons and Lovers* continued to invite this kind of critical approach more than most other novels by Lawrence and this fact is an interesting and important clue that theories are generally procrustean beds.
As a result, the novel is not read for what it is. The present study makes an attempt to study the novel in and for itself. That is why we have quoted at length the text so as to see that there is nothing superfluous or discordant is it. In this context Gertrude was casting Walter Morel off, though half regretfully but relentlessly, using him now and then for love and for life of the children. But in any event he was increasingly being reduced to a husk. Not surprisingly, Walter himself acquiesced, as Lawrence writes, so many men do, yielding their place to their children. He was himself becoming irrelevant. She, on her part, looked wistfully to William. The boy was getting big. She hoped that he would one day replace his father. "She saw in him a man, young, full of vigour, making the world glow again for her. "(544). Meanwhile, she was big with another child, thanks to the truce between the two. She was sorry when she came to know that she was big with the child "both for economic reasons and because she did not- love her husband ..."(545).
These details, though, at times, repetitive, confirms Lawrence's view that marriage is no guarantee for the couples' mutual happiness. In terms of existential analysis, human beings are

essentially alone. In order to assert their selves, they make the other an object. Mrs. Morel did the same. She had no love for the children either. It was her interest in them, in their earnings, that she loved them. In fact, her pride in William was in proportion to his brilliance at school. He was already sixteen and was learning shorthand and book-keeping. He was also ambitious. He gave all his money to his mother, keeping only a fraction of it for herself. But then Gertrude Morel was heard that William was going away. By this time she almost lived by him. She liked to do things for him, washing and ironing his clothes. William was not so much against his father as was Paul. In fact, he was like her--slightly and rather small. As the mother depended more and more on her sons, Walter would willingly take a back seat but at times he would bully. And sometimes beats her. Paul would suffer no more ill-treatment of her mother. So he bore a deep-seated hatred against his father.

Lawrence at this point seems to come closer in terms of psycho-analysis to that of Freud but this was not because he loved his mother and therefore hated his father, but that he could not bear his father's destruction. The mother obviously loved Paul on this score. The boy also loved his mother, the way he has been treated. He loved to sleep in his mother's bed, not because of any incestuous feelings for her but that he was still very young and weak. The warmth, the security and peace of soul, he found in her, heated his otherwise sick body. He lay against her and slept and got better.

These words have nothing incestuous about them. What Lawrence, perhaps, wished to say was that the mutual objectification between husband and wife leads the couple to depend upon their children. That is why, there are complexes like Oedipus and Electra. It is the couples' mutual antagonism which develops these complexes. They are otherwise not born of incest. This is not to say that there are no intimations of this kind in the novel. For example, Paul always brought one spray, the best he could find. In response, his mother would say, "Pretty", in a curious tone, as Lawrence writes, "of a woman accepting a love token"(559).

These intimacies, however, should not be misconstrued. They are part of harmony between the mother and sons, because after reducing husbands to nothingness, they would dote upon their sons. There is not much psychoanalytical, as much sociological in these responses. The woman's positions, precarious as is in a family, she in all probability finds her sons to be more responsive to her then her husband. The sons are her defense mechanism.

Mrs. Morel did nothing untoward in keeping her hold on her sons. As Lawrence writers "William had gone away to London and his mother missed his money. He sent ten shillings once or twice, but had many thing to pay for at first..." (566). Lawrence makes it clear that she missed his money and though she still thought him to be her knight "who wore her favour in the battle, she knew that she would have to depend upon Paul more than on William" (566) Lawrence makes his position clear that in the original farword to *Sons and Lovers*. It is in the form of a letter written to Edward Garnett. Here, Lawrence referred to the old son-lover oedipus complex and added that "if a son-lover takes a wife, then, is she not his wife, she is only his bed. And his life will be torn in twains, and his wife in her despair shall hope for sons, that she may have her lover in her hour."[11]

He made this reference in the context of his own bible of human relationships. It is Darwinian in symbolism. What Lawrence meant to say in the title itself of the novel was that a woman would not spare her son for his wife. She would rather chain him for herself. The son is, thus, pulled in two opposite directions, towards his wife and towards his mother.

This is clear how firm was Gertrude's hold on Paul and yet the mother always feared Paul's attraction for Miriam and later for Clara. The two women, in turn, fear the mother and fear each other. The battle between the women--mother and Mistresses is for exclusive claims on the man, whether son or lover. It is not that the mother claims Pau1 for her son and her lover, both Miriam and Clara also claimed him for both as their lover and son. They are his mammas, as Lawrence writes.

Lawrence was obviously unhappy with such a relationship which destroys the object of love. He found this relationship unhealthy. For him it was on old relationship, of the dominant and the dominated, of the master and slave.

Mankind, according to Lawrence, has failed to achieve a pure relationship, because it is difficult to achieve. We are happy in old relationship because they are easier to achieve, as for example our relationship with the prostitute: "if a man establishes a living relation to her, if only for one moment, then it is life, but he does not, if it is just money and function, then it is not life but sordidness, and a betrayal of living."[12]

Lawrence was thus for a healthy, wholesome and pure relationship. Gertrude's relationship is for money. If she cast off Walter Morel it was because he earned dismally low wages. Other weaknesses could be added to make him a non entity. Similarly she depended on William mainly for money. She did so in the case of Paul also. For Lawrence, any relationship which is functional is a sordid relationship, a betrayal of life. There is no subtle inter-relatedness in such relationship. Lawrence's conception of human relationship as we have seen by now, is of wider significance. It is a relationship with the whole universe. It is eternal, subtle, perfected relationship between a human being and his whole circum ambient universe. It is also noted that his views of a believing community in which man- woman relationship is not problematic. In such a society, in earlier and modern times, there is the disturbance of organic relationship. It is a kind of society in which one's identity is not threatened. One remains whole and alive as he and she allows others to be whole and alive.

After the death of William, Gertrude comes to depend upon Paul. His wages had been raised at Jordan's. He was already in love with Miriam. But his mother would not let her hold go on him. She was still young. She had her sophistication intact, she could walk in mud without dirtying her shoes. But Paul had to clean them for her. She still had her beauty. One day she appeared in her inner doorway rather shyly. She had got a new cotton blouse on. Paul exclaimed, "on, my stars! " (595). He told her that she was a fine little woman to go jaunting out with. And she added that he was too young for her. These exchanges confirm the general impression that there was something Oedipal in this relationship. She would tell him that marriage is a hopeless affair and that her marriage was bad enough. In fact, she was afraid of losing her hold on him. Her break from her husband, though bad enough, did not destroy her power to live but she would not be able to survive if after William, Paul also betrayed her.

Paul's love for Miriam also turned out to be hopeless, partly because of the pull of his mother and partly Miriam's own spirituality. He loved to sleep with his mother for warmth, the security and peace of soul, the utter comfort from the touch of the other. This made him hate Miriam. From the moment Gertrude sensed his interest in the girl she tried to fight her off. Always when he went with Miriam, and it grew rather late he knew his mother would be fretting and getting angry with him—why, he could not understand? Paul's inability to understand Mrs. Morel's antagonism to Miriam was, at this stage of the narrative, was bound up with his own repressions. Struggling as he was with his complex towards his mother, "it was hardly surprising he should fail to realize that her jealousy was," as H.M. Daleski says, "nakedly sexual."[13] The real reason for her annoyance is casually phased as an after thought, but her sudden employment of the word "disgusting and the illogical asperity of the comment itself are sure guides to her feeling," adds Daleski: It is seldom, however, that the serpent in the garden slitters out of the undergrowth in this way. She rationalized that Miriam was not like an ordinary woman, who could leave her share in him. She suspected that Miriam would absorb him. She also feared that Paul would be crippled. She will suck him up. However Paul had his own problems. Miriam was extremely religious. He felt impotent against her spirituality. He, as Lawrence, wished to live as a whole man. But with Miriam it was not possible. He had his physical side. "His blood was concentrated like a flame in his chest" (635). Miriam, somehow, ignored the stream of blood flowing in his veins. She was expecting some religious state in him. He was naturally so young but their

intimacy was so abstract. He wanted to crush her on his breast to ease the ache there but he was afraid of her. In short, he felt ashamed. Her religious look made him feels small. It is in this way that the spirituality of Miriam brought him his shame of the original fall, a fall which can be most generally described as a fall from himself. Her purity prevented even their first love-kiss. It was as if she could scarcely stand the shock of physical love, even a passionate kiss, and then he was too shrinking and sensitive to give it.

His only defense against her spirituality was to objectify her-shame her, as she shamed him. This is how he could re-establish his identity. Lawrence feels that this involves fight, at times, unto death. That is why Chapter-8 of the novel is titled "*Strife In Love*". It is a significant pointer to Lawrence's view that fight is an essential ingredient of recovery of one's relationship. He in this chapter uses the word "gaze" when she looked at him. The strife begins when Paul meets Clara. Clara was separated from her husband and had taken up Women's Right. She appeared to him opposite, to Miriam who was uninterested in such matters. Clara interested him as Miriam's opposite the physical part. When he next met Miriam, she asked him about Clara. Paul replied that what interested him "was her fighting spirit. Her very mouth showed her deep passion, he told Miriam. He complained against Miriam: "You make me so spiritual". He, however, added, "And I don't want to be spiritual" (642).

This was the beginning of revolt that finally ended with the casting off Miriam. He simply could not kiss her. There was something that prevented him. He felt low and degraded in her company. This hatred against her stirred his blood because she never realized the male he was. He felt he was not valued. It is not that he was not attracted by her spirituality. Indeed, he was part spiritual, but he has also his physical self. He was angry with his mother precisely for this reason that she also prevented him from meeting any woman, for that matter. He was twenty-one at this point of time and Miriam was twenty. Like the persons in Eliot, she was beginning to dread the spring. In fact, she hated to be alive in body. This made Paul hate her. He questioned: "Why did she make him feel as if he were uncertain of himself, insecure, an indefinite thing ...” (645).

If spring was a bad time for her, it was equally bad for Paul, of course, for different reason. He could not bear to look at Miriam. She seems to want him and he resisted, because he felt that she wanted the soul out of his body and not his whole self, body and soul together. This was like depriving him of his identity. She wanted to draw all of him into her like a python, eating him alive. He was, thus, attracted towards her spirituality but equally repelled by it. This struggle, inevitable though, in such a relation of attraction and repulsion, ended in the defeat of Miriam. His mother also contributed towards Miriam's defeat. The deepest of his love belonged to his mother. Now it was spring and there was battle between him and Miriam. The battle that ended in the defeat of Miriam; perhaps, she had not in herself that which he wanted. The sense of shame kept the two apart. Both felt ashamed of each other. They searched in each other love but because of their different orientations, different expectations, found "nothing" (665). This is a characteristic feeling, attendant on all human expectations. Lawrence is existential in this regard. Paul then told her that he did not love her and so ought to leave her a chance with another man. He felt foolish and blind and shamefully clumsy. He asked himself: What were men to her at all ! But she, ah ! she loved his sou1 (665). He was deficient in something. Indeed, he was not spiritual enough.

Miriam also sensed his hatred and shrank away. He could go to his mother and she to her spirituality. The mother meanwhile increased her pressure on him because William by now was dead. She would fight to keep Paul. Human relationships in Lawrence are highly problematic. There is unfortunately no recognition of the relationship with the other. The other is, of course, needed, as one needs a slave, a minion. After withdrawing from Miriam and retracing his steps towards his mother who was happy to reclaim him, Paul, being what he was could not remain satisfied in the fold of his mother. He had grown by now suspicious of religion and also his mother's hold of his soul. He wanted to wallow in his physical self. Ironically he still kept up his

connection with Miriam, could neither break free of her nor go the whole length to her. In short, he lived in bad faith, neither consenting nor withdrawing. All the same, he has been drawn by Clara's charm. His mother wanted him to fall in love with one of the girls in a better station of life. So she would never agree or feel good, if he was to be drawn by a married woman. But somehow Paul drifted towards Clara. What he liked in her was, besides her charms, her fighting spirit. They talked about her husband who lived apart from her. All the same she was a married woman and Paul believed in simple friendship. Moreover, sex has become so complicated with him that he would have denied that he ever could want Clara or Miriam, and for that matter, any other woman, it was this dilemma that made him an unenviable figure. He wanted more than friendship with Clara but he missed Miriam also not for marriage, for sure. Lawrence here poses a question as to what is a man in relation with a woman Miriam and Clara. As Lawrence writes: "Being the sons of mothers whose husbands had blundered rather brutally through their feminine sanctities, they were themselves to diffident and shy. They could easier deny themselves than incur any reproach from a woman. They preferred themselves to suffer the misery of celibacy, rather than risk the other person (704).

It is unfortunate that female sanctities could cripple the male. When he looked at Miriam, he saw in her a nun with a mouth of Madonna, so spiritual, that he must not ask her for physical union, despite the fact that she was a creature of flesh and blood. There seemed no maidenhood about her. And yet he should not ask for anything physical. With Clara, on the other hand, he found the other side of human personality, not any touch of the soul in it. This was what hurting to him. He courted her now like a lover, not and passionate. He could kiss her, which he could not do with Miriam. But then there was something missing in his love for Clara. Lawrence's views on organic relationships are clear beyond any doubt that he wants establish a mutual understanding between lovers, a relationship in which there is no sadism or masochism. As we have noted earlier Lawrence finds such a relationship immoral which made either of the two a sacrifice.

He came over to Clara seeking his liberation from Miriam who was trying to be another mother. Clara, no doubt, helped Paul to liberate himself from the hold of Miriam but she also knew that she would not be able to keep him for long. The self, as Lawrence viewed, needs his or her identity which is Lawrence alternatively means freedom, freedom not from one person or the other, but freedom as such—absolute freedom. Of course, Lawrence's conception of identity or freedom has been, in critical parlance, the source of many strange features of his thought. He does recognize the con tangency of the world but at the same time he was fascinated by the past, especially by his conception of a believing community. This is despite the fact that the past is dead. The kind of society he visualizes, in which Paul could breath his free self cannot be recalled; his choice lies in the future, not in a structure which has been built in the past. Only in virtue of this fact that could Paul free. His relations with Clara was never smooth, particularly after the illness of her husband, and although he was physically captivated by her, he, would not be able to achieve his organic relationship. Towards the end of the novel, the need of an organic relationship for Paul takes the forms of anxiety. He then blamed his mother that he would never meet the right woman while she lived. His anxiety thus takes the form of neurosis. He drugs identity is found, as it is noted earlier, in his essay "Morality and the Novel" in which he underlines that the balance with the other can be achieved when we decide not to encroach upon each other's freedom.

REFERENCES

[1]D.H. Lawrence, *Three Complete Novels* (London Magpie Books Ltd., 1993), 514.
[2]Simond William, "The Social Thinking of Lawrence," *A D.H. Lawrence Miscellany* ed. Harry T. Moore (London : Heinemann, 1961), 295-311.
[3]Ibid.
[4]Mark Schorer, "Technique As Discovery," *20th Century Literary Criticism* (London: Longman, 1984), 286-400.

[5]Ibid., 391.
[6]Mark Schorer, "Lawrence and the Spirit of the Place," *A D.H. Lawrence Miscellany* (London: Heinemann, 1961), 280 -294.
[7]Ibid., 283.
[8]Ibid., 285.
[9]Ibid., 517.
[10]Jamini Salgado, *D.H. Lawrence: Sons and Lovers A Case -Book Series*. (London Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1969), 14.
[11]D.H. Lawrence "Original Foreword to Sons and Lovers," D.H. Lawrence: Sons and Lovers, ed. Gemini Salgado, 37.
[12]D.H. Lawrence, "Morality and The Novel, *20th Century Literary Criticism*, ed. David Lodge (London: Longman, 1984) 129.
[13]H.M. Daleski, "The Release: The first Period," *D.H. Lawrence: Sons and Lover*, (Case book Series) (London: Faber and Faber, 1965), 196.