



DAVID HERBERT LAWRENCE NOVEL: THE RAINBOW

Dr. Sakshi Antil

Flat No. 203, Tower-9, Fresco Apartment, Nirwana Country, Gurugram-122001, Haryana (India)
Email: Sakshiantil75@gmail.com

Abstract: This is the story of three generations of Brangwens. *The Rainbow* is one of Lawrence's great creation, partly for its tale of three generations of Brangwens and partly for its symbolism of The Rain bow. The latter figures in the end of the novel, when Ursula, representing the third generation of Brangwens, envisions a rainbow, symbolizing her hope, as of the novelist himself, after her fiasco with Skrebensky. Not coincidentally the last chapter of the novel is also titled "The Rainbow". What could have given her a setback, infused her with a new life. Her flesh thrilled, though her soul was still sick. She suddenly found liberated, nonetheless, because Lawrence would care for the health of body more than for the health of soul. It seemed, as Lawrence writes, "this child like the seal set on her own nullity" (499). Lawrence's conception of nothingness or nullity is born out of human desire. She desired Skrebensky but he left for India and married there. She wanted to "marry him, and live simply as a good wife to him"(499). Thus she had assured herself that the only kind of life was that of a simple sacrifice, subjugating her freedom and identity. Lawrence is obviously critical of Ursula was becoming a sacrifice. In fact, while thinking in these terms, Ursula was herself conscious of the fact that freedom did not matter. She asked a rhetorical question to herself : "What did the self, the form of life matter?"(499). It is ironic that Ursula decided to live in bad faith, knowing full well that herself, that is, her identity was all that mattered. But somehow the self in its freedom and identity becomes a burden, as it did for Ursula. She was tired of her struggle with Skrebensky. So she decided to compromise offering to live from day to day. This alone mattered for her — "the beloved existence in the body, rich peaceful complete with no beyond, no future trouble, no further complication"(499). She felt guilty for she had been arrogant and wicked, "wanted that other thing, that fantastic freedom, that illusory conceited fulfillment which she had imagined she could not have with Skrebensky"(499).

[Sakshi Antil. DAVID HERBERT LAWRENCE NOVEL:THE RAINBOW. *Researcher* 2022;14(9):5-13] ISSN 1553-9865 (Print); ISSN 2163-8950 (Online). <http://www.sciencepub.net/researcher>.02.doi:10.7537/marsrsj140922.02.

Keywords: Novel, Lawrence, The Rainbow

Introduction: This is how she consoled herself that it did not matter selling herself for a peaceful existence; She questioned her own presumptions; "Who was she to be wanting some fantastic in her life? Was it not enough that she had her man, her children, her place of shelter under the sun ?"(500). Lawrence was not one of the popular novelists of old relationships, saying, like Shelley, if winter comes can spring be behind. This was for him a recipe for re-heated dishes of old relationships in which the self is easily adjusted in, its secondary role. Such relationship of sacrifices on either side—Tom and Lydia and, Anna and Will—were equally immoral for Lawrence. For the novelist any relationship short of equal relationship was immoral. A new relationship, where no sacrifice is involved is a new relatedness; "it hurts somewhat in attaining it—in fact it always hurts; so life will always hurt," said Lawrence in "Morality And The Novel."¹ That is why people chose to live in 'bad faith'. For Sartre, Bad Faith is akin to lying to oneself. It has already been referred to Ursula's sense of nullity. She

came to posit her nothingness because she desired Skrebensky but failed to marry him. So her nothingness occasioned bad faith. She had argued that she would marry and love her husband and fill her place simply: Was it not enough for her, as it had been enough for her mother. This chain of thinking led her to re-evaluate her mother in a just and true light. Her mother was simple and radically true. She had taken the life that was given. She had not what Ursula had--her arrogant conceit, insisting on creating life to fit herself. Her mother was right, profoundly right, she thought and she herself had been false and untrue. In this state of humility she wrote a letter that she was pregnant with his child and pleaded with him to come back. She wrote with her' deepest, sincerest heart. She wanted to feel that she expressed her true self. Obviously she had some reservation regarding her true self which thought in terms of living simply as an obedient wife. This becomes evident when she raises the question: "For what had a woman but to submit ? What was her flesh but for child bearing, her

strength for her children and for her husband, the giver of life? At last she was a woman"(500).

In lying she hid the truth from herself that she was nothing but her free self. This consciousness that she was just a woman came to her not from outside but from within herself. She was compelled to do so because she was pregnant. This made her rationalize her plight. She became all intellect, divorcing her soul from her body, transforming her body into an object or thing to be used. She objectified her body and ultimately herself, as she staged a flight or an escape from herself. In fact, she lost her subjectivity, her freedom, and her responsibility for decision. She was content to exist in bad faith. She hoped to soon join him in Calcutta as she waited for his reply, meanwhile, she had an experience of the freedom of horses. She could not bear the sight because she felt the weight of freedom on her own heart. Through this symbolism, Lawrence points out the fact that one's freedom is not a possession but the very nature of our being. There is no difference, between the being of man and his being free. Ursula was aware that she was also free. This experience was liberating. She came home at last, tired because there was some division in herself and her freedom. As a result she fell ill. She asked herself: "Must she belong to him, must she adhere to him? Something compelled her, obviously, the child in her body and yet it was not real"(500). Her body pained because it belonged to Skrebensky. She further asked; "What bound her to him when she was not bound to him? Why did her falsity persist? Why did the falsity gnaw, gnaw, gnaw at her, why could she not wake up to clarity to reality"(504).

In her delirium she answered her question—it was the child—the child bound her to him. The child was like a bond round her brains, tightened on her brain. It bound her to Skrebensky. Thus it was the child that robbed her identity, her self, her freedom, But the quest for human relationship in Lawrence is radical; it lies in total freedom. This consciousness of freedom is disclosed in anxiety, that freedom is in our being not outside and beyond us. The question that still haunted her was that despite the child could she not yet be free. For a woman, the child is a real obstacle to her freedom, particularly in the state Ursula that was. As it is held, our consciousness is not made by something outside it. The child is an obstacle to Ursula's identity, her freedom, in the same manner as any other obstacle, as for example the English Channel. What she called her compulsion to her freedom, is only her compulsion is relation to the choice she has made. The child restricted her freedom only because she has decided to give birth to it. In this regard, her choice took the form of compulsion she has shaped her life in no other way. Ursula, indeed was always free to overcome her bond by re-shaping

her purpose. The existence of such compulsions, as Lawrence would say, do nothing to diminish our freedom, although they—and particularly the compulsions created by the existence of other people, imposed on us—may induce us, in bad faith, to conceal our freedom from ourselves.

Ursula thought: "Could she, not have a child of herself; was not the child her own affair? What had it to do with him?"(504). She was right to say that she was not bound to Skrebensky, "Aching and cramped with the bondage to Skrebensky and Skrebensky's world?"(504). It is thus she sought her freedom within relationship. Of course she had to fight within herself to overcome the compulsions of the world. In that case, she would have to live an alternated life but she must break out of it and thus strive to take new roots and form new relationship. Fortunately she was found not pregnant but "even if there had been a child, it would have made little difference however"(504). She would have kept the child to herself; she would not have gone to Skrebensky. He now belongs to her past. Anton was her past. She would not live in her past. If her part provided the foundation for her activity, her future would provide the foundations of her possibility. So she decided to look ahead with hope rather than look back in anger.

The Rainbow:

The Rainbow thus ends on the note of self assertion. This underlines Lawrence's moral stance that human relationship should be like a flickering rainbow, entailing no encroachment on either side. Of course each time we strive, as Lawrence says, in "Morality and the Novel", it involves struggle for displacing the old relationships of the slave and the master. The two earlier generations of Brangwens also involved themselves in excruciating struggle without achieving the calm Ursula attained. Tom and Lydia could not have the satisfaction of a perfected relationship because none of them valued his or her freedom above anything else. Tom met Lydia, a polish woman and fell in love with her. She was the widow of a polish doctor. Her husband had died, a refugee, in London. She spoke a bit foreign-like but she could communicate. Tom Brangwen got fascinated by her foreignness. He thought perhaps of forming a new relationship. She appeared to him somewhat unreal; she had also a child, Anna who forms the second generation of Brangwen. The mother-child relationship of course excluded him but he wished to be part of this strange company. She was thirty-four and he was twenty-eight but even this difference did not matter. Lawrence deliberately dwells on showing this difference in order to show that they were two selves trying to seek their separate fulfillment, their individual identity. In his scheme of things, the self and the non-self forms the world. However, in the

word of the say, the other has already made his or her appearance. Lydia intruded upon the world of Tom who has grown up all these years unattached. The young man grew up very fresh and alert, with rest of every moment of life: "He worked and rode and drove to market, he went out with companions and got tipsy and played skittles and went to the little travelling theatres. Once when he was drunk at a public house, he went up stairs with a prostitute who seduced him. He was then nineteen" (235).

He was considerably younger than his brothers. Naturally, he was his mother's favorite. He was not a very bright student at school. Lawrence thus gives a character sketch of Tom in the earlier pages of the novel, before he had a chance meeting with Lydia. Now when Tom Brangwen at nineteen, a youth, fresh like a plant rooted in his mother and his sister, met the strange-looking woman, he was taken unawares because he did not know that there was a different Tom who would feel suddenly transported on seeing Lydia. He had lived an insulated life. He did not know that he would love anyone.

Lawrence makes Tom realize that there is, in a man or a woman, a self, that is, insulated, a self, that is alone. This point's to Lawrence's thinking that self-in-itself lacks companionship. It has a need to belong. Tom also felt this need, although he was pre-occupied in his work at the Marsh. It is at this point that he met Lydia; the strangeness about her attracted him. But the sense to belong also entails the loss of a self which is essentially lonely and unattached. Lydia, of course, responded warmly to his gesture of love. As Lawrence notes: "She remained attentive and instinctively expectant before him, unfolded ready to receive him. He could not act because of self-fear and because of his conception of honour towards her. So he remained in a state of chaos" (236).

Tom's response was obviously less than she expected. She also found something lacking in her expectations. As a result, "she closed again away from him, was sheathed over, impervious to him, oblivious"(236). Thus both Tom and Lydia try to save their respective identities, fearing lest they should not lose what is their own. They lost one opportunity for belonging to each other. Tom even felt that he had lost it for good. He was once again reduced to his stony-self. However, they met again under one more spell of mutual attraction. Unfortunately he missed this opportunity once again to open himself to her. Nevertheless, she came to him unfastened the breast of his waste coat and his shirt and put her hand on him, needing to know him. Still it was not easy to do so. But she found it necessary to do so in order to know him. She gave herself to the hour, but he could not. Even at the time of their marriage, his face was stiff and expressionless. She was still foreign and unknown to himself and he

to her.

In Lawrence the organic relationship is problematic. When two people come together they always fear the loss of their respective selves. And even when they become intimate \ the fear regarding their identity is never fully overcome. It happened in the case of Tom and Lydia. Tom blamed her for being cold and selfish, only caring about herself, caring really about nothing. This happened sooner than later. He felt more and more alone and she, as her pregnancy advanced, was more and more unaware of him. He felt that his existence was annulled. He often went out of the house for relief. In essence, he was afraid of his wife. During the months of her pregnancy, their relationship was that of strangers. The only bond they had was the child, Anna; for all else, their relationship was strained. Even after the birth of male child, Tom continued to love Anna more than the new born. He wanted a robust exchange of love, moral at base, that is, when love is given and received in equal measure. But that was, perhaps, not to be. She could not give her love and he was wanting to have it. So he had to begin the bitter lesson, "to abate himself, to take less than he wanted"(252). She was still a woman to him, his ideal, for she had satisfied him. And he wanted it to go on. But it was not possible. His sense to belong to the other, was frustrated. She could only want him in her own way, and to her own measure. It was because she had spent much life before he found her as she was, "The woman who could take him and give him fulfillment"(252). In fact, she could do so, in her own times and ways till then he "must control himself, measure himself to her"(252). This, obviously, entailed the loss of organic relationship. She was the dominant partner simply because he needed her more than she needed him. His freedom was lost. Lydia was more preoccupied with the child than with her husband.

Anna at nine, was shy and wild but like her mother she asserted her superiority over ordinary people. In fact, she cared for her mother more than anyone else. She loved Tom but patronized him. The question of organic relationship is linked with human pride. For Lawrence, human relationships are generally difficult to maintain, particularly when it comes to forming a rainbow of them, to balance them, but the worst in this respect is the man-woman relationship. One can notice the making of a proud woman in Anna, as she grows to form the second generation of Brangwens. Anna had, right from the beginning, a curious distaste for the common place people. She often shrank from ordinary company. That is why she felt easy at home, where the common sense and the supreme relations between her parents made her comfortable. She was happy to be with her parents but she also wanted to go out. She felt this lack, as

Lawrence would say. At school, or in the world, she was usually at fault. She hated her teachers. Therefore she was always ill -at-ease with authority. At the bottom of her heart she despised the other people, particularly if they had power over her. According to Lawrence, human intimacy can be sustained only in perfect relationship which he would call 'pure' relationship. But such a relationship has to be created anew because we tend to fall into old relationship of the dominant and dominated. Anna had a proud mind, absolved from the petty ties and considerations Tom was delighted to see his proud child, which perhaps he himself could not be. Meanwhile, Lydia went on in her own way, following her own rhythm. She had now three children, two sons by Tom, and Anna by her forever husband. These three children kept her so busy as not to give her any time for her husband. Anna being the eldest felt supremely proud and independent. At seventeen, she was touchy, full of spirits, and very moody. Her pride was unbounded. This even troubled her parents. She went to the church but her proud mind would not understand the language. She was only eighteen when William, her cousin, came to live at the Marsh. She felt excited. She found in William as she did not know him from the childhood days, a man, who had something strange in him. The self always seeks what it lacks. It has a hole in the heart, as it were. Anna felt the same as did Tom in respect of Lydia. The young woman was not only excited, she was also "troubled by the strangely intimate, affectionate way her father had towards this young man." William seemed gentle towards Tom. This irritated Anna because she perhaps expected the same consideration for herself. She showed her superiority as the two went together. She took it ill when Will tried to divert her attention to him: "'Why would he obtrude, and draw notice to himself? It was bad taste'(269).

A proud woman as she was, she could not tolerate even a slight mistake on Will's part. He was interested in churches, in church architecture. He was influenced by Ruskin in this regard. She would often listen to him talk about church architecture. She was in such moment carried away but it almost hurt her, whenever she felt charmed by him. Will offered, no doubt, an opportunity to her to belong, as he freed her from her desire to be home bound. In him she had escaped, in him "the bound of her experience were transgressed; he was the hole in the wall, beyond which the sunshine blazed on her outside world" (271). Virginia Woolf would call it, as she does in "To The Light House," "The Window", the title of the first chapter of the novel. He would often come to their place and was gladly received. Eventually Anna and Tom started withdrawing to their private space. Tom got irritated on such occasions. Nevertheless he liked and respected his nephew. Lydia was irritated by

Anna. So gradually Anna and William gained a new independence, a new relationship. Anna sought her freedom to live independently of her parents. The two young hearts found themselves in perfect harmony with each other. It went on for some time but soon Will started feeling uneasy. He felt that there was something fixed in him, forever. So in her company he felt both glad and afraid. This 'something' in Lawrence is the fixed self, which longs to flow towards the other but is equally afraid of losing itself in the process. Will did not know what to do. As she wanted to go home, he felt more miserable. They, then decided to marry. Anna has been much more alive even during the courtship. But to him, "she was a flame that consumed him, the flame flowed up his limbs, flowed through him, till he was consumed, till he existed only as an unconscious dark, transit of flame, deriving from her"(281) Obviously Will feared the loss of his relationship even before their marriage. During their honeymoon, he and she had got up in the morning even to breakfast. And Will felt guilty, as if he were committing a breach of the law-ashamed that she was not up and doing. The title of the chapter VI is ironically "Anna Victrix". This crisis of the disturbance of organic relationship begins here because Will had a religious cast of mind, whereas Anna had none. While lying together, she, of course, felt hungry but she would rather not get up. In fact, both felt terribly hungry. Besides being religious, Will also was an orderly, conventional mind, that would not violate the established rules of things. For example, one ought to get up in the morning and wash oneself and be a social being. Instead, the two of them stayed in the bed till nightfall and then got up. Anna did not wash even her face. Will, however, felt ashamed in the company of the elders. However, he allowed her to do as she liked. Indeed he put himself in her hand, throwing his qualms to the winds, his maxims, his rules; his smaller beliefs were scattered by her. He was very much astonished and delighted to see them gone. Such was their abandon. The old things did not matter any more. Still he was less careless than her. She enjoyed her domination over him. This is not to say that Will was fully won. He was ashamed at his own dependence on her. At times he was angry. He began slowly to lose his head, marking the beginning of their struggle and Anna's eventual victory.

Lawrence's attempt to bring human relationship to an even keel seems to fail. As we have noted, Lawrence's position, in this regard, there cannot possibly be any relationship without conflict. But he is careful to note that the fight should not end in death, nor should it end in defeat. Anna was proud of her young body. She loved Will, "to put his hand on her ripe fullness, so that he should thrill also with the stir and the quickening there" (320). But Will was

afraid and silent. It was so deathly to her, that he was unresponsive. His defeat resulted in her victory. He went away, trembling, and slept apart. Nevertheless, the birth of the child whom they together named Ursula brought about some satisfaction, some reconciliation between the two; they saw in the child the picture of the saint, but that was not to minimize Anna's victory. She was, indeed, Anna Victrix. Will could not combat her anymore. He was out in the wilderness, alone with her.

This is the paradox of human relationship that Anna and Will were together and yet apart. As we have seen, there is no relative self in Lawrence, for we want relationship and yet remain our separate selves in it. As a result of this alienation, Will preoccupied himself with the architecture of the church, while she wallowed in the richness of her youth and procreativity. Meanwhile Ursula started growing amidst her parent's separate preoccupations. She became the child of her father's heart, it was natural for her to become dearer to Will, as Anna was busy with her second child. But even this relationship of father and the daughter was not without a conflict or two. Anna blamed her husband for rebuking Ursula. Still Ursula loved her father. Everything she did, was magic to her. By the time she was eleven, she was the eldest of the family of two sisters and one brother, but Lawrence concentrates on Ursula's growth. Like her mother she was a proud child. She could not take kindly to her parents' distance between them. She could see that human relationship was difficult to form. She could also see how they were different, her father "so utterly simple in his demeanor, yet with his strong, dark soul fixed like a root in unexpressed depths that fascinated and terrified her: "her mother, so strangely free of all money and convention and fear, entirely indifferent to the world, standing by herself, without connection..."(364). She wanted to remove the separation between her parents. But outside, it was all vastness.

Thus she grew up from her girlhood to her womanhood amidst parents' loss of belonging to each other. As a consequence, she also became conscious that she was a separate identity in the midst of an unredeemed obscurity. She wanted to belong, to have an organic relation. She longed to go somewhere, she longed to become something. She often felt depressed living in an "undiscovered life"(376).

It is in being mutual, in forming a community, in being persons rather than individuals, that they could attain to the I-thou relationship. But unfortunately both of them, one after the other became 'it'. She then casually asked whether he had an appointment in India. But he was presently on six months leave - he would enjoy hunting polo and perhaps do some work about which he was not definite

Lawrence, here observes: "He was always side-tracking, always side tracking his own soul. She would see him so well out there in India - one of the growing class, superimposed upon an old civilization, lord and master of a clumsier civilization than his own" (475).

Thus he would become alien to himself; he would control people rather than form community with them. He would organize, rather than be with Indians. It was his choice. He would again become an aristocrat, inverted with authority and responsibility, having a great helpless populace beneath him. Lawrence gives these details of his pre-occupation in India precisely because he wishes to show that the loss of self in controlling other people has already resulted in his loss of Ursula. To fulfil this condition he would go to India, but that was not her road. And yet she loved him, at least the body of him. He also wanted something of her, not her whole self. But the meeting of partial selves, the bodily selves at the cost of the spiritual selves or the whole-selves.

He obviously wanted a casual relationship, not a relationship of value. He was waiting for her to decide of him. It has been decided in her long ago when he kissed her first. She was still prepared to yield, though not in her will. She was still in her heart and soul his prisoner. He waited upon her. And she accepted him.

He was happy that she had accepted him. They were once again lovers burning with the fire of love. A new life flowed into her—a new warmth a woman was capable, the whole of woman. She was exhilarated. As they walked towards a remoter place, he took her hand. What Lawrence shows in their coming together is their inauthenticity; it is a comment on Ursula, for this would eventually result in her loss of identity, for she knew him so well. He held her with a subtle, stealthy, powerful passion. But she, in a bad faith, said: "It is like it was before" (476). Lawrence was quick to write: "Yet it was in the least as it was before, nevertheless his heart was perfectly in accord with her. They thought one thought" (476).

Ursula thus put her body in his body or in his hands and abstracted herself, as if he meant nothing. She started asking questions in order to forget her situation. Once such an absurd question was: "Did you always love me?(476). He found it difficult to answer but deviously said: "I had to come back to you. You were always at the back of every thing" (476). And though he did not mean to say anything straight that he loved her, she said: "I loved you, always" (476).

Lawrence is very subtle when he comes to describe human relationship. He is equally ironical. He lets human beings betray themselves through their relationships in bad faith in which, as for example Ursula and Skrebensky indulged. He calls such

relationship "dark"(477): "She was all dark will-less, having only' the receptive will" (477). Skrebensky also seemed like the "living darkness upon her, she was in the embrace of strange darkness...like darkness is closed upon her, omnipresent at the night, "(477) obviously, as he shows, darkness clemes to darkness. Such is the quality of this relationship. They met very often during this period, though her soul mocked at all this pretence: "Herself, she kept on pretending. She hurried through her lectures because Skrebensky was waiting in darkness to possess her dark-self. Outside the college the cuter darkness, Skrebensky was always waiting" (478). They met as an animal do. They went to theatres and public meetings anywhere and everywhere, because they had their own company. They always met even by skipping classes. As Lawrence would ironically say, they felt free. But freedom lies In responsibilities. None of them could, or would understand it. They were two inauthentic souls ironically searching in each other their respective identity Lawrence doesnot reject bodily responses, provided they are genuine, particularly when one does not seek to possess the other. She was "caught up, entangled in the powerful vibration of the night" (480), as Lawrence writes. He further writes: "The man, what was he? a dark, powerful vibration that encompassed her. She passed away as on a dark wind, far, far away, into the pristine darkness of paradise, into the original immortality. She entered the dark fields of immortality" (480).

Lawrence's treatment of this relationship, of the possessor and the possessed is what is an utter disturbance of organic relationship of the possessed. In this relationship, Ursula becomes the other. Thus alienated from herself she enters the world of Skrebensky. Her body flows to the other, who sucks it into his orbit, dissolving her world. This alienation, this loss of organic relationship is made manifest by Lawrence through the affective structures such as shyness: "When she rose, she felt strangely free, strong. She was not ashamed, - why should she be? He was walking beside her, the man who had been with her. She had taken him, they had been together..."(480).

However this is what she feels, but the fact is that she felt ashamed for what she did, knowing full well that the man was not honest. Her denial that she was not ashamed to express the consciousness of her body not as she claimed it her own, but as she disowned it for the other. Or else, she could not have been embarrassed by her own body. Only a body which Lawrence feels, exists for the other can become an occasion for an embarrassment. "Wither they had gone, she did not know, but it was as if she had received another nature" (480); it means she was not herself. She received another self given by

Skrebensky. She went back to her parents but with an another self that knew darkness. Of course, she felt stranger; she had become indifferent of the opinion of the world. Her strength was the strength of darkness. According to Lawrence, however, "Her whole soul was implicated with Skrebensky—"not the young man of the world, but the undifferentiated man he was." (480). This relationship had obviously made her different—stronger and more powerful, but Lawrence would not wish Ursula to ignore the world. One doesnot exist apart from the world. Such an attitude brought about a split in herself; while she continued at college, or at home in her ordinary routine, she could feel the flow of her under-life. This was an unhappy split. She would have lunched with him in his hotel and spend his evenings with him, either in town or at his rooms or in the country. She lied to herself as to others. She made the excuse at home of evening study for her degree. But she paid not the slightest attention to her study. The two existed in their supreme bliss, making everything else subordinate to their passion. They felt free. Skrebensky expresses his desire to get married but it was Ursula who was not sure whether she wanted to marry him. She wanted to postpone the moment of decision, and yet she wished to enjoy his company. They stayed in hotels as man and wife. They even bought a wedding ring, from a shop in a poor quarter. Thus they lived in an exclusive world. Ursula was like a girl who would go with a man and yet believe that there was nothing unfair about it. She even believed she was a young wife of a titled husband on the eve of his departure for India. In fact, she tried to loose her identity in such a make-belief. She was, in fact, lying to herself—hiding the truth from herself as well as other. In fact, she was deceiving herself. She knew that he would be gone, but she continued believing that he might stay put.

On the other hand he also went on "disposing of her" (483). Before leaving for India in all probability, he wrote a letter which revealed his mind that he wanted to go and also wanted her to stay on to take her degree and so on. He wished if only he could be with her. All he wanted now was to marry her, to be sure of her. Yet all the time, as Lawrence writes, "he was perfectly, perfectly hopeless, cold, extinct, without emotion or connection. (483) Lawrence finds him utterly divorced from -life, a mere spectre. The whole of his being had become sterile, barren. He had become fixed, flat. The horror of not being possessed him. It all amounts to saying on the part of Lawrnece that Skrebensky had gone back to his fixed self, his reduced self. If he opened up to Ursula, it was a temporary phase. In short, he had no being, no contents.

There was no roundness or fullness in him - everything was a dead shape—devoid of potency

and becoming, roughly equivalent to the inert world of objects and things. He had become a stone among stones. In Lawrence's words, his activities "made up for his own negation, they engaged his negative horror" (484). He only became happy when he drank and he drank a good deal. Ursula, however, still loved him. As a result of his shrunken self, he started avoiding Ursula but somehow they got engaged. He had written to her father and the thing was settled.

They then together went in the countryside near Oxford. She enjoyed his company. She was happy, however, when he had gone back quietly to his own room in the morning, having spent the night with her, "She found herself very rich in being alone, and enjoying to the full her solitary room..." (484). While being very casual, Lawrence very subtly introduces the sense of human longing for solitariness. It is seen Lawrence's in emphasis on human aloneness. With others, - howsoever intimate may be their relation, a Lawrence persona feels uneasy. The disturbance of organic relationship in Lawrence, is, as we have seen in the two novels under the present study not a smooth affair. When left to herself, she drew up her blind and saw the plum trees in the garden below all glittering and show and delighted with the sun-shine. She hurried through her dressing to go and walk in the garden under the plum trees, before anyone should come and talk to her. Obviously, she did not wish to be disturbed by Skrebensky. On being questioned as to where she had gone, she with a glowing face, told him that it was so lovely to go out under the plum trees. This put Skrebensky off. A shadow of anger crossed his soul. It meant that she was happy without him. He hardened his will, as Lawrence notes.

The human relationship is a complex issue. It want to be ourselves and in relation with others. Such a relationship is apparently difficult to achieve. It is not that Ursula was not in love with him, but she had also her own self. The moment he was pacified, she pretended to be tired. So she went quickly to bed. He waited and when she came to him, she once again enjoyed his company. Once more she "owned his body and enjoyed it with all the delight and carelessness of a possessor" (485). Lawrence is careful to note that human relationship feels threatened with the other, except when we are able to possess the body of the other. His language betrays his mind, particularly the words. "owned" and "possessor." Lawrence's world is, of course, not an insulated world, experienced in isolation. Lawrence's characters live in this temporalised world, of as all of us do. It is, in this world that Ursula or Anna or Lydia come in contact with their male counterparts. As Tom falls in love with Lydia and as Anna gets enamoured of his cousin will. So, Ursula so readily falls in love with the first young man who meets her in a casual situation. So the first

condition for any relationship including that of man-woman relationship is that the world is already given to us. It is in this world that others have already made their appearance. Hence we are always in for some relationship. There is nothing particular about our-choices of others. Lawrence's study of human relationship is to be seen in this contingent world. Ursula was happy to enjoy the body of Skrebensky as a master, as a possessor, but Skrebensky was on worm as not to resent her attitude. So, "he had become gradually afraid of her body" (485). Nevertheless, he wanted her endlessly, but observes Lawrence, "there had come a tension into his desire, a constraint which prevented his enjoying the delicious approach and the loveable close of the endless embrace. He was afraid. His will was always tense, fixed" (485).

Skrebensky felt no longer free. It is in this sense that he could consider himself as slave, owned and possessed. He had become a slave to the degree that his relation was dependent on Ursula's love. He wanted her, as Lawrence says, 'endlessly'. That was his bondage; he could free himself by withdrawing himself from her. So, out of fear, he wanted to be alone. When he learned that she would willingly go to India with him, he was angry, particularly the way she said that she would be glad to leave England, as everything about the country was so meager and partly that even its democracy was unspiritual. Ironically, he became angry that she might readily go with him but he did not know why he was not happy. Somehow, he could not bear it, the kind of language she used for attacking her own country: "It was as if she were attacking him" (485). He felt that he was without defence for a freedom which was not his freedom. It is in this sense that he could not appreciate Ursula's calling his country unspiritual. She not only said this much, she continued hammering that only the greedy and ugly people come to the top in a democracy and that only degenerate races are democratic.

As Lawrence finds, this discussion regarding the merits and demerits of democracy versus aristocracy was not indeed, relevant in itself. The fact was that he did not want her to accompany him to India and she wanted to go because she was in control of his body. It was his fall that can be most generally describe as a fall from himself. He wanted to belong but failed to do so because he felt afraid of her supremacy. It was he who wanted her more than she did. The question whether she wanted aristocracy or democracy was nevertheless relevant because it also pertained to the question of domination, though in political terms. Human relationships are also in a deeper sense, political. That is why, we think of man-woman relationship in terms of sexual politics. Lawrence equates human relationship with human freedom. Ursula not only owned his body but also

claimed her preference for aristocracy. She was righteous in her views in striking down the flag of male supremacy. He hated her for what she said. His cunningness, nonetheless, suggested to him "all the ways of making her esteem him" (486). His only defence was the objectification of Ursula. He could do only one thing in this regard. He left her and did not write to her. He flirted with the other women, with Gudrun, her sister, this strategy obviously made her angry. She was still fiercely jealous of his body. She accused him.

Lawrence's view of human relationship, especially with regard to mutual objectification, endangers the identity of one or the other. It is never, therefore, a balanced relationship. The clash between Ursula and Skrebensky, as was expected ended in the rupture of their relationship what hurt him was her refusal to marry him. This is how she retaliated in response to his earlier indifference to her. She refused to marry him when he wanted her to marry him. It appeared as if the battle between the two would never end. Both wanted to have an edge over each other. At last, the fight ended. The trouble began one evening. Ursula yearned for something unknown. She was in a state of ecstasy. In this state she met Skrebensky. The fight, the struggle for consummation was terrible. Then they felt as if that were the last meeting between them. He felt, if ever he must see her again "his bones must be broken, his body crushed, obliterated for ever" (498). She also felt dead in her body. Next morning she felt within her—cold and inert. They did not speak, while taking their breakfast, they were two dead people observes Lawrence, "who dare not recognize, dare not see each other" (498). Their meeting had undone them. As Lawrence finds, sexual meetings, within or outside marriage, do not necessarily bring two people together. On the contrary marriage is no refuse for human loneliness. As we have earlier noted, Lawrence is no Freudian in his psycho-analysis. Sexuality, for Lawrence, is no guarantee against our loneliness. So the two, Ursula and Skrebensky lay cold and dead after the sexual act and this realization was enough to part their ways. As Lawrence writes, "He was waiting for her to be gone" (498) when she was out of sight "a great relief came over him, a pleasant banality" (498). In an instant, everything was obliterated. He was childishly amiable and companionable all the day long. He was astonished that life could be so nice, "what a simple thing it was to be rid of her"! (498) he felt. When he was alone, he was friendly but when he was with her, he longed to be lonely. Lawrence's language shows his moral position when he records that he felt a pleasant "banality" after she was gone Lawrence would want them to stay together, but that required both courage and discipline on the part of both Ursula and

Skrebensky. Lawrence would insist that human relationship is a flickering balance, a rainbow, so to say, which cannot be grasped and made stable, neither its occurrence, nor its colours.

The last chapter of the novel is rightly titled "The Rainbow". Thus stretching his narrative over a period of three generations, Lawrence could sustained narrative momentum by including a range of successes and failures, since successes by themselves arrest the narrative. Therefore, he uses failures to move the plot forward, just as he sustains dramatic action by holding successful marriages in a stage of flux. He puts the failure of Ursula-Skrebensky's relationship in the context of his view that unequal relations are easy to achieve than the equitable relationships. We can hold the former, stabilize them, as happened with two earlier relationships that of Tom and Lydia, and Will and Anna.

Critics have, in general, appreciated Lawrence's perception of human relationships, including F.R. Leavis, who, among others have appreciated the loss of communal relation in the age of technology. But the problem is not so much of the loss of communal sense—a believing community, as much the difficulty in having a rainbow of relationships. A community can possibly remove some of the problems of couples, but the essential of man-woman relationship can be appreciated by the two sexes themselves. The problem of disturbance of organic relationship is a human problem—of individuals in all their freedom and responsibility. It should not be sidetracked by any other means.

The present reading of the novel, though existential, is not much in contradiction with the reading of F.R. Leavis, particularly with reference to *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*. The critic's praise of these two great novels, the greatest in Lawrence corpus is for their originality¹. According to Leavis, *The Rainbow* is not only Lawrence's complete novel, but also the one he wrote rapidly, till the novelist reached the conclusion, which come with "a certain uncertainty"². It is because of this reason that our discussion begins with the conclusion of the novel. According to Leavis, Lawrence left the conclusion uncertain, because "he has been defeated by the difficulties of life: he has not solved the problem of civilization that he analyses."³ Indeed, as we have also noted, the disturbance of organic relationship organic community has problematized human relationship, but Lawrence does suggest the solution of the problem of mutual objectification that couples indulge in, in order to put each other to shame. And though the solution is only suggested through symbols in all his novels, it is so clearly stated in the essay "Morality and the Novel"⁴. It is there that Lawrence points out that we need to have courage to love, but also discipline not to

enslave the other.⁵

Leavis also finds that it is not in "Lawrence's nature to rest in negation"⁶. He further says that the "affirmation of life was always strong in him, and he had always that profound sense of responsibility which, whatever one may conclude about some manifestations, is his strength and his genius."⁷

It is for his affirmation of life that Lawrence finds a place of prominence in Leavis' *The Great Tradition. The Rainbow* in particular has for its theme "the urgency, the difficult struggle of that higher human possibilities to realize themselves."⁸ Leavis' moral position, however, is that of self realization through which oneness of experience, of thought and feeling as T.S. Eliot also proposed.⁹ is attained. Both Eliot and Lawrence are then close to each other in the thought propounded by F.H. Bradley.¹⁰ Leavis wrote both on Lawrence and Eliot, appreciating their contribution respectively in novel and poetry for what they did in promoting non-contradictory experience. Leavis finds his support in Ursula's laboratory experience how various properties, physical and biological, though being separate, cohere towards unity. This points to Bradley's view of coherence of diversity and unity in which analogously human beings-"individuals, that is, who are themselves, recognizing their separateness or otherness,"¹¹ also recognize that "there is no personal relations that are lasting and satisfactory."¹²

While Leavis' view of separateness and harmony as Lawrence often puts in the phrase "Starry Equilibrium" is idealistic, the same can be read existentially, for existentialist also insist that what one chooses for oneself also chooses for others. This interplay or the dramatic element in Lawrence is pointed out by, for example, J. W. Beach in his *The Twentieth Century Novel*.¹³ According to Beach, Lawrence's "all embracing intention is, seemingly, to show the materialization in human lives of the elemental life-impulse... his main concern is with the stream-with its flow."¹⁴

Beach apparently views Lawrence in

Bergsonian flux. But as we read more closely, Lawrence turns out to be existentialist in his perception of human relationship. Some perceptive critics have already seen Lawrence's existential affiliation, as for example Doris J. Sehwalbe's *D.H. Lawrence and Existentialism*.¹⁵ One more study that is close to the heart of Lawrence is by Judy Atkins' *The Living Relationship in The Rainbow*.¹⁶ It is only hoped that future studies would focus on Lawrence's conception of wholeness or living relationships, finds as does, in it human beings.

REFERENCES

- [1]. F.R. Leavis, *D.H. Lawrence: Novelist* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1957), 21.
- [2]. Ibid, 26.
- [3]. Ibid.
- [4]. D.H.Lawrence, "Morality and the Novel," *20th Century Literary Criticism* (London: Longman, 1972), 127- 131.
- [5]. Ibid.
- [6]. F.R. Leavis, *D.H. Lawrence: Novelist* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1957), 29.
- [7]. Ibid.
- [8]. Ibid., 101.
- [9]. T.S. Eliot, "The Metaphysical Poets," *Selected Essay* (London: Faber and Faber, 1932).
- [10]. F.H. Bradley, *Appearance and Reality* (Columbia Columbia University Press, 1889).
- [11]. F.R. Leavis, *D.H. Lawrence: Novelist* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1957), 103.
- [12]. Ibid.
- [13]. J.W. Beach, *The Twentieth Century Novel* (New Delhi: Kalyani Publishers, rpt. 1994), 370-71.
- [14]. Ibid., 371.
- [15]. Doris J. Sehwalbe, *D.H. Lawrence and Existentialism* (Toledo: University of Toledo Press, 1952).
- [16]. Judy Atkins, *Living Relatedness* (Columbia: University of British Columbia [Canada], 1968).

8/21/2022