

GAZE TYPES IN D. H. LAWRENCE'S *THE RAINBOW* AND *WOMEN IN LOVE*

By

Earl F. Yarrington

A Thesis

Submitted to the Department of English of the State University
of New York, College at Brockport, in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

MAY 2000

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my mother whose constant support throughout my college career has made it possible for me to get this point, and for my brother, Tim for being my persistent companion and friend in life. It is because of their efforts and love that I will someday become a professor. Whenever, I doubted my abilities or was cut down by others, I could always look to them for encouragement. I thank them for dealing with the real me throughout this endeavor.

I also would like to thank Dr. Ingersoll for his constant support of this project, which he encouraged while I was taking one of his classes. He also has given me many opportunities to do extensive research on D. H. Lawrence, and is largely responsible for me getting into the Ph.D. program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. His influence will always be carried with me. And a big thanks to Dr. Matsukawa for being genuinely concerned with my progress during this thesis, and my college activities. She made learning both challenging and fun. Thanks to Dr. Kurtz, who, with very short notice, took on reading this paper, and provided me with detailed criticism and a few laughs. I would also like to thank Dr. Mitrano of the Student Support Services Program for her constant personal and professional support throughout all my difficulties with college, life and this project. And thanks to Dr. Hale for all his help and understanding throughout my years here. All of you are what made my experiences at SUNY Brockport extraordinary, thank you.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this project to my childhood friend, Kim Welsh, whose eyes would always light up when she saw me. She wanted to be a teacher, but, even though killed at eighteen, she will always be in my prayers and an inspiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: FIRST LOVE	21
CHAPTER 3: IN THE MOONLIGHT	33
CHAPTER 4: VOID CHARACTERS	45
CHAPTER 5: CENTERED CHARACTERS	55
WORKS CITED	66

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The focus of this project will be the function of the gaze in *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*. D. H. Lawrence's two works are my focus because they evolve from the same single work, "The Sisters." While struggling greatly with many revisions during this period of 1914, Lawrence came to grips with his own philosophy. However, before the author's new-found closure, he faced some of the greatest challenges of his literary career. The gaze, as one of the senses, is largely responsible for balancing the characters' relationships in Lawrence's work, which came from his own experiences.

Lawrence's many attempts to publish "The Sisters" failed, leaving him in an emotional and financial struggle. Much of the emotional struggle Lawrence felt came from the rejections he received from the editors, who turned down "The Sisters" and *Sons and Lovers*. In general, they claimed that the problem with these works were the obscenity of some passages. Further, there was word from the publisher that there might be a postponement on all projects for six months. This action would include the stoppage of any royalties due to Lawrence (Kinhead-Weekes xxxi). To make things worse, World War I was a great disappointment to him because it dashed his hope for a new world vision. There was simply too much violence in the present. But what he didn't realize at the time was how his decision to write *The Study of Thomas Hardy* would provide him with a solution for his distressed work, "The Sisters." It is while writing *Hardy* that Lawrence was able to finish constructing his own philosophy of life. Simply defined, Lawrence's philosophy involves relationships among people; Lawrence sees the balancing of opposite forces—positive and negative—between people. Mark Kinhead-Weekes explains that this study, "helped Lawrence find a language to articulate his own

deepest beliefs, and grasp, with greater clarity, what his fiction had been reaching towards since *Sons and Lovers*" (xxxii). It is this philosophy, the necessity of the dialectic opposition between all things, that make these two works important when discussing the gaze. Here, Lawrence finds his new-found closure; he comes up with a new plan for "The Sisters."

With Lawrence's newly framed thought, he decided to rewrite "The Sisters," opting to split the novel in two. His second revision became the core of *The Rainbow*, along with significant parts of the third revision. His first revision became the basis for *Women in Love* (Kinkead-Weekes xxxiii-xxvii). Therefore, it is Lawrence's newly adapted theory, which has strong ties to each work, including his use of religious language. Part of Lawrence's opposition theory involves the religious; he sets out to create his "bible" in *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*: For instance, God the Father is all-embracing, but God the Son is self-awareness. This, simply defined, sets up the necessary opposition in all things (Kinkead-Weekes xxxiv). We see this opposition present throughout both works involving all the major characters.

Because sight plays such an important part in human relations and identity, it too has conflicts. In order to better understand these conflicts of vision and how they are important to Lawrence's works, the gaze itself needs further explanation.

Laura Mulvey's well-known study on visual pleasure in the cinema explains how gazing at a film can produce pleasure for the viewers. One of these pleasures is scopophilia, the pleasure in looking. Her interpretation of Freud's "Three Essays on Sexuality" explains that people become objects to the scopophilic viewer, where the viewer is able to decipher only a sexual desire from the object. In other words, as Freud

explains further in “Instincts and Their Vicissitudes,” this voyeuristic activity, if obsessive, can lead to perversion, where the only sexual pleasure one can experience is through looking (Mulvey 434-35).

But the function of the gaze is more complex than merely providing pleasure. It forms much of human identity. According to Mulvey, Lacan explains that during childhood, children see their image in a mirror as more complete. They don't see themselves for who they are; they create an idealistic image of themselves. Therefore, the recognition of themselves is really misrecognition; this concept is known as Lacan's Mirror Stage. The child sees what she/he wants to see. This phenomenon establishes how the child will view others in the future (Mulvey 435). What occurs in the individual are two ways of gazing, subject/object and identity recognition. These two viewing elements can run contrary to each other, “. . . one implies a separation of the erotic identity of the subject from the object on the screen (active scopophilia), the other demands identification of the ego with the object on the screen through the spectator's fascination with and recognition of his like” (Mulvey 435).

Turning back to Lawrence, forces of opposition sustain the life-force in everything. Like my earlier example, God the Father and God the Son, the gaze also needs to be balanced between the pleasure of looking and the recognition of self. When balanced, pleasure is experienced when looking, but the subject recognizes his/her own self in the object and recognizes others in the self-image. In other words, the subject's curiosity in looking brings out desire—when the object is favorable, but the object becomes the subject when the original subject sees her or his own self in the image. For example, John says, “I think Sue is desirable because she's sexy and strong.” John's

objectification of Sue identifies his desire for her sexually as sexual object; however, John also respects her strength as a person. Here is the recognition of self, balancing the subject/object principle. This is not to say that Sue is not strong by herself without John playing a part; rather, good self-recognition is really about identifying the similarities *all* humans share with one another.

If John looks at Sue and says, “Wow, what a fox,” notice that there is only the subject/object principle. Sue is, in fact, being separated from human comparison by being called a cute animal. John does not see himself as a fox, a cute animal. This could very well lead John to more perverse behavior because of the lack of the self-recognition principle.

The gaze will be discussed with these two principles, the subject/object and self-recognition. The balancing of these gazing principles will create healthier characters; its lack will create unhealthy characters. Therefore, my purpose is to show how the major characters in *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* represent the gaze among themselves, and how Lawrence influences the reader’s sight by his construction of the narrative gaze. The gaze, as a trigger for sexuality, plays a major role among Lawrence’s characters because it can either hinder or assist in each character’s and reader’s stability as a spiritual and physical being. In order for the reader to understand how characters gaze upon one another, they must be assisted by the narrator in obtaining a visual picture of the characters and their actions. The description of each character’s body helps to define his or her actions more clearly to the reader.

One theorist who has been especially helpful for understanding the narrative gaze is Peter Brooks. He explains that the individual body, its desires, pains and pleasures has

been repressed, especially in the medieval and early modern period (Brooks 4).

However, as the novel develops in the nineteenth century, the body and its desires both indirectly and directly start coming center-stage through the language of the novel. The body, through metaphors and visual devices, becomes a major element in narrative plot and meaning. The description and action of the body paints for the reader a visual representation of a particular body—male or female—how the body is affected within its social context, and the struggle to break free from such a context (Brooks 3-7).

In order for the reader to understand the above triad, the author must be successful in creating a narrative gaze for the reader. For example, a man noticing the beauty of a woman's ringlets can fit into the triad: woman's ringlets are a sexual marker to attract a man, ringlets are fairly exclusive to Western society. If a woman finds herself to have very fine hair—she has trouble curling it—she may try to break free from this marker. Therefore, to be capable of conveying this, the writer creates a successful representation of the body by using words.

The reader must see the body as a signifier. The words create the body and the body creates the reader's expectations; i.e., the reader expects the character (body) to fall in love; the reader expects the character to dress according to his or her own style (Brooks 6-7). The character is not real in fiction, or non-fiction for that matter, because even real-life characters must be recreated according to the biographer. Therefore, characters become signifiers of true people who live(d) or must be real enough for the reader to believe. The reader's preconceived cultural notions contribute to or constrict his or her vision and, oftentimes, a good writer is aware of these notions the reader has.

However, the words used in novels must be non-obstructive. The language cannot hinder the character creation; rather, it must add to the creative, visual experience of the reader. Brooks writes, “The body, I think often presents us with a fall from language, a return to an infantile presymbolic space in which primal drives reassert their force. . .” (7). All of our most powerful symbols come from bodily sensations (7). It may seem as if language devalues itself because *it* does not hold the power, but if language is a system of symbols which represents the objects of everyday life for a person and/or population, then language serves as a vital link to the reader’s creative visualization, which includes the earlier mentioned cultural notions, and other senses. Language is not needed *when* experiencing; it is needed *to* experience. In other words, the novel needs to *trigger* these primal drives and bodily sensations when its many signifiers are used to create the experience. Novels, similar to the cinema Mulvey discusses, are these experiences, and must depend on the written symbols to fulfill the reader’s desires.

It is also possible for the body to be read as a text. Brooks discusses Roland Barthes’s theory:

. . . the “symbolic field”—the field of reference of the symbolic code, the one of his five codes of structure and meaning in narrative that refers to the text’s overall rhetorical, thematic, and economic structurings—“is occupied by a sole object, from which it derives its unity. . . . This object is the human body.” (6)

In order for the text to be successful, it must create a vivid image of the desired body, and the body must, when gazed upon by the reader, read into the text. This object, the

character's body, is nonetheless part of the novel. What I will be establishing is that the gaze is far more than a single element; the gaze has variations. These variations, among what has been already discussed, include the writer and reader's conscious and subconscious contributions.

The variant of focus in this project will be the *narrative gaze*. The narrative gaze is created on two levels. First, the narrator controls and assists the reader in creating a visual representation of the body—reading the body through the use of signifiers—which helps the reader establish the visual image. This includes my reference to the earlier mentioned gaze types along with her or his cultural attitudes and experiences. Second, these visual characters gaze upon each other according to the narrator's wishes where he assists the reader's imagination. The second level includes sub-levels dealing with gender and sexual orientation.

The sub-levels involve the following: heterosexual gazing, which can be both healthy and unhealthy; homosexual, which can also be healthy or unhealthy. These are part of the narrative gaze Lawrence is using both in creating his characters' appearance and in their dealings with one another. In other words, my project is concerned with how gazing is involved in the characters' relationships within the novel, and my interpretation of them as a reader. Brooks emphasizes "the epistemic principle, and the point from which vision is directed at the world, have largely throughout the Western tradition been assumed to be male"(96). The Western tradition assumed that all its readers *were* male and would view only women as objects. Therefore, only a heterosexual gaze existed. Today, it's evident this is not true because there are ways people look at both sexes, regardless of sexual orientation. The gaze is under the direction of the subject and

involves whom the subject chooses to look at, regardless of the gazer's sexual orientation. In other words, the particular gaze is *not exclusive* to one's claimed sexual preference; rather, it is how the subject chooses to look at the object. Brooks explains that people gaze for knowledge:

Sight, knowledge, truth, and woman's body: such a nexus intertwines central and highly charged attitudes and gestures of our culture. Man as knowing subject postulates woman's body as the object to be known, by way of an act of visual inspection which claims to reveal the truth—or else makes that object into the ultimate enigma. Seeing woman as other is necessary to truth about the self. (97)

But if seeing woman as other is necessary in order to define self, and if it involves simply a quest for knowledge, a revelation of truth, a defining mechanism for the self, then it is not desire that triggers curiosity; it is curiosity that triggers desire. The above is also true when viewing the same sex with one exception, however. When looking at the same sex, you *believe* there must be a difference. Difference creates a need to know. When looking at the other sex you *know* there is a difference. Both start with curiosity, which leads to desire if the image is acceptable, regardless of orientation (nude men have been sculpted and painted for centuries by men). In other words, if men look at women for knowledge and to define themselves, then men must look at other men to maintain their sense of self. Mulvey explains that men identify with the male hero in cinema which sustains their own self-image. For example, a man whose preference is heterosexual may see another man changing his clothes and examine this man's body. This examination is a homosexual gaze because he looks with curiosity—a curiosity that

is created by the subject *believing* that there *must* be a difference to behold in the other individual. However, the same man may gaze at a woman sunbathing. This is a heterosexual gaze because he looks with curiosity—a curiosity that is created by the subject *knowing* that there *is* a difference to behold in the other's body. Overall, gender preference does not make one type of gaze exclusive.

For this project, curiosity is the precursor to desire. It is a need to find out more about someone or something. For example, John may have a curiosity for snakes because he watched them on television; however, when he takes a course in herpetology, he finds them repulsive. He not only loses his curiosity, but he never develops a desire to own or learn more about snakes. These explanations of curiosity and desire fit into the above examples because, in both the sexual homosexual and heterosexual gazing “mode,” the gazer is trying to find out more. If the man finds the man changing his clothes or the woman sunbathing repulsive, he will no longer have a sexual curiosity for that object, the person.

There is, however, one problematic issue about the snake/human example. John finds all snakes repulsive and has no curiosity for them, but the man gazing in the locker room and on the beach does not find other men or women repulsive and will continue to gaze at other humans. The reason for this is that humans are social creatures who need each other. Therefore, the curiosity will rebound, and transference—i.e., I saw a naked woman and she was ugly, so all naked women are ugly—will not be a lasting factor. However, the snake is more generalized because it is not a necessity for humans to interact socially with snakes. Now, let's look further into mental processes associated with the gaze.

Moving back to Freud, the visual gaze gains importance when, early in development, humans learn to walk upright. When on all fours, humans relied more on the sense of smell to trigger sexual desire. However, when humans began walking upright their genitals were more exposed creating this shift among the senses. This shift may also explain the human desire to hide the genitals by covering them (Brooks 10). I may also add that even though humans conceal genitals, their clothing has become manifestations of the male and female sexuality. Clothing tags tell us that the human we are gazing at is either female or male. Therefore, tags and sex type are the difference and not the gaze itself. Gazing becomes important for both sexes because clothing is really an extension of sexuality, similar to a bird's showing its plumage. If these tags are crossed, it becomes very frustrating how one should address and view the one whose crossing them. So whether a person is viewing tags such as Gudrun's stockings in *Women in Love* or a nude body, Brooks claims that vision, "desire and drive toward knowledge become connected though narrative in a newly eroticized sense of time as the medium of desire and its possible realization" (11). The reader has control over time by choosing when to read the novel. Novels are manipulations of this desire, creating a fictionalized world where desires can be acted out.

The question now arises, what desires are acted out? The gaze triggers one's instinctual drive (id), but this drive is repressed by the ego and superego. Even though novels and the cinema are not dreams, there can be several similarities. Some books have been banned because they create thoughts contrary to societal beliefs. Therefore, authors attempt both consciously and unconsciously, during the writing process, to use symbols and metaphors to convey the true meaning of the text. In other words, books can act as a

mystic dream, a condensed and recycled version of a latent dream (Wright 16-19). Some of the desires the characters have are consciously obvious, i.e., Jane Austen's Emma desires a relationship with Mr. Knightley (*Emma*). But other desires are more unconscious, i.e., Jane Eyre's desire to break free from patriarchal society. With this concept in mind, Freud's "dream-work" can be used to analyze scenes that are dream-like or ones that have a more taboo societal meaning.

The three views Freud has of the processes of the mind are, according to Elizabeth Wright, the dynamic, the economic and the topographical. The dynamic involves the interplay between internal and external forces creating conflict. For example, Tom is gay but he keeps it to himself because most people in his town hate homosexuals. In the economic, the ego is created to regulate both instinct and social demands in order to maintain self-preservation; Tom accepts who he is and decides to move to a more accepting town. The topographical, which will be the focus here, contains two versions to mediate conflicts of energy. The three-fold division, the first version, is made up of the conscious, the preconscious and the unconscious. The conscious uses the senses to create an order of the external world with vision being most prominent. The preconscious determines subjects and events that can be thought of at will. The unconscious represses elements from the conscious and preconscious. The repressed elements in the unconscious come out in latent dreams, but much of the latent dream can be lost because the subject replaces or leaves out elements in the manifest dream, which would bring the forbidden desire to the surface. When dreams occur, it is due to the "return of the repressed," the emergence of this desire (Wright 9-13).

The second topographical version deals with the desire, drives and needs of the body better known as the id, the ego and the superego. These, as mentioned earlier, will be used here according to their classical definitions: desire (id) is regulated by the ego through the negotiation of both the superego—which is usually the outside and/or familial authority and the id's drive (Wright 10-11).

The true id or desire of a character in a novel and how this desire is being compromised by society is created by curiosity and the gaze. In a dream or novel, words can mean other things besides their general meanings—metaphors or symbols of the repressed desire. Because gazing at a body triggers desire and drive, an important interplay develops between the author, reader, characters, and the mental processes mentioned above. The categories of the dream-work and how it works in constructing the latent dream from the manifest are my next concern.

As Wright explains, the dream-work is made up of four categories. These parts are used to retrace the dream through its string of associations. First is condensation. The manifest dream has less content where words and symbols can take on more than one meaning. For example, the appearance of a bee in your dream may identify your fear of bees, but also symbolize your love of honey. Displacement, the second event, can happen in combination with condensation. Disguises are used to replace elements in the latent dream. The considerations of representability are next. Here, the latent becomes “imagined by words” (9). The images created may not reflect on the real meaning or the order of the dream where images create a string of pictures. These images or symbols may recur in other typical dreams or can be cultural symbols. Finally, secondary revision takes place. Usually, secondary revision is a verbal telling of a dream where a logical

order is created; however, the conscious creates a revision of this dream, but the “mind’s eye” is still unchanged (19-23).

The dream-work is a complicated process and will be better understood when various parts of Lawrence’s texts are discussed and analyzed. Lawrence creates characters who are “dream-like” or are in scenes that appear as such. The body is involved in these instances where gazing triggers conflicting drives. Therefore, if the central preoccupation of the novel is the body, then Lawrence would not only bring his theory to the forefront, but enhance and further develop both Freud’s topographical and dream-work theories and Mulvey’s scopophilic and self-recognition gaze types. Gazing also triggers both desire and a drive for knowledge, an understanding of what the subject is looking at. But desire is not meant to be a stationary feeling; rather, it triggers not only the senses, but touches the spiritual and physical core of every individual.

The narrative gaze plays a central role in both *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* because it is used to trigger the character’s and thus the reader’s narrative gaze invoking his or her primal awareness, the passionate and sometimes promiscuous side of human nature. The narrative gaze Lawrence creates in both novels acts as a trigger to the further development of the battle of the wills.

As Eric Levy indicates, *Women in Love* deals primarily with this battle of the wills. Ursula and Birkin are the characters working towards a centered self, whereas Gudrun and Gerald are void characters because a void they are not balanced; their obsessions collapse upon them. They are involved in an unhealthy opposition (5-7). The development of these centered and void characters originates in their childhood development. This can be traced by, first, looking at *The Rainbow* and paying attention

to Ursula's upbringing and the sense of time. *Women in Love* gives a few instances of Gerald's childhood and why he fails to be a centered character. By putting the two novels together, more can be learned of Gudrun's childhood also. These novels show the developmental cycle of the wills in both a positive—Ursula and Birkin—and negative—Gudrun and Gerald—light. Gerald and Gudrun are too emotionally charged; they are trying to defend their emptiness by fighting each other until one kills the other. But Ursula and Birkin create an equilibrium:

In Lawrence's psychology, true love consummates the recognition of independent selfhood, in both oneself and the other who is loved.

Through awareness of the loved one as an inviolable other—a separate self whose autonomy can never be absorbed—each becomes aware of himself (or herself) as pure other to the loved one: “For she was to him what he was to her, the immemorial magnificence of mystic, palpable, real otherness” (320). Each enjoys the “perfectly suspended equilibrium” (319) of his own selfhood only through respecting the intrinsic equilibrium of the other. (Levy 5)

This kind of deep understanding does not just happen. The couple goes through this developmental process. If Birkin feels any regret, it is only because of Gerald's inability to be centered. But how does the gaze fit into Lawrence's theory of wills and equilibrium?

If the gaze acts as a trigger enabling the centered characters to better balance their wills, then what about the void characters' gazing? There are different forms of gazing, both healthy and unhealthy. A novelist can use the narrative gaze to make a reader look

lustfully or respectfully at someone. If one sees a person as primarily a sex object, he or she will look lustfully and thus objectify that person, and may also objectify the sex of that person. If one sees the other person as a human being deserving of respect and individuality, she or he will view this individual, and this individual's sex in a different light. Sexuality is not being voided here. A person may feel desire when looking at the desired sex; however, there can be both a destructive and productive way of doing so. Having sex or desiring sex is a biological function; this is not true when making love. Disturbingly, a person can have sex with anyone or anything. But making love is separate from the act of sex because sex in itself requires no emotional attachment.

Centered characters are beyond this sexual destructiveness because their struggles are balanced by the connection to others. This involves Levy's explanation of Lawrence's centered characters. One who sees someone only sexually cannot love because he or she seeks only the act, the satisfaction that never is complete satisfaction, a temporary cure for a terminal disease. This kind of false fulfillment leads, as we see with Gerald and Gudrun, to destruction. Lawrence develops the character's gaze which influences the narrative gaze of the reader.

If gazing can trigger a healthy or unhealthy vision, do these have categories of their own? Can there be a mystic homosexual vision? Can there be a mystic heterosexual vision? The homosexual and heterosexual gaze fit in the mystic and unhealthy vision and will be the focus here. Tom, the heterosexual gazer, in *The Rainbow* gazes at Lydia for the first time and knows she's "the one." Ursula and Gudrun are more complex gazers when watching the people at the wedding. Their gazing is a mixture of homosexual and heterosexual. Gerald and Birkin, the homosexual gazers, strip nude to wrestle. Both

subcategories are challenging because they may not take place between the characters only, but encourage the reader to gaze in either subcategory depending on his or her social influences.

In summary, Lawrence uses the narrative gaze, which involves subject/object and self-recognition gazing, to trigger a balancing of opposing forces. These opposing forces may be centered or uncentered, balanced or void, including types of gazes such as heterosexual and homosexual. How the character handles the gaze involves his/her childhood and psychological development (mystic vision, voyeurism, sadism). Finally, some have a unique situation because they are able to empower themselves by manipulating the gazer. But what is most important here, is how the character visualizes? If Ursula's gaze triggers her desire correctly, then she is seeing mystically. If Gudrun's gaze triggers a desire to dominate, then she has a destructive or unhealthy gaze.

The examination of *The Rainbow* consists of two chapters, "First Love" and "In the Moonlight." *The Rainbow* is important because of its demonstration of time, how and if characters see the past, present and future. Of most importance, is how characters are able to suspend mechanical time. The gaze is a very necessary factor in the suspension of time. Lawrence desires a new utopian society. For humanity to achieve this, the mechanical clock must be eliminated. G. H. Ford points out that Lawrence is not fixed in only the past, present or future; he deals with all three:

The Rainbow can be seen as an historical novel, yet the past of mankind drawn upon is prehistoric, providing "a renewal of the past in the present." Time appears in two versions in these novels [*The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*]. Many of the characters live a day-to-day existence, unconcerned

with past or future. More distinctive is the special kind of experience of present moments, in which the intensification of the experience effect a suspension of clock-time, what Browning called the 'Eternal Moment.' Some of Lawrence's characters, however, are committed to moving beyond the present experience and forward into a future when a utopian society will be realized. (512)

When an eternal moment takes place, it acts much like a dream, for mechanical time is not realized when one is sleeping. An example may best explain the past, present and future process mentioned above.

The Rainbow deals with three generations: Lydia and Tom, Anna and Will, and Ursula and Anton. Lydia and Tom represent the past. Tom is a farmer; Lydia is a widow who comes from an aristocratic Polish family. The present situation has brought their paths together. But even though they do represent the past, they still play a role in securing the present and future. Lydia recreates the past when she marries Tom in the present in order to provide for the future; Anna is the child for the next generation.

Anna and Will belong to the present generation, and will be discussed in detail in chapter two. Anna has little past because she is a small child; however, she and her parents recreate this past when they speak of their own or family history. Will recreates his past through his interest in the church and his religious artwork. Their future is created through their children, particularly Ursula. Ursula and Anton signify the future because, unlike the other generations, there is no marriage between them. In fact, Ursula's life is largely dealt with in *Women in Love*. Ursula seeks this utopian vision, this eternal moment, but she must go through a learning process in *The Rainbow*. The

eternal moment or utopian vision is one of the most important elements for Lawrence's characters. Anna and Will try to make the eternal moment last, but they cannot and, therefore, give up submitting to worldly pressures.

All the characters are involved in this sense of limitlessness. Some want to bask in it while others, like Ursula, desire to move beyond to make the vision more lasting. In order to understand how time does and does not play a role in a given situation, within each novel, it must be explained that traditional life, a life ruled by a natural clock, is at odds with the modern, industrial world—a world ruled by the mechanical clock. This time conflict is what establishes Lawrence's concern over a person's state being stifled, what he calls sensual will. In resistance to this, the author develops an important life-saving theory in order to balance the forces of nature and the forces of modern life, what he calls spiritual will (Ford 512-17). The gaze is involved because it is the sense that can trigger both wills.

Chapter one takes in the first gazing instances in the novel, and how these instances are from a heterosexual or homosexual vantage point. Despite either vantage point, the gaze is either subject/object or self-recognition. Nonetheless, they trigger the primal consciousness; however, if the character has more spiritual will, he/she will have an unhealthy gaze; this is where visual exchange comes in. If the character has more balance between the sensual and spiritual wills—involving suspension of time, he or she will have a healthy gaze and a good relationship. If unhealthy, the relationship falls apart.

Chapter two includes the moonlight and harvest passages because of their dream-like quality. In other words, they can lead us into the consciousness and

subconsciousness of the characters. They also have a timeless quality. The second and third generations are explored, one unhealthy and the other an in-between where a learning process is involved. The dream-work will be used to analyze these dream-like passages, and to show how they relate to Lawrence's theory of the wills and his utopian world vision.

Women in Love will also have two chapters dedicated to it, "Chapter Four: Void Characters" and "Chapter Five: Centered Characters." Chapter Four will focus on the Gerald and Gudrun relationship and their predominantly subject/object gaze. This imbalance of the wills escalates to incompleteness and violence. Chapter six will discuss the more balanced Ursula/Birkin relationship.

For chapter four, the visual exchange plays an important part in the characters' visual mishaps. In other words, they see the world through lack of self recognition. But in chapter five, Ursula and Birkin, through a more balanced will approach, develop their sensual and spiritual wills, keeping the gaze in its rightful place, as a trigger. This gives them the ability to experience what is not seen also. Therefore, Lawrence is interested in a way of seeing others and the world. Earl Ingersoll sees this interest as Lawrence's mystic vision:

It is not a looking at, but a way of seeing the world anew, with eyes able to "see" at last. Even then, this seeing is subordinate to the darkness of the "body of mysterious night," just as "silence" is privileged over even the most inspired "speech." These expressions of a more positive visual exchange are crucial to the narrative's attempt at balancing interest in the two couples. In their own frequently underacknowledged way, they

function as a counterpart variant that might be called a perversion of looking. (270)

Gerald and Gudrun serve as the unhealthy, gazing couple, whereas Ursula and Birkin have obtained self-actualization through this new mystic vision. Therefore, the gazing instances between Ursula and Birkin will be limited but more productive. In fact, there are only two major encounters in *Women in Love*. One encounter occurs in “Moony” and the next in “Excuse”, while the major “unhealthy gazing” situation for Gudrun and Gerald happens in “Coal-Dust” (Ingersoll 269). This overwhelming intensity that Gudrun and Gerald feel towards one another explains Lawrence’s understanding of what Freud discusses about the visual exchange in “Instincts and Their Vicissitudes,” even though Lawrence never read it. Here, the scopophilic is only present. This visual exchange involves three stages: first, the subject gazes at another as object, but as the object becomes more familiar, the subject takes the object’s place where, finally, the object (now the former subject) looks for another subject so that he or she can start over as the passive object (Ingersoll 272). This explanation of the visual exchange is what will be used to explain the unhealthy gaze in the selected scenes from the above named chapters. These scenes will be the gist of the argument when dealing with *Women in Love*.

CHAPTER TWO: FIRST LOVE

For this chapter, I would like to examine the “first love” encounters involving two of the three generations in *The Rainbow*: Will and Lydia, and Ursula and Anton. The second generation, Tom and Anna, will be discussed in detail in chapter three. These first love encounters are important because the type of gaze which is evident in each meeting influences the whole relationship later on. Here, what will be determined is whether the subject/object, self-recognition or a combination of gazes is used by each generation’s characters, and at what sub-level, heterosexual or homosexual, each character gazes. If one gaze is favored, then one of the wills, either sensual or spiritual, will be overdeveloped. On the other hand, if the gaze involves both subject/object and self-recognition, then there is a better chance that both the spiritual and sensual will become balanced.

What is often eliminated in the first love encounter is the sense of time which brings the characters into an eternal moment, a precursor to Lawrence’s hope for a new utopian society. The eternal moment is a force necessary for a balanced life. The recognition of this force triggers the sensual will, which is stifled in modern life. This creates an eternal moment. If the wills are balanced, the eternal moments happen more often for the characters involved. Therefore, these balanced characters can begin to build this future utopian society, a society concerned with a peaceful, sensual coexistence. Whether this society is possible or not is not the issue here. Rather, the focus is how the characters gaze, and how this gazing can influence their lives. Further, the question is how does the narrator assist the reader when creating a visual representation of the characters?

It is interesting to see how the narrator assists in influencing the reader through visual representation of the body. In the first chapter, the “love at first sight” incident between Tom Brangwen and Lydia Lensky gives the reader a wonderful “view” of what Tom sees when first gazing upon Lydia:

Then he turned to look at her. She was dressed in black, was apparently rather small and slight, beneath her long black cloak, and she wore a black bonnet. She walked hastily, as if unseeing, her head rather forward. It was her curious, absorbed, flitting motion, as if she were passing unseen by everybody, that first arrested him. (29)

This first descriptive paragraph uses unusual adjectives which refer to Lydia. But the language is a mixture of culturally positive and negative connotations. The narrator explains, “She was dressed in black. . .her long black cloak. . . she wore a black bonnet” (29). The adjective “black” has negative connotations. It refers to mourning, as in this instance, death and darkness. Moreover, the second sentence in the passage, “She was dressed in black, was apparently rather small and slight beneath her long black cloak,” informs the reader of the visual deception taking place. Lydia must appear long and bulky, but the reader’s eyes peer *beneath* this long, black cloak, undressing her, and see her apparently small, slight self.

The conflicting Lydia character can make sense since she has lost her wealthy husband and finds herself alone in a strange land. But her tragedy will help her through the current conflict by teaching her to balance these opposing wills. Also, conflicting characters attract. Opposites oppose; therefore, opposites attract: life attracts death,

rabbits attract foxes, and women attract men in this instance. Opposition is necessary but not conflict.

For Tom's gaze, it is this dead but living woman who is large but small that "first arrests" him. She is different, and these opposing visuals and actions make her so. Simply put, his heterosexual gaze both sees and sensationalizes Lydia. Tom visualizes more than what is within his gaze:

‘That’s her,’ he said involuntarily. As the cart passed by, splashing through the thin mud, she stood back against the bank. Then, as he walked still beside his britching horse, his eyes met hers. He looked quickly away, pressing back his head, a pain of joy running through him. He could not bear to think of anything. He turned round at the last moment. He saw her bonnet, her shape in the black cloak, the movements as she walked. Then she was gone around the bend. (29)

“That’s her” is certainly a statement beyond Tom’s subject/object gaze. He has never conversed with her, yet he knows Lydia is his future love. His gaze triggers a sensual connection to her. He needs her for a balanced life. After this realization, Tom’s eyes meet hers and he is thrilled at the possibilities of what could come. He is dumbfounded, but does remember to glance at her when she’s walking away so he can gaze at her shape and movement. He has found a kind of recognition in Lydia. He has found himself, his desire in her.

Tom’s gaze is instinctive and impulsive. “He could not bear to think of anything” after his gaze triggers desire. This recognition is what Tom previously lacked. His gazing enables him to release himself from time and find an eternal moment. Tom’s

heterosexual gaze is triggered here because he knows but cannot see *all* the difference Lydia has. When Tom first gazes at her, he does so with curiosity, which leads to desire, which, in turn, triggers the suspension of time until Lydia disappears around the bend.

But Lydia's unseen difference goes further, involving both the subject/object and self-recognition gazes. Part of what draws Tom to Lydia, as Barry Scherr explains, is his desire for the unknown: "Tom is 'unable to know anything, except that this transfiguration burned between him and her, connecting them, like a secret power'" (Scherr 10). The way Lydia is dressed signifies that she comes from the dark, unknown world, where she is unseeing and unseen. The desire the gaze triggers for Tom is an escape from the present, an escape from Cossethay. This escape also introduces Tom to the eternal world for just a moment (Scherr 10). However, in order for Tom to take advantage of this experience, he must take the opportunity to pursue Lydia. Lydia helps to enable his gaze to be balanced between subject/object and self-recognition.

The presence of self-recognition is evident from Tom's involuntary statement at the beginning the passage, "That's her." He sees part of himself in Lydia, but this part of himself has been unknown. More specifically, this unknown part he recognizes for the first time is the loneliness that he and Lydia share. She is "as if unseen" by everyone in a strange land, where he is alone in his home town of Cossethay. Therefore, this recognition of self in Lydia is what "first arrested him."

However, Tom's initial curiosity is activated when he notices this small, dark figure passing by. His curiosity triggers the subject/object gaze. Tom looks at her when she is walking away from him. He observes her shape and movements. Here, she is the sexual object. Earlier in the passage when his gaze meets hers, he looks away with "a

pain of joy running through him” (R 29). His actions suggest his reluctance to be seen by Lydia; therefore, his initial gaze is more voyeuristic with him as the subject and Lydia as object.

The self-recognition gaze is in combination with the subject/object gaze. I see this as a balanced, healthy gaze. Tom first recognizes himself in Lydia and then sees her sexually. When the subject/object gaze triggers self-recognition, Tom looks with curiosity for a known difference in Lydia; however, when she notices his gaze, he looks away—avoiding being seen, but instead of fear, he felt “joy running through him. His gaze switches to self-recognition. So, here, Tom is using the subject/object and self-recognition gaze in a heterosexual context. His curiosity leads to desire because of his knowing there is a difference in Lydia. This difference is what creates the opposition needed in their relationship.

In this short scene the narrator uses conflicting language to describe the character. Furthermore, the language “shows” what the one character desires in the other, an opposing but important force the eternal moment is. Therefore, if the characters can learn to balance their spiritual and sensual wills, they can move successfully toward a permanent utopian existence. This is what I theorize Lawrence desires to convey to readers. But, of course for *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* there are more generations and building blocks at work. For example, what about a homosexual gaze? What about the other generations?

Ursula finds Miss Inger to be very appealing. The question is how does the following passage fit into Lawrence’s vision?

Her hopes were soon to be realized. She would see Miss Inger in her

bathing dress . . . Ursula, trembling, hardly able to contain herself, pulled off her clothes, put on her tight bathing suit . . . Miss Inger came out . . . How lovely she looked. Her knees were so white and strong and proud, she was firm-bodied as Diana . . . For a moment Ursula watched the white, smooth, strong shoulders and the easy arms swimming. (313)

There are a couple of obvious differences to note between this passage and the earlier ones. The first is that the narrator uses no conflicting language to describe each character; next, this gaze is homosexual.

The narrator's description of Ursula's "hopes being realized" treats this encounter like any other impulsive or instinctual drive. This is only unusual because of the time period involved. Here, we have a woman gazing at another woman much the same as a man gazing on a woman. Tom Brangwen "could not bear to think of anything," and this passage where "Ursula trembling [is] hardly able to contain herself" are similar. Even though the narrator relays how Ursula is desiring Miss Inger, there is no opposition present and she fails to have a balance between her subject/object and self-recognition gazes.

Miss Inger's movements are not contrary to her appearance. She is dressed like a Greek girl and is firm-bodied-like the goddess Diana. She has "strong shoulders" and "easy arms," when she is in motion. In fact, Miss Inger, along with her description, remains consistent throughout. Ursula is drawn to Inger through the gaze, similar to Tom's situation, but her gaze becomes unhealthy. This unhealthy gazing does not come from her desiring the same sex; it develops from her placing Inger on the same plane as a goddess or other idol:

And she swam blinded with passion. Ah, the beauty of the firm, white, cool flesh! Ah, the wonderful firm limbs. If she could but hold them, hug them, press them between her own breasts! Ah, if she did not so despise her own thin, dusky fragment of a body, if she too were fearless and capable. (313-14)

Ursula has a curiosity to see Inger's body. When her dream is realized, it leads to desire. However, unlike Tom, Ursula's desire really lies in the hatred she has for her own body. She puts Inger on a pedestal, compares her to Diana, and puts her own body down. Therefore, she not only desires Inger's body; she wants Inger's body to be her own. This is specifically the problem. For the young Ursula, her spiritual plane is over-developed. The society in which she lives has somehow made her negative about herself. Furthermore, the battle of the wills between Ursula and Inger is non-existent because Ursula has not enough confidence to stand her own ground. The result is that the relationship will be unsuccessful.

It may seem that Ursula recognizes herself in her vision of Inger. However, her negative feelings about her body represent a denial of her own self-recognition. Because she wants Inger's body to be her own, she voids her own identity and uses only a subject/object gaze. This gaze has voyeuristic qualities. For instance, much of her visual admiration for Inger occurs when Inger is not looking at her. But Ursula's negative feelings come out once Inger makes eye contact with her, "She turned to see a warm, unfolded face of her mistress looking at her, to her. She was acknowledged" (313). After Ursula is recognized, Inger moves ahead of her student. The physical positioning of Inger's body, ahead of Ursula, makes it possible for Ursula to peer at Inger unnoticed.

But because Ursula was recognized earlier, she must bring her own body into the fantasy. Here is where she must acknowledge her own body.

The swimming passage suggests that Ursula gazes upon Miss Inger as object. As Ursula becomes more accustomed to looking at Inger's body, she starts to compare her own body to Inger's; she takes the place of Inger as object. The reversal from subject to object, which happens because Ursula has negative feelings about herself, is what kills the relationship; therefore, Ursula must go back out as the subject looking for another object (Ingersoll 272). By following this "visual exchange pattern," Ursula is able to create a wishful identity for herself, i.e., she sees herself as Inger until they get too close, then she moves on to Skrebensky.

The Tom and Lydia relationship involves healthy, heterosexual gazing. Tom does not compare himself to Lydia, and the narrator creates Lydia with conflicting characteristics—opposing but necessary forces. Even though these characters are challenged by the modern industrial world, they still have enough balance to stay together. This does not involve marriage alone; rather, it involves the concept of a non-assertive togetherness and equilibrium. Tom and Lydia Brangwen may represent the past, but these characters live presently in the novel where they successfully prepare for the future. They are well balanced because both are in touch with their sensual wills and balance this with their spiritual wills. At first both characters need help. Tom needs to feel "fecund darkness" with a woman, while Lydia needs the guidance of a native English farmer to help her understand the new land she is in. Her sensual will is helped further by Tom being a farmer, and, therefore, he is more in touch with the biological or natural seasonal clock. Here is where Ursula is not yet developed.

Ursula is looking at Inger with a homosexual gaze. I stated that a homosexual gaze is created by the subject believing that there must be a difference to behold in the other individual. The difference Ursula sees is the muscular, goddess-like Inger. She has physical features unlike hers. Like herself, Inger is the same sex, but Ursula still has a curiosity for the different characteristics Inger possesses. This is in no way implying that a homosexual gaze only involves the subject/object principle. Rather, the homosexual gaze has been under more societal pressure (spiritual will). Justin Edwards explains about the Ursula/Inger relationship:

. . . Lawrence refers to Winifred's desire for Ursula as part of the perverted life of the older woman (*Rainbow* 343). Did Lawrence bring an end to Winifred and Ursula's relationship as an expression of his own homophobia, or was he merely representing the modern ideological shift regarding female sexuality and lesbianism? (45)

Edwards concludes that, for Lawrence, it is the combination of his own homophobia and the modern ideological shift which makes this chapter important. Ironically, this chapter is also one of the major reasons why the work was banned (45). Of importance is the societal pressure that makes the relationship unsuccessful. Ursula uses a subject/object gaze and hinders her own self-recognition because she feels guilt over her "shameful" thoughts. This is part of the reason why she belittles her own body in comparison to Inger's. These feelings make her stifle her sensual will; therefore, it is harder to come by a homosexual gaze that is balanced equally between the subject/object and self-recognition gazes.

However, Ursula's heterosexual gaze also suffers with her previous first-love relationship with Anton Skrebensky. Barry Scherr explains that Skrebensky is no match for Ursula because he is submerged in "darkness" (sensual will). At first, Ursula is attracted to this soldier at sixteen, when he appears as someone from the outside world. Later, when he returns from the Boer War (Ursula is now twenty-one), Skrebensky attracts Ursula because he came from Africa, the "other" continent. But these are temporary "hang-ups" for Ursula (23). From the beginning, Skrebensky is after only the physical, "His eyes became confused with roused lights, his detached attention changed to a readiness for her" (*R* 269). Upon their first meeting, Ursula too is attracted to this man for the outside.

Skrebensky is largely a man with a single subject/object gaze. During his visit to the barge, Skrebensky admires the father who owns the barge:

He was envying the lean father of three children, for his impudent directness and worship of the woman in Ursula, a worship of body and soul together, the man's body and soul wistful and worshipping the body and spirit of the girl, with a desire that knew the inaccessibility of its object, but was only glad to know that the perfect thing existed, glad to have had a moment of communion.

Why could not he himself desire a woman so? Why did he never really want a woman, not with the whole of him: never loved, never worshipped, only just physically wanted her. (294)

Skrebensky realizes after this incident that he really cannot have a true, balanced relationship with Ursula. He is obsessed with the subject/object gaze. In many ways,

Skrebensky, the soldier, is much like a hunter after his prey, “. . . the huntsman who stalked her and was turned into a stag, the quarry of his own hounds. . . Skrebensky [is] metaphysically and metaphorically torn to pieces; his ‘triumphant, flaming, overweening heart of the intrinsic male would never beat again’ (Whelan 279). But the father on the barge can “worship” not only the body, but the soul of Ursula as well: “The lean man sitting near to her watched her as if she were a strange being, as if she lit up his face. His eyes smiled on her, boldly and yet with exceeding admiration underneath” (292). Even the bargee’s wife shows a similar admiration, “The woman looked the young girl up and down. Evidently she was attracted by her slim, graceful, new beauty, her effect of white elegance, and her tender way of holding the child” (291). Skrebensky realizes his inadequacy.

Skrebensky cannot gaze like this, and he is aware of this fault, which lies in his inability to see his own self in Ursula. Like Ursula’s unhealthy, homosexual gaze, Skrebensky sees his inadequacy when comparing himself to another of the same sex (notice his gaze at the father is homosexual). However, he continues the relationship because of his desire for just a purely sexual relationship.

Skrebensky and Ursula are not meant for each other. She is drawn to him as a young girl because he comes from the outside world. He is a soldier from the outside, and this, for a time, captivates her. He is drawn to her by a purely subject/object gaze. He seeks her out “hunter-like,” similar to the way a soldier might. Skrebensky’s realization of his inability to see a woman at different levels is what slowly kills the relationship. Therefore, Ursula’s disappointment makes her turn to envying her school mistress with a subject/object gaze.

Ursula is also only in the present and has lost touch with any natural clock or sensual will. She is being controlled more by the spiritual will. Part of this spiritual dominance, which creates an imbalance in Ursula's gaze and consciousness involves Lawrence's use of the moon and moonlight. Relationships that are unsuccessful or, at least, challenged involve moonlight passages. In the next chapter, the three moonlight passages in *The Rainbow* will be discussed along with second generation (Will and Anna). These dreamlike passages bring in another dimension to the two generations mentioned. More specifically, the gaze I have discussed so far deals with how the narrator assists the reader in creating a visual image of the characters involved, and how the characters gaze either homosexually or heterosexually at each other, causing either a legitimate or illegitimate eternal moment. But not yet discussed are some of the greater forces involved: the moon, and the sub-consciousness. These are for the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE: IN THE MOONLIGHT

In chapter two, the balancing of the gazes is important in order for the characters to have a healthy gaze. In creating these characters, the narrator assists the reader in providing a picture of the characters involved. All characters gaze both homosexually and heterosexually regardless of their sexual orientation. However, the subject/object and self-recognition gazes are not often balanced, even less so at the homosexual sub-level.

Tom and Lydia have a balanced, heterosexual gaze, whereas Ursula and Winifred Inger, along with her relationship with Skrebensky, are in trouble. She is homosexually unbalanced with Inger and heterosexually unbalanced with Skrebensky. For further explanation on why these unhealthy gazes exist, I would like to look at the moonlight and harvest passages.

The discussion of the moonlight has great importance because of the effect it has on the gaze. The moon has a dream-like quality because there is underlying meaning in the passages. However, Lawrence disagrees with uncovering repressed dreams but Lawrence, the writer and narrator, has a specific purpose for writing *The Rainbow*. In other words, in order to create a realistic character, Lawrence must make the character real. In doing so, the character is given a consciousness which will lead to the unconscious. During dream-like passages, I can uncover more about how the gaze goes underneath the surface of the consciousness. Even though Lawrence objects to uncovering the unconscious, much can be better understood if the unconscious is uncovered.

Further, the moonlight and harvest passages are important because they represent one of the problems in Lawrence's dealing with the separation of male and female vision, which I have tried to stray from. Linda Williams explains that, according to Lawrence's *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, men and women have different vision. Men are more in-tune with their "blood consciousness." In other words, the dark is man's domain, the sensual will; the light belongs to women, the spiritual will (Williams 22-25). What has happened to men in the modern world is that they have become dependent on a female gaze. They visualize about sex in the daytime, which is the women's domain and, later at nighttime, light up the dark invading this fecund male darkness. Darkness can only happen if the female submits (Williams 23-24).

If nighttime is a kind of man's domain, then the moonlight, lighting up the darkness, can become a threat to the male gazer. Further, another reason for this threat is the "hidden" power women really have with their gazes:

Lawrence, on the other hand, emphasizes the power of women's eyes, their unnatural ability to fixate and pin down whatever their gaze rests upon, their role as the organs and agents of conscious control. Lawrence's women seldom fail to see, often initiate desire with a look . . .

(Williams 45)

This can be very threatening to men like Will who are influenced with a subject/object gaze. Women's gazing can be threatening because it forces the male's recognition of them as human beings. Men have made women's gazing unnatural through their objectification of women. Therefore, in the novel, it is the subject/object and self-recognition gazes which create relational success for seeing individuals. Further, these

gazes can help assist in the interpretation of the moonlight and harvest passages and what these passages mean.

In the “Girlhood of Anna Brangwén,” Anna falls in love with Will during the moonlit harvest scene. Will is “disempowered” here because he fails at self-recognition:

‘My love!’ she called, in a low voice, from afar.

The low sound seemed to call him from far off, under the moon, to him who was unaware. He stopped, quivered, and listened.

‘My love,’ came again the low, plaintive call, like a bird unseen in the night.

He was afraid. His heart quivered and broke. He was stopped.

(116)

The above is an example that self-recognition is becoming known to Will. She dominates by asserting her will—her desire for recognition which Will refuses to recognize. Will becomes confused and thinks, “The conflict was gone by” (116). At the end of the harvest passage, the couple is going to marry, and Will walked helplessly beside her, holding her hand” (117). As a result, Anna’s and Will’s marriage becomes an empty shell like the moon. Anna desires self-recognition, which she can’t have because Will is only objectifying her. They both become only subject/object oriented. Anna must have Will and win, Will must control and have Anna. In the end Anna’s assertive will wins and both characters enter a controlled marriage.

Will is submerged in “fecund darkness” which is precisely the problem. At this point, Will desires Anna sensually. When “His heart quivered and broke” (30), it is because Will recognizes for the first time that only the sexual is not possible in Anna.

Though she calls, “My Love!” She desires more than sexual pleasure; she needs a whole relationship. This particular passage does not involve much gazing; however, what it does show is Will’s largely physical (visual) attraction to Anna. For him, they are disconnected in spirit. Her call, “My Love!” indicates this by the way it startles Will.

Moreover, Will has been looking at Anna as object for sexual fulfillment. His helplessness by the end of this passage demonstrates his failure to understand his own emotions. To explain Will’s unhealthy gaze, I would like to examine the following passage using Freud’s dream-work:

He waited for her, he fumbled at the stook. She came. But she stood back till he drew away. He saw her in the shadow, a dark column, and spoke to her, and she answered. She saw moonlight flashing on his face. But there was space between them, and he went away.

Why was there always space between them, why were they apart? Why, as she came up from under the moon, would she halt and stand off from him? Why was he held away from her? His will drowned everything else. (115)

The above passage is dreamlike because the narrator provides a manifest telling of what Will is consciously and unconsciously experiencing. It’s manifest because the original, latent dream is retold using Freud’s four principles: condensation, displacement, considerations of representability and secondary revision (Wright 19-21).

These two paragraphs are a manifest telling of a latent dream. Condensation is effective here because there is more going on than is written (Wright 19). For example, Will not only waits for Anna at the harvest; he has waited for her his whole life. Though

he questions, "Why was there always 'space between them, why were they apart?," he already knows the answer subconsciously. As explained in the first passage, Will gazes at Anna sexually as object. Therefore, the sensual will is too assertive which causes Anna to stand at a distance. Further, "He saw her in the shadow, a dark column, and spoke to her, and she answered" (115), does not indicate what they said. They have a fear of getting too close, getting to know each other.

The narrator refers to Anna as a dark column; however, Anna is being displaced here by Will's own sexuality. "Dark" for Lawrence in this instance describes the sexuality of Will. "His will drummed persistently, darkly, it drowned everything else" (115). As Will's own name suggests, his willpower is creating the distance. He wants her as an object for sexual fulfillment. His desire is being threatened by the distance and apartness he feels from Anna. Opposition is very important, but not distance. Both characters must be able to sustain an equilibrium, opposing each other but lacking in distance. They must work together to fulfill their relationship.

Condensation and displacement are not exclusive of each other. The fear of self-recognition Will has for Anna is displaced, but the apartness is present. The "dark column" displaces Anna and inserts Will's sexual concerns, similar to Ursula's concerns over her frail body. Therefore, the dream-work elements are often blurred by one another.

During considerations of representability, words create images and syntactical connections that are to be made by the dreamer or reader. The words tell the reader that this is not a perfect "in love" moment for Will and Anna, "... he drew away ... in the shadow, a dark column ... the work carried them, rhythmic" (115). As for Anna, "She

saw moonlight flashing on his face. But there was space between them” (115). The moon is in control and exposing Anna and Will’s lack of self-recognition. The rhythm that carries them is not natural because Will tries to manipulate it. Anna falls in love by being influenced by her spiritual will; Will, threatened by this and his desire for her, asks for marriage (a means of assertive control), which is fixed, not a rhythmic movement of opposing forces. Therefore, the rhythm is stopped; it becomes fixed.

The passage, under secondary revision, is being put in a logical order and sequence by the narrator. First, the golden moon must be present to attract Anna. The harvest and the moon set the natural rhythm. The rhythm depends on Tom and Anna’s opposing wills until it is manipulated by an imbalance of gazes in both characters. Anna desires Will while the moonlight reflects on his face. Will tries to manipulate the rhythm to gain control. Both fail and resort to a fixed marriage.

What is of most importance in this dream-like analysis are where the gazes fit in. The narrator leaves enough hints to show that there is something unnatural about the passage’s conclusion ending in a marriage proposal. The reader is aware of the presence of moonlight. It may be less obvious to the characters themselves. “She saw moonlight flashing on his face” (115). The moonlight acts as the daylight, and enhances the actual vision or lack of vision by elevating her self-recognition and covering the sensual will within Will. Thus, the second generation is caught in a fixed life. Later, their utopian honeymoon falls apart because they try to force the eternal moment on. There can’t be a utopian moment or society when the Adam and Eve (Will and Anna) have an unhealthy gaze. Their marriage becomes fixed and unnatural, making Will participate in exorbitant acts, as F. B. Pinion notes:

Their married love becomes ‘a sensuality violent and extreme as death,’ until Anna eventually sinks to the level of her ‘sensual male,’ and Will Brangwen, the great church-worker, who had taken refuge in pseudo-mystical flights of the imagination, resorts to ‘shameful, natural and unnatural acts of sensual voluptuousness’ with her. He is victimized and degraded by mental sex. (41)

Because of Will’s unbalanced gaze—his favoring of the subject/object gaze—he slips to desiring sex, but perverse forms of sex, as a way to empower himself over his wife. He has been degraded and castrated. But Anna is no better off for both of them have become competitors against each other; they misread their own gazes. Therefore, the moon only reflects the desire the subject/object gaze triggers.

There is one more example of the moon’s exposing the characters’ “unbalancedness.” The characters involved are the third-generation characters, Ursula Brangwen and Anton Skrebensky. However, there is one notable exception, Ursula situation has her a more positive outcome. Because her life has little past and, therefore, represents the future, she must learn through experience how to balance her gazing:

‘The moon has risen,’ said Anton, as the music ceased and they found themselves suddenly stranded. . . She turned, and saw a great white moon looking at her over the hill. And her breast opened to it, she was cleaved like a transparent jewel to its light. She stood filled with the full moon, offering herself. Her two breasts opened to make way for it, her body opened wide like a quivering anemone, a soft, dilated invitation touched by the moon. She wanted the moon to fill in to her, she wanted

more, more communion with the moon, consummation. But Skrebensky put his arm around her and led her away. He put a big dark cloak around her, and sat holding her hand, whilst the moonlight streamed above the glowing fires. (296)

The statement, “whilst the moonlight streamed above the glowing fires,” is condensed from a larger meaning. Like Will, Anton is trying to control the rhythm, the flow of life by covering Ursula’s breasts, her body from exposure to the moon. Therefore, the glowing fires underneath the moon are being put out or cloaked. The moon’s characteristic description for Lawrence is usually associated with a white, *cold* light. The sun is the hot light, the glowing fires. To prevent his own self-recognition, Anton peers with his subject/object gaze disconnecting himself from Ursula.

In relation to the above paragraph, the moon is displaced by the glowing fires. Self-recognition is filling Ursula until Anton attempts to displace it. Also, the characters find themselves “suddenly stranded” before the moon which is a representation of their self-recognition. There is regret among the characters for being put in this situation. Anton wants the darkness, Ursula wants the moonlight, and neither one wishes to compromise. They are stranded but together; together but apart. The characters themselves are displaced.

One element of considerations of representability is the string of pictures created by the narrator to the reader. “Her breast opened . . . her two breasts opened” submitting to the moon’s power and “offering herself.” Ursula wants to be consumed by the moon. The breasts open and transform like a “quivering anemone,” and then she is eaten. The

string of pictures show both a desire and a fear of knowing herself. If she knows herself, she can see herself through Skrebensky.

Like the first moon passage, Lawrence follows a sequence in the telling of the moonlight incident. Ursula is first drawn to the moon by its gaze upon her, "Ursula was aware of some influence looking-in upon her" (296). The white light of the moon watches them and balance the forces "all in its revelation" (296). But the retelling sequence of this dream is similar to the second generation's. The man topples the balance, out of fear over his recognition of self through the woman. This self-recognition humanizes his mate and takes her out of only the subject/object gaze. The moon is not a desired force for Skrebensky, but what makes it an ally for Ursula is the reference to the exposed breast in both passages. Ursula begins to possess the ability to recognize herself, her desire for more than sex through the light of the moon. "She wanted to be kind and good" (300).

Later on when she meets Skrebensky after a long separation, Ursula is not sixteen but twenty-two. Before the final passage, Ursula observes his appearance:

At night there was a moon, and the blossom glistened ghostly,
they went together to look at it. She saw the moonlight on his face as he
waited near her, and his features were like silver, and his eyes in shadow
were unfathomable. She was in love with him. He was very quiet. (426)

Later, the narrator explains how she enjoys Anton's body and how he desires, but is afraid of her body. Her gaze is largely subject/object in the moonlight. But after the following successful encounter, Ursula realizes that Anton is too "fixed" in his ways, like

her parents' fixed marriage. The result is an eventual end to their relationship. She sees self-recognition in Anton; she realizes she can find a better match.

The fast dream-like passage moves Ursula closer to being balanced because the following experience that gives her a true eternal moment; a moment that is lacking when she's sixteen:

She took off all her clothes, and made him take off all his, and they ran over the smooth, moonless turf, a long way, more than a mile from where they had left their clothing, running in the dark, soft wind, utterly naked, as naked as the downs themselves. Her hair was loose and blew about her shoulders, she ran swiftly, wearing sandals when she set off on the long run to the dew-pond. (430)

Running naked during a moonless night gives the reader a foreshadowing of what the future utopian vision would be like. There are no assertive wills, just pleasure in looking and feeling, total and complete spontaneity and freedom. Being naked is being free. There is nothing to hide; bodies can be gazed upon in abundance. Time is suspended because spontaneity creates the moment, not a mechanical clock. Running toward the dew-pond, where life begins, means that their eternal moment is leading them to a new utopian life. However, only Ursula enters the pond and grasps at the stars. The circular pond signifies forever. Ursula is beginning to master her gaze and wills. This is a successful love-making adventure for the couple. This passage also refers back to Tom and Lydia. They have a successful unity because they are closer to the earth and more accustomed to the seasonal clock.

There is some consistency in this passage compared to their first moonlight encounter. Anton is still being led or controlled. Even though this moment is successful for Ursula, she realizes later that Anton is too fixed in his ways. This is precisely why she has to lead him in the darkness because the subject/object gaze cannot be used here. He is not spontaneous. He is already planning to marry her and take her to India. Therefore, this resistance is displaced from this dream. Anton is not *really* the man Ursula desires to be with. Her true mate is still out there, Birkin in *Women in Love*.

Pictures of naked people signify sexual activity, fecund darkness, freedom and spontaneity. The dew-pond is also Ursula's liberation from her own assertive will, which opens her eyes to the realization that Skrebensky is not her true mate. The passage is also strung along by "and" and it also contains only two sentences representing the quick sexual pace of the activities underway. It suspends time. The whole night went by in a flash; just like a dream.

The dream is revised or retold by the narrator in the following sequence: darkness, nudity, nature and reproduction. Naked bodies are natural in the fecund darkness and will lead to fulfillment and reproduction. The darkness begins to close the gap between subject/object and self-recognition because it forces the characters to deal with one another in human terms.

In summary, *The Rainbow* is a novel that deals much with the alteration the natural world is facing due to the mechanical inventions of humans. These three generations signify the struggles of the human to maintain balance. More specifically, the personal relationships of each generation are affected. *The Past*—the first generation struggles but remains stable. *The Present*—the second generation has yielded to a fixed,

unchanging lifestyle. *The Future*—Ursula, through much struggle, begins to master her own gaze which helps her find contentment through an eternal moment. The gaze, as the trigger to both the subject/object and self-recognition gazes, can be both positive and negative, healthy and unhealthy. If unhealthy, the visual exchange can lead to certain destruction of self, others and relationships. The author is successful in this because he is able to create realistic characters, guide the reader through the narrative gaze, and demonstrate the characters' struggles by how they gaze upon one another and themselves for that matter.

The Rainbow deals, more generally, with three generations and how each generation struggles for mastery in life. The mutilation of time causes spiritual and sensual breakdown in which the gaze can play positively or negatively. If the characters see in a healthy manner, they can balance their lives. If the character is negative, the visual exchange leads to further unhappiness. Ursula becomes the pioneer because she moves from an unhealthy gaze to a healthier one. *Women in Love* will be much more specific. Two relationships will be followed, one unhealthy and one healthy. Here, the extent of both the positive and negative relationship will be better understood through the following questions: Is the gaze still the trigger? How does one balance gazes? Who is void and who is centered? These are questions that will be analyzed in depth in each of the two relationships which follow.

CHAPTER FOUR: VOID CHARACTERS

Up until now, the focus of this project has been the three generations in *The Rainbow* and how the characters in each generation gaze upon one another. Further, these gazes influence either the heterosexual or homosexual sub-level. As for *Women in Love*, it will provide a more intimate look into two present relationships; enabling a deeper, more specific study on how these types of gazes can lead to constructive or destructive relationships. For this chapter, my focus is on the destructive relationship between Gerald and Gudrun.

In order to better understand Gerald and Gudrun's relationship, it's important to define this chapter's title, "Void Characters." Void characters are largely ones who fail at self-recognition. Eric Levy explains, "Love as a reciprocal fulfillment of two independent centers is impossible to the void character; for his or her very identity is already formulated as a resistance to love or, more precisely, to the *emptying* of identity which love threatens." (6). The two independent centers refer, in this case, to two centered, balanced individuals. Part of the creation of this resistance to love is to subconsciously create a more dominant subject/object gaze. We've seen through the dream-work how certain desires and feelings are kept from the manifest dream. Here it can be demonstrated how these repressions can affect Gerald and Gudrun's relationship (Crick 107-13).

What will be shown in the following passages is how Gerald and Gudrun become destructive because of their failure to have a self-recognition gaze. To them, love of their selves and others is perverse, things that either need to be avoided or controlled. Many of the same principles used in chapter one will be utilized here, but there will be

more opportunity to show the destructive forces at work in *Women in Love* involving both Gerald and Gudrun.

During the first chapter, Ursula and Gudrun decide to attend a local wedding ceremony. There, they can view Gerald Crich's sister getting married to a naval officer. Gudrun becomes apprehensive about attending when she notices the common crowd gathered outside the church. When one in the audience yells out, "What price the stockings"(13), she becomes enraged. What the reader finds out shortly thereafter is, as the narrator explains, that Gudrun liked putting people in their place, "She knew them, they were finished, sealed and stamped and finished with, for her" (14). However, when Gudrun is placed in the object position, she hates and rebels against it. Furthermore, when Gudrun discovers Gerald through her subject/object gaze, she feels challenged to know him; she is overcome by desire:

His gleaming beauty, maleness, like a young, good-humoured, smiling wolf did not blind her to the significant, sinister stillness in his bearing, the lurking danger of his unsubdued temper. 'His totem is the wolf,' she repeated to herself. 'His mother is an old, unbroken wolf.' And then she experienced a keen paroxysm, a transport, as if she had made some incredible discovery, known to nobody else on earth. A strange transport took possession of her, all her violent sensation. 'Good God!' she exclaimed to herself, 'what is this?' . . . 'I shall know more of this man' . . . She was tortured with desire to see him again . . . (14-15)

As I mention in chapter one, during the visual exchange, the gazer will dehumanize the person they are gazing upon. For Gudrun, Gerald and his mother become

wolves. Gerald and his mother are dangerous objects, “the lurking danger of unsubdued temper” (14). She sees Gerald as an animal to be tamed, but nonetheless one that is also dangerous. This danger, if implemented, has the ability to put her in the object position. Here, the object and subject switch places (Ingersoll 272). Furthermore, Gudrun discovers something unknown to anyone else. Her voyeuristic gaze transports her to a violent, overwhelming desire to control Gerald who is dangerous to her own self. One part of Gudrun wants to have a confrontation that she can control and win in the end. The other part of her wants to move herself into “harm’s way,” toward destruction. As Levy suggests, Gudrun is void because she eliminates any personal identity from her relationship with Gerald. But if opposites attract, this notion is not true here. Gerald and Gudrun are much the same (Levy 5-7).

During the chapter entitled “Diver,” Gerald both finds and puts himself in a subject/object position. When Gerald first appears, the narrator continues Gudrun’s objectifying of Gerald:

Suddenly from the boat-house, a white figure ran out, frightening in its swift sharp transit, across the old landing stage. It launched in a white arc through the air, there was a bursting of the water, and among the smooth ripples a swimmer was making out to space, in a centre of faintly heaving motion (46).

The animal-like characteristics Gudrun applies to Gerald begin this passage. He is first an “it” referring to his body. Like the wolf, his swift body launches arc shaped into the water similar to a wolf attacking its prey. Once the object hits the water, it becomes an unknown swimmer. This occurs because Gudrun does not know who she’s gazing at

until shortly thereafter. She replies to Ursula, “‘How I envy him,’ in low, desirous tones” (46). Here, during her visual exchange, she desires to put herself into the object’s position. She would like to be nude in the water, being gazed upon.

Gerald desires much the same “visual exchange” as Gudrun. The only difference is that because he is a male, he is able to act the part easier, i.e., he can swim naked in the water; Gudrun cannot. Here, the narrator relays both Gerald’s and the women’s perspective:

He, having swum a certain distance, turned round and was swimming on his back, looking along the water at the two girls by the wall. In the faint wash of motion, they could see the ruddy face, and they could feel him watching them. (47)

There is gazing in both directions in this passage, which marks an interesting transition. Gerald is nude, exposed and he is swimming on his back. His whole body is being viewed by the women. This demonstrates the second phase in the visual exchange. Gerald knows he is the “object” being gazed upon, but he gazes back at the women making them the objects of his desire, “He could see the girls watching him way off outside, and that pleased him” (47). Gerald is getting pleasure by looking and being looked at.

The difference in the two female watchers is that, similar to the inadequacy Ursula feels when she compares herself to Winifred Inger, Gudrun is desiring to become a man, “‘God, what it is to be a man!’ she cried” (47). Ursula does not understand Gudrun’s reaction, “‘What?’” Gudrun’s desire completes the visual exchange: the former subject desires to be made an object, then the process recycles from the beginning; the

subject seeks the object (Ingersoll 272). So far, these characters are involved in an unhealthy (subject/object) visual exchange using heterosexual gazes. The women know the man, Gerald, is different and desire to know this physical difference. Gerald enjoys showing his “difference” to the women. But how does Gerald act in a homosexual gazing situation? Is the visual exchange a factor?

I would like to move toward Gerald’s homosexual gaze by looking at the chapter, “Fetish.” When Gerald spends the night at the apartment with Birkin’s friends, he finds both Halliday and Maxim nude by the fire. After some conversation about living in the nude, he gazes at the Russian:

Gerald glanced at him, and saw him, his suave, golden coloured body with the black hair growing fine and freely, like tendrils, and his limbs like smooth plant-stems. He was so healthy and well-made, why did he make one ashamed, why did one feel repelled. Why should Gerald even dislike it, why did it seem to detract from his own dignity. Was that all a human being amounted to? So uninspired thought Gerald. (78)

Through Gerald’s gaze, we begin to see the troubled consciousness unfold. First, in this passage, Gerald looks at the Russian with a homosexual subject/object gaze. He gets scopophilic pleasure looking at the “well-made” man. The narrator’s description compares the Russian’s body to natural things, i.e., tendrils, smooth plant-stems. However, Gerald’s thought is interrupted when he begins to feel guilt over his subject/object gaze. In other words, when Gerald’s subject/object gaze begins to move toward self-recognition, he develops guilt. The guilt over finding another man attractive, a societal taboo, forces Gerald to turn back and alienate his view of the Russian, “So

uninspired thought Gerald.” He tries to remove himself from any curiosity, which may lead to desire, because when such is attempted he feels guilty. Similar to Ursula’s encounter with Winifred Inger, Gerald puts himself down, but in a more discrete way. He feels bad that he has guilty feelings, whereas Ursula is envious because her body is not like Inger’s. He also envies the two men, but cannot allow himself to move against the super-ego. In other words, he stifles his real identity, the self-recognition gaze.

The end result of both Gudrun and Gerald’s lack of self-recognition is destruction. They both seek to tame and control one another. Relationships for them become a competition, “I must see more of him,” and the unbalanced behavior leads to a destructive visual exchange. One of the best examples of this visual exchange out of control is the mare passage in “Coal Dust.”

I would like to treat the following “mare breaking” passage in terms of a dream using a couple of elements from the dream-work:

And he was very picturesque, at least in Gudrun’s eyes . . . He saluted the two girls . . . Gudrun liked to look at him . . . She [the Arab mare] began to wince away, as if hurt by the unknown noise. But Gerald pulled her back and held her head to the gate . . . The repeated sharp blows of unknown, terrifying noise through her till she was rocking with terror. She recoiled like a spring let go. But a glistening, half-smiling look came into Gerald’s face. He brought her back again inevitably. (110)

The sound of the approaching train is what the mare is rebelling against. The train is one of several symbols in this dream-like sequence. In Freud’s *The Interpretation of Dreams*, he explains that it is impossible to bring all of a dream’s content and meaning to the

surface; the list would be infinite. But what is of greatest importance is getting the most meaningful symbols (Crick 214-15). For the previous passage, I would like to bring attention to the symbols from Gudrun's point of view: the red mare, train, Gerald and Ursula.

The red mare, which can be looked at as a displaced symbol is really a foreshadowing of Gudrun's experience with Gerald. What happens to the mare, a metaphorical rape, Gudrun desires for herself. The color red signifies the act of rape itself, while the train is the symbol of sexual drive: "The sharp blasts of the chuffing engine broke with more and more force upon her" (110). Gudrun resists being controlled by Gerald, but it is in this resistance that creates her wish fulfillment of punishment.

Gerald really signifies the element of danger. It is precisely this danger that Gudrun wants to tame, but she also desires to be exposed and abused. In other words, she sees herself on the mare, and she sees herself as the mare. Like the earlier passage in "Diver," she desires to be a man, but a kind of destructive man like Gerald. If the mare represents her also, and Gerald represents her desire to be a man, then her wish is to break herself. Gerald signifies danger because he triggers her subject/object gaze, which leads to the unhealthy visual exchange.

The two principles at work above are displacement and representation, which is what the central concern for this and the next passages. The train, Gerald and the red mare are part of Gudrun's id. Her subject/object gaze, which is a result of her curiosity, triggers her desire (id) for this unbalanced, unhealthy visual exchange. This ultimately manifests itself into her real life. Ursula, is a representation of Gudrun's ego. She should be recognizing her identity in this situation. The horse is a living thing like her and

shouldn't be abused. If she did, she would realize her own self-hate and destructiveness. Her behavior indicates this. First, she desires a man who has a "violent" cruel demeanor. But her desire for control also attracts her to Gerald. It is danger she likes to play with because her self hatred leads her to a conflicting relationship.

Gerald is not much different from Gudrun. He too is acting out his fantasy with the red mare, which he treats much like Gudrun, as we'll see later. He hears Ursula's pleas to stop, "Let her go!" But, "a sharpened look came on Gerald's face. He bit himself down on the mare like a keen edge biting home, and *forced* her round" (111). Gerald doesn't submit. He must win; he must compete and win. Finally, Gudrun makes a statement to Gerald before he rides away, "I should think you're proud" (112). This is both a realization of his success and a challenge to him. This is why he looks upon Gudrun with "some wondering interest." This challenge from Gudrun imposes on Gerald, and builds both characters up to the eventual, what I call symbolic, rape or "mare-breaking passage" during their trip to the Alps in snow country.

During both couples' "honeymoons" in the mountains, Gerald and Gudrun's relationship is prevented from exploding temporarily by Birkin and Ursula's happiness. However, when the healthy, happy couple leaves, the void characters' relationship makes its final turn towards destruction. I see Gerald and Gudrun's last sexual encounter as the final encounter which leads to Gerald's death. After first rejecting him, Gudrun goes to Gerald's bed:

His passion was awful to her, tense and ghastly and impersonal like
destruction, ultimate. She felt it would kill her, she was being killed.

‘My God, my God!’ she cried in anguish, in his embrace, feeling her life being killed within her. And when he was kissing her, soothing her, her breath came slowly, as if she were really spent, dying . . . And yet, next day, the fragment of her which was not destroyed remained intact and hostile . . . (444)

There are some general similarities between this and the red mare passage. Gerald attempts to tame Gudrun through his sexual encounter with her. But her hostility in the morning proves that she cannot be “tamed or broken.” If this passage is a metaphorical, physical rape of Gudrun, then Gudrun mentally rapes Gerald of his manly pride, i.e., her relationship with Loerke. Loerke is a particularly difficult person for Gerald to handle because Loerke is more mental than physical. He can’t understand what Gudrun sees in Loerke.

Further, the above passage makes Gudrun realize that the relationship must end. She is and was in control. She was in the saddle breaking in the mare. In the end, Gerald does not kill Gudrun but chooses to kill himself because Gudrun had final control over him. She is able to break down his pride and symbolically castrate him. But Gudrun does not win in this situation either. She is now alone with a dead man; a man who was friends with her sister and Birkin. She is unfulfilled and angry. Even when Loerke offers a place for her to go and work on art, she refuses. The truth is both of these unhealthy characters objectified one another to serve their own unhealthy needs by creating a false identity through control. Gudrun desired to be like Gerald; she desired his body, his power. But she also desired to harness it, to control it. Gerald saw Gudrun as a

challenge, a mare needing to be tamed. When he fails to “tame” her, his only action is to attack her and kill himself.

When Gerald and Gudrun fail to see their selves in each other, their vision becomes sadistic, voyeuristic. They see one another as objects; thus, they harm their own selves in the process. They are void characters—characters who attempt to cover their emptiness by distorting their gazes through an unhealthy visual gaze. However, their two friends are a drastically different story.

In the final chapter, the centered characters will be dealt with, Birkin and Ursula. Here, we have a vastly different scenario. Since her childhood in *The Rainbow*, Ursula has struggled to comprehend her feelings, but through her experiences, she begins to “see” self-recognition through others. She finally finds her match in Birkin, but there is still more to be learned and to be done on both Ursula and Birkin’s part. This learning process is the topic of the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE: CENTERED CHARACTERS

Gerald and Gudrun take us in depth into an unbalanced visual world. When these characters fail to recognize their connection to others, when they fail to see themselves in others, they resort to unhealthy forms of establishing an identity. Establishing this unhealthy identity takes in the visual exchange, the subject/object gaze. Both Gerald and Gudrun create an identity that is defined by how they control the external world, including their partners. They are void characters.

However, Ursula and Birkin are centered characters. But these two healthy characters didn't just happen to fall upon being centered or balanced; it is a learning process. We were able to trace much of Ursula's learning through *The Rainbow*, during her homosexual encounter with Winifred Inger, and Ursula's heterosexual involvement with Skrebensky. However, Birkin is still learning. His relationship with Hermione is dangerous. She is much like Gerald and Gudrun. She needs to have a sense of control over the external world. On the other hand, Ursula is forced to deal with Birkin's relationship with Hermione, while Birkin must also fight his desire for "close" male companionship.

For this final chapter, I would like to discuss Ursula and Birkin's progression as they move toward a more centered, eternal existence. I would also like to show how the negative influences, similar to what Gerald and Gudrun face, do not leave a lasting, destructive effect on these characters. They have learned through experience, as Levy argues:

. . . true love consummates the recognition of independent selfhood, in both oneself and the other who is loved. Through awareness of the loved *as* an inviolable other—a separate self whose autonomy can never be absorbed—each becomes aware of himself (or herself) as pure other to the loved one . . . (5)

Before these characters can see the other person as independent, they must first recognize the similarities they have among each other. These characters do not try to control everyone and everything in their external world. As a first example, let us look at the Birkin/Hermione conflict. The following passage gives a good example of a controlling character with contradictory actions toward another whose moving nearer to self-recognition. When Hermione realizes she is losing control over Birkin (he is becoming increasingly interested in Ursula), she resorts to physical violence. She grabs a “beautiful ball of lapis lazuli” and strikes Birkin in the head with it. Birkin softens the second blow with a book:

‘No you don’t, Hermione,’ he said in a low voice. ‘I don’t let you’ . . .

‘Stand away and let me go’ . . . ‘It isn’t I who will die. You hear?’ . . .

And he was on his guard, she was powerless. (106)

This incident is a deciding factor for Birkin. Hermione fails at controlling him. She realizes she is losing Birkin and control over her external environment. In this relationship, Birkin and Hermione compete with one another. She issues orders and he tries to abide by them. But Ursula’s influence on Birkin makes him recognize both Hermione’s and his own unbalanced, destructive will. Hermione understands that Birkin is slipping away and attempts to control Birkin further but it fails. Birkin is beginning to

set himself free. The unhealthy actions are a result of the dominance of the subject/object gaze.

Birkin's meeting Ursula begins to open his eyes through self-recognition. This can be best explained by looking at the incident between them in "Moony," where Ursula is peering at Birkin, and Birkin is peering at the moon. The moon, I feel, is a representation of the "centered bond" between Ursula and Birkin. Birkin's "battle" with the moon in this passage is really his own personal struggle with self-recognition. On three occasions, Birkin attempts to destroy the moon's reflection in the water. But every time, the moon gathers itself, "He saw the moon regathering itself insidiously, saw the heart of the rose intertwining vigorously and blindly, calling back the scattered fragments, winning home the fragments, in a pulse and an effort of return" (247). His battle with the moon is his last attempt at self-denial.

After Ursula watches this conflict, she can't bear to see him attempt to destroy the moon again. Lawrence writes, "Ursula was afraid that he would stone the moon again" (248). Therefore, she makes her presence known to him. At this point, Ursula is better at self-recognition. She first hides from Birkin and secretly gazes at him, but her self-recognition makes her approach Birkin; something a voyeur would not do. She stops his conflict because she realizes that the moon is a representation of her own relationship with Birkin. Birkin is still struggling with his feelings, and his struggle reflects onto her. The way she can help him balance himself is to ask questions about the moon. For example, his last attempt to eliminate the moon's vision on the water creates an understanding in Ursula, "They were gathering a heart again, they were coming once

more into being” (248). These are not only the elements of the moon coming together, is also signifies the coming together of Ursula and Birkin.

Earlier, the couple was separated when Birkin fell ill, similar to the moon’s fragments being scattered. Like Ursula’s struggle with Skrebensky, Birkin is starting to grasp, and beginning to balance both his gazes, “There is a golden light in you, which I wish you would give me” (249). This statement to Ursula shows the *beginning* of self-recognition for Birkin. He meets resistance from her because he’s asking her to *give* instead of *share*. His statement still has subject/object connections. However, he, at least, sees a golden light in Ursula; a light he wants and a light that is part of him and her. He needs to share this light not take it. “The golden light represents their connectedness, their self-recognition of independent selfhood, in both themselves and the other who is loved” (Levy 5).

Other critics like F. B. Pinion and Barry Scherr have argued that the moon is a representation of the spiritual will. Pinion says, “if it ascend to the breast and head woman will be a perverse creature. As tide-turner, the moon sways the blood of both sexes” (37). In addition, Scherr argues, “Thus the moon, the representative of white, light mental consciousness and will power, will not be quite destroyed [this occurs during Birkin’s attempt at eliminating the moon in the water], but Birkin can get rid of it for a moment” (34).

So what is at stake here? What purpose is there in getting rid of something for a few seconds? The problem I have with these constructions is that the moon itself is natural, not mechanical like the clock. How can the moon, being billions of years old—this thought was present at the time of publication too—represent this damaging

consciousness? Regardless of what Lawrence's psychology may suggest about "darkness" or "blood consciousness," it would appear to me that the moon is natural, operating on natural laws—it cannot be destroyed. Birkin and Ursula realize its existence, and it becomes a symbol of a needed opposite force similar to day and night, or light and dark. Just as there is a difference between opposing forces and conflicting ones, the moon need not be conflicting. It's in necessary opposition to the earth. Birkin feels frustrated because his desire to *have* Ursula is opposing his desire to *share* her.

One of the other reasons Birkin is struggling to see his self-recognition gaze is because of his troubled feelings, desiring to have a "close" male relationship with Gerald. During the chapter, "Gladiatorial," it is interesting to note that Gerald encourages the actions which follow. He is the first to suggest that they both strip naked. Both men have this desire to see each other. This attitude shows a change from Gerald's actions in "Fetish." The presence of Birkin triggers a more positive homosexual gaze from Gerald. He and Birkin participate in a homosexual encounter. This large passage, like the moonlight harvest and mare passages, can be looked at as a dream-like encounter. If looked at in this perspective, Gerald and Birkin have a sexual encounter:

They seemed to drive their white flesh deeper and deeper against each other, as if they would break into a oneness. Birkin had a great subtle energy, that would press upon the other man with uncanny force, weigh him like a spell put upon him. Then it would pass, and Gerald would heave free, with white, heaving, dazzling movements . . . Now again came a sharp gasp of breath, or a sound like a sigh, then the rapid thudding of

movement on the thickly carpeted floor, then the strange sound of flesh escaping under flesh . . . two bodies clinched into oneness. (270)

Many critics have noted the homoerotic quality of this passage and with good reason. For instance, after this struggle, both men speak of their physical appearance, “I think also that you are beautiful” (273). This passage shows the homosexual gaze at work, and this time the gaze is a healthy one. There is a combination of subject/object and self-recognition gazes present.

As previously mentioned, the men show that they enjoy looking at each other physically by exchanging comments regarding their physical appearance. However, self-recognition is also present, “We are mentally, spiritually intimate, therefore we should be more or less physically intimate too—it is more whole.’ ‘Certainly it is,’ said Gerald” (272). Each recognizes the other’s similarities according to himself, and this balances the relationship visually and otherwise. But even though Gerald’s subject/object and self-recognition gazes are balanced within the homosexual gaze, they are not in the heterosexual. He objectifies women and cuts off his own self-recognition. Birkin has a positive influence on him. What destroys Gerald and Birkin’s close relationship is that their close male relationship is only possible behind closed doors, i.e., they lock themselves in a room and tell the servant not to bother them.

Earlier in “Fetish,” Gerald was disturbed by other men’s nakedness, but with Birkin he is able to “ease into” homosexual gaze because he can displace his homosexual curiosity and desire by the justification of wrestling. He can say to himself, “We were only wrestling.” Unlike Ursula’s homosexual experience with Winifred Inger, Gerald does not put his own body down and place Birkin’s on a pedestal. But when the door is

unlocked, these men must be dressed and go on as exclusively heterosexual males.

Birkin believes their relationship can work, but Gerald is scared away, especially when whose marriage to whom becomes inevitable. Through these characters, the narrator is making a statement about the homophobia in society.

As I have stated during both Ursula's relationship with Winifred Inger and Birkin's relationship with Gerald, society influences unhealthy gazing. Paul Delany points out what Lawrence wrote in the original "Prologue" about Birkin's parallel desires:

He wanted all the while to feel this kindled, loving attraction towards a beautiful woman, that he would often feel towards a handsome man. But he could not . . . He loved his friend, the beauty of whose manly limbs made him tremble with pleasure. He wanted to caress him. (Delany 20)

Delany goes on to suggest that Lawrence later "compromises the sexual issue: Birkin is no longer a half-hearted heterosexual who really prefers men, but someone who wants to run his life on parallel lines—marriage with Ursula, blutbruderschaft with Gerald" (Delany 20). I would tend to agree except that Birkin really desires parallel relationships. If this was not true, he would not have discussed this issue with Ursula at the end of the story. He wanted both the heterosexual and homosexual on the same plane.

Despite this struggle, Birkin is developing more "centeredness" in his life. He is sure he can have a close male and female relationship, both a balanced heterosexual and homosexual gaze. But, the main reason for this is Ursula. This in some ways runs contrary to other critics who seem to suggest that Birkin is the spokesperson or prophet for Lawrence's "philosophy." However, as I pointed out, it is Birkin who is in an

unhealthy, dangerous relationship with Hermione, and Ursula who has a positive effect on Birkin. Why else would Lawrence put so much effort in *The Rainbow* to develop a character such as Ursula, and tell of her several experiences if Birkin is the prophet? The point is, each is as important as the other, and Birkin must learn from his mistakes with Hermione.

Birkin's detachment from Hermione is completed in the all-important chapter, "Excuse." The fight between Ursula and Birkin is much different from the more physical fight between Birkin and Hermione. Ursula is jealous over Birkin's involvement with Hermione. She becomes intensely angry when Birkin compares her to Hermione, "But, Hermione's spiritual intimacy is no rottener than your emotional-jealous intimacy" (308). However, as Birkin realizes previous to his statement, "He knew she was in the main right" (308). Ursula is saving Birkin from a controlling women. Yes, as he admits, he is wrong to carry the relationship on. Birkin's fight with Ursula is not one of control; it is one of balance.

When Ursula and Birkin make up, they come to an understanding. Neither of them clearly admits wrong; they let the conflict pass and find an eternal moment in its place—a moment of self-recognition and understanding between two independent beings. "It was all achieved, for her. She had found one of the Sons of God from the Beginning, and he had found one of the first most luminous daughters of men" (313). After love-making, the couple goes into a kind of utopian seclusion similar to Anna and Will's during *The Rainbow*, but Ursula and Birkin ease into reality. They decide to get married and go off to Austria with their friends, Gerald and Gudrun.

At the point of marriage, Birkin and Ursula have reached a true centeredness with each other. They are a successful couple because their learning to balance both their subject/object and self-recognition gazes. This has led them to grasping eternal moments more frequently. These moments are illusive to mechanical time. But this does not mean, specifically, that Birkin is not desiring his friend Gerald. Gerald's relationship with Gudrun is void; therefore, their destructive relationship leads to Gerald's death and didn't involve any fault of Birkin.

When both couples get married, Birkin may feel that he would be able to come closer to Gerald, but the homosexual gaze becomes more inhibited. Towards the end of the novel, the men no longer are gazing upon each other's bodies. Birkin *is* centered, but Gerald *is* void, and, thus, their relationship cannot be possible (societal homophobia is partly to blame). But there is a last passage where Birkin goes to his dead friend and gazes upon him for the last time:

Birkin remembered how once Gerald had clutched his hand, with a warm, momentaneous grip of final love. For one second—then let go again, let go for ever. If he had kept true to that clasp, death would not have mattered. Those who die, and dying still can love, still believe, do not die. They live still in the beloved. Gerald might still have been living in the spirit with Birkin, even after death. He might have lived with his friend, a further life. (480)

Here we have some of the standard guilt anyone feels after a loved one's death. But Birkin actually feels himself robbed. The "past tense" in the passage stands out because Birkin could not go "all the way" with his void friend Gerald. The truth is Birkin did keep

true to Gerald. Gerald could not balance his gazes or his thoughts. Gerald could not love, and if he feels he would have, like he did after wrestling with Birkin, he will pull away. This coldness killed him. But Birkin still sees Gerald's face as beautiful, "That dead face was beautiful, no one could call it cold, mute, material" (480). This is because he sees his own connection through Gerald, through Gerald's death also. He sees self-recognition, and this is why his friend's death is so painful.

Even with this emptiness in his life, Birkin must count his blessings. He disagrees with his wife: there can be two kinds of love, but this homosexual love involves all of society, or at least another individual who is centered. Ursula claims that there can't be two kinds of love for Birkin, but, in fact, she had two kinds of love briefly. However, her experience was unhealthy so it is easier for her to classify her homosexual relationships and feelings as shameful. Birkin's experience is more difficult and different. He sees himself through Gerald. He did not compare his body negatively to Gerald's.

For everyone with the sense of sight, our first experiences usually start with the visual. What I've attempted to argue here is that the gaze is not just a simple, male-only phenomenon. The gaze has a domino effect on the rest of one's being. Laura Mulvey addresses this when she discusses scopophilia and self-recognition. Therefore, from her work, it becomes evident that the subject/object gaze is not unhealthy or really perverse—it becomes so through abuse. The visual exchange, the desire to make someone stay an object for the purpose of controlling them, for the purpose of voyeurism, sadism in order to hide his/her identity, makes the subject/object gaze harmful. Characters who are balanced have a combination of gazes; characters who are unhealthy have a dominant subject/object gaze. I recently heard a Chinese director talk of

stereotypes enforced by the traditional male patriarchy. He said, "These are harmful to everyone." So is isolating the subject/object gaze because of societal influence, and for perverse control.

Throughout Lawrence's work, the reader can observe many characters' struggles with life issues such as homophobia, oppression, love, desire, and even though there is not a "cure all," it is evident that gazing in itself must be balanced. This way the real character comes through, not just their image. More can be learned in a passage if it's looked at like a dream because so much true feeling is hidden in a dream-like manner. More meaning can be found underneath. What Lawrence writes about is not unusual. All writers write about the human relationship with others, whether it's with the earth, other people or animals. And almost always it's how and what the character sees that makes all the difference.

Works Cited

- Brooks, Peter. *Body Work, Objects of Desire in Modern Narrative*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1993.
- Delany, Paul. Rev. of *Women in Love*. *London Review of Books* 3 Sept. 1987. 20-22.
- Edwards, Justin E. "Historicizing the Homosocial: Shifting Lesbian Identities in *The Rainbow*." *Henry Street* 5.2 (1995): 33-48.
- Ford, G. H. "The Eternal Moment: D. H. Lawrence's *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*." *The Study of Time*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1978. 512-39.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Trans. Joyce Crick. New York: Oxford UP, 1999.
- Ingersoll, Earl. "Staging the Gaze in D. H. Lawrence's *Women in Love*." *Studies in the Novel* 26 (1994): 268-80.
- Kinhead-Weekes, Mark. Introduction. *The Rainbow*. D. H. Lawrence. New York: Cambridge UP, 1989. xix-lxxvi.
- Lawrence, D. H. *The Rainbow*. Ed. Mark Kinhead-Weekes. New York: Cambridge UP, 1989.
- . *Women in Love*. Ed. David Farmer, Lindeth Vasey and John Worthen. New York: Cambridge UP, 1987.
- Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Feminisms, An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Robyn Warhol and Diane Herndl. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1991. 432-42.
- Pinion, F. B. "The Development of a Key Image in the Earlier Writings of D. H. Lawrence." *Forum* 16.3 (1978): 36-44.

Ross, Charles L. *Women in Love, A Novel of Mythic Realism*. Twayne Masterwork Studies. 65. Ed. Robert Lecker. Boston: Twayne, 1991.

Scherr, Barry J. "Two Essays on D. H. Lawrence's 'Darkness.'" *Recovering Literature* 18 (1991): 8-40.

Whelan, P. T. "The Hunting Metaphor in *The Fox* and Other Works." *D. H. Lawrence Review* 21 (1990): 275-90.

Williams, Linda Ruth. *Sex In The Head*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1993.

Wright, Elizabeth. *Psychoanalytic Criticism, A Reappraisal*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 1998.