

DE PROPRIETATIBUS LITTERARUM

edenda curat

C. H. VAN SCHOONEVELD

Indiana University

Series Practica, 30

D. H. LAWRENCE'S BESTIARY

A Study of His Use of Animal Trope and Symbol

by

KENNETH INNISS

1971

MOUTON

THE HAGUE · PARIS

© Copyright 1971 in The Netherlands.

Mouton & Co. N.V., Publishers, The Hague.

No part of this book may be translated or reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publishers.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER: 70-165144

Printed in Hungary

for Barbara_a

PREFACE

This study of D. H. Lawrence's animal rhetoric had its origin in a distraction from my linear progress through Lawrence's novels. With *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*, a special world with its own axioms and thematic images of beasts came into view. Fascinated by this world I set aside my strictly chronological reading of the novels and began to note the way in which the key animal terms of his vision appear in poems, letters, travel-books, tales and speculative writings. There were, I soon discovered, vital lines of force between the symbolic worlds and their maker's existence; his animals moved easily back and forth in a constant process of transmutation and adaptation; patterns began to appear; an internal order seemed possible; a reading of Lawrence's public and private rhetoric suggested itself.

Before I could proceed further, however, I had to involve myself in archetypal studies by Northrop Frye, Philip Wheelwright and others, carrying into these frontiers of speculation the indispensable biographical ballast which the scholarship of Harry T. Moore has made available. Among the many other critics of Lawrence I consulted, I found Graham Hough the most consistently useful, particularly so for his treatment of Lawrence's doctrine. Other important stimuli to my own thinking were the philosophers Eliseo Vivas (in his treatment of Lawrence's symbolism), and Leone Vivante, whose concept of potentiality clarified my intimations of Lawrence's "wild". In addition Harold Orel of the University of Kansas provided me with the right mixture of encouragement and Socratic opposition in directing the original project as a doc-

toral dissertation. Following no one method, either in original composition or in rewriting for publication, I have discovered after the fact that my approach does have certain affinities with a type of thematic explication practiced in France as one variety of the new criticism, though mine does not aspire to the philosophical rigor of that school.

In making it possible to bring the present version of my study to print the Department of English and the Research Advisory Council of Western Washington State College have been liberal patrons.

K. I.

Western Washington State College
Bellingham, Washington
1971

CONTENTS

Preface	5
Introduction	9
I. Toward the Definition of a <i>Weltanschauung</i>	16
A. The Sacred Wild	16
B. Emblems of Good and Evil	30
II. The Animals in Poetry	57
A. <i>Look! We Have Come Through</i>	57
B. <i>Birds, Beasts and Flowers</i>	65
C. <i>Pansies and Last Poems</i>	90
D. Conclusion	105
III. The Animals in Fiction	108
A. Pure Passionate Experience	108
B. Fighting for the Crown: <i>The Rainbow</i>	118
C. <i>Dies Irae: Women in Love</i>	137
D. The Savage Pilgrimage	158
E. The Serpent Power	174
IV. The Last Phase: Pure Animal Man	189
Selected Bibliography	198
Index	204

INTRODUCTION

That D. H. Lawrence's major contribution to literature was in the novel, and that it is as a novelist¹ that he will continue to live, is now critical orthodoxy. Nevertheless, Lawrence is recognized as a novelist of a peculiar and disturbing sort: cosmological rather than exclusively social in his interests; driven, as a visionary, to preach strange metaphysical doctrines; concerned, like a lyric poet, with the expression of timeless states of being. A powerful mythopoetic element, charged with the "rapt bardlike quality" that E. M. Forster noted,² is constantly at war in his fiction with the predictable world of common sense. Individual character, the central focus in the traditional novel, tends at moments of intensity to dissolve into its

¹ *D. H. Lawrence: Novelist* (New York, 1956), the polemical work of the English critic F. R. Leavis, has insisted on the view of Lawrence as before all a great novelist. Yet even Leavis is driven to write of *St. Mawr*, *Women in Love*, and *The Rainbow* in terms of 'dramatic poem'. Horace Gregory in *Pilgrim Of The Apocalypse* (New York, 1933), had noted in *The Rainbow* and following the breakdown of narrative into symbolic exposition as in a lyric poem. W. H. Auden in "Some Notes on D. H. Lawrence", *Nation*, CLXIV (1947), 482, said that Lawrence, like Blake, was interested not in individuals but in 'states'. Eliseo Vivas in *D. H. Lawrence: The Triumph And Failure of Art* (Evanston, 1960), p. 238, sees Lawrence as one of the few novelists whose interest is in man's relation to the cosmos instead of purely human realities. And of course long ago E. M. Forster in *Aspects Of The Novel* (New York, 1927), pointed out, in his chapter "Prophecy", the "rapt bardic quality" in Lawrence, who "sings" rather than says something about the universe, and whose prophetic vision seems to be irradiating nature from within.

² *Aspects Of The Novel*, p. 207.

primal and impersonal elements; and man is seen in his connection with bird, beast and flower as part of the living mystery of the cosmos.

Writing novels out of a poetic vision of life, Lawrence moves us to a sense of wonder by rhythmic incantation, image, metaphor and symbol. As E. L. Nicholes pointed out in 1949, an important aspect of his prose style is "his use of animal imagery and symbol, in brief metaphors or in the more extensive and complex images which characterize whole episodes and conflicts".³ But in spite of some interesting studies of the imagery of individual works,⁴ no one has yet shown how Lawrence's bestiary, in novel and poem alike, is intimately connected with central notions of his world-picture. To know the general typology of his animals, the central associations of tiger, swan, horse, rabbit and whale in the total *Gestalt* of Lawrence's discursive writings, is to bring deeper perspective to individual works and to perceive a special unity in his art. Such an investigation can also throw light on the manner in which his shaping imagination worked.

Problems of organization and selection immediately present themselves. With Lawrence, as Herbert Lindenberger has said, "the interests, attitudes, methods, and also the mannerisms of one novel flow, not only into other novels, but also into the travel books,

³ "The Simile of the Sparrow in *The Rainbow* by D. H. Lawrence", *MLN* LXIV (1949), reprinted in *The Achievement of D. H. Lawrence*, eds. Frederick J. Hoffman and Harry T. Moore (Norman, 1953), p. 159.

⁴ E.g., Robert Hogan, "The Amorous Whale: A Study in the Symbolism of D. H. Lawrence", *Modern Fiction Studies* V (1959), 39-46; and with Patricia Abel, "D. H. Lawrence's Singing Birds" in *A D. H. Lawrence Miscellany*, ed. Harry T. Moore (Carbondale, 1959), pp. 204-214. Kingsley Widmer in three articles: "Our Demonic Heritage: D. H. Lawrence", *Miscellany*, pp. 13-27; "Birds of Passion and Birds of Marriage in D. H. Lawrence", *University of Kansas City Review*, XXV (1958), 73-79; and "The Primitivistic Aesthetic: D. H. Lawrence", *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, XVII (1959), 344-353. Haruhide Mori, "Lawrence's Imagistic Development in *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*", *EHL*, XXXI (1964), 460-481.

poems, letters and essays".⁵ And nowhere do we have, in one place, a metaphysic shaped with the geometric finality of Yeats' *A Vision*. Nevertheless, I believe that we can find, within flux, mutation, and contradiction, generative ideas and animal tropes which, in essentials, do not vary.

First, I establish the conceptual framework — a critical synopsis of Lawrence's notion of 'the wild', followed by the general history and morphology of his world-picture, with a concentration on the key animal figures involved. The sequence of his 'philosophical' writings begins with his first visit to Italy in 1912. That experience produced the essays finally gathered in *Twilight in Italy* (1916). Other key documents are "The Crown" (1915); *Fantasia of the Unconscious* (1922); *Studies in Classic American Literature* (1923); *Apocalypse* (1931); and *Etruscan Places* (1932). Dates of publication, however, do not represent the actual sequence of ideological developments.

The poems, which I next examine, both illuminate the philosophy and are themselves further illuminated by concepts therein.⁶ The volume *Birds, Beasts and Flowers* (1923) is, of course, of central importance to the whole study; but from *Look! We Have Come Through!* (1917),⁷ to the posthumous *Last Poems* (1932), Lawrence's poetry (and much of his best) is full of animals and animal imagery which, directly or otherwise, convey doctrine.

⁵ "Lawrence and the Romantic Tradition", *Miscellany*, p. 339. This "overflow principle", as Lindenberger points out, makes it difficult to approach any of his works, except perhaps for some tales, as self-contained entities.

⁶ A solitary attempt to read the central philosophic notions in Lawrence's poetry as a whole is that of George G. Williams: "D. H. Lawrence's Philosophy as Expressed in His Poetry", *Rice Institute Pamphlet*, XXXVIII (1951), 73-94. Williams finds (p. 74) that "Not one of his poems really develops any considerable part of his thought", and that the poems are like "highly colored fragments of some unassembled whole". My own study attempts to supply a coherent background and to draw needed connections. It also wishes to modify the idea that no one poem really develops any considerable part of his thought.

⁷ Williams notes (*op. cit.*, p. 75) that up until 1917 and *Look! We Have Come Through!* prose fiction anticipates poetry in expressing doctrine. This volume also marks the real beginning of Lawrence as a symbolist poet.

Turning to the major fiction, I keep the entire range in view and refer to this as needed; but I find that, from the perspective adopted for this study, certain works virtually select themselves for detailed examination: they have a higher proportion of the animal tropes and symbolism; and, in addition, their place in Lawrence's development as an artist is especially important.

From 1912 onwards we find an unbroken development in poetry and in philosophical myth-making.⁸ In the long fiction, where we often move uneasily between the poles of social realism and visionary metaphysics, the animal terms of Lawrence's world-picture break out irregularly and in varying degrees of intensity. This animal rhetoric and symbolism plays a minor role in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928), though it permeates the Etruscan essays, *Pansies* and *Last Poems*, which also belong to the final phase of his art and life. Conscious theory begins to affect the novels only after 1912, but *The White Peacock* (1911), a maiden effort nearly innocent of doctrine, demands consideration both for reasons of contrast and because it holds the seeds of later development. There we find, for example, Lawrence's archetypal gamekeeper and the dark utterance "be a good animal". This first great commandment appears to me also to have been the last. For the rest of his life as an artist, Lawrence is engaged in working out and dramatizing the implications of his gamekeeper's wild metaphor.

The Rainbow and *Women in Love*, now generally agreed to be Lawrence's largest achievements, get special attention. These triumphs of expressionism⁹ clearly show his dualistic world-picture and related bestiary in action.¹⁰ *Kangaroo*, "St. Mawr" and *The*

⁸ Max Wildi, "The Birth of Expressionism in the Work of D. H. Lawrence", *English Studies*, XIX (1937), 241-259, first traced this development in detail.

⁹ Wildi's term Expressionism appears to me a little more useful than Symbolism, of which it is one type; but I recognize the looseness and instability of such descriptive terms. In the largest sense, Lawrence's art represents a development of Romanticism, itself a battleground for those who would define it.

¹⁰ *Sons and Lovers*, his chief work in the realist mode, is important in this study principally in having the first notable appearance of the horse-figure. See discussion on p. 117.

Plumed Serpent are the significant products of Lawrence's "savage pilgrimage",¹¹ and these also receive extended treatment, along with the totemic novella "The Fox" which serves here as a species of transition from the European to the wilderness phase in which Lawrence had turned his back on Western Civilization.

In each division of the study, I attempt some conclusions as to what Lawrence was and was not able to achieve as a writer as a result of his animal doctrines and mythology. Ultimately I focus on the modifications in tone, emphasis and iconography we find in the last phase of myth-making, placing *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in the context of *Last Poems*, *Etruscan Places* and "The Man Who Died" for these purposes. 'Sensitiveness' and 'tenderness', the two key notions of the period, do not mean that Lawrence is now tame;¹² but he is there less one-sidedly identified with beasts of prey. Ending what was at once a pilgrimage and a flight from the spreading nightmare of mechanized society, Lawrence appears to have had a vision of the Just City -- a place in touch with the creative wild, where the animal principles in man are recognized, tiger balanced against deer. But it is a cemetery populated by shadowy Etruscans outside of history, in the world of myth. Beyond this, his *Last Poems* are concerned with the adventure of individual consciousness facing the unknown dimension of death.

What I offer is not an exhaustive catalogue of all of Lawrence's animals and animal images. The animals, loved by Lawrence for their own sake, do make many and incidental appearances without moral and cosmological implications worth mentioning. We can distinguish three categories within which they appear meaningful in his art:¹³

¹¹ The title of Catherine Carswell's biography *The Savage Pilgrimage* (New York, 1932) describes a phase both of Lawrence's life and of his art.

¹² 'Tameness' remains first and last, a negative term, opposed to both 'wildness' and 'sensitiveness'.

¹³ In setting the following animal 'traps' I have been helped by the literary theory of Philip Wheelwright, Northrop Frye and Eliseo Vivas. Wheelwright's chapter "Four Ways of Imagination" in *The Burning Fountain*

A. Animal as 'other'.¹⁴ Here Lawrence confronts the creature directly in what is virtually an I-Thou relationship. In this response of wonder, he tries to express the essential fishness of fish, horseness of horse, rabbitness of rabbit.

B. Animal as emblem or archetype.¹⁵ Here the animal, natural or supernatural, has a clear didactic and ethical function, carries suggestions of universal human behaviour; or a fictive character, described in the animal terms of Lawrence's world-picture, is an example of ontological good and evil actualized in human life. Image and idea are united. A particular person is described in terms of an animal species; or a personalized animal, such as Bibbles the bull-bitch,¹⁶ is seen as example of a human species with a particular type of behaviour.

(Bloomington, 1954), pp. 76-100, provides basic conceptions. Northrop Frye's *The Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton, 1957), particularly in his study of Apocalyptic, Demonic and Analogical imagery (pp. 131-162), has provided invaluable clues to the recognition of literary archetypes. Eliseo Vivas' view of "The Constitutive Symbol", as noted, provides the third of my categories. Finally, I have read with respect what W. H. Auden wrote (with regard to Lawrence and Marianne Moore) in "Two Bestiaries", *The Dyer's Hand And Other Essays* (New York, 1962), pp. 300-303.

¹⁴ This is 'sensual vision', the famous 'blood consciousness'. "In the sensual vision there is always the pause of fear, dark wonder and glamour. The creature beheld is seen in its quality of *otherness*, a term of the vivid, imminent unknown" — Version one of his Crèvecoeur essay in *The Symbolic Meaning: The Uncollected Versions of Studies in Classic American Literature*, ed. Armin Arnold (London, 1962), p. 60.

¹⁵ At their best, as Richard Ellmann has noted, the animal poems "reveal Lawrence's attitude toward men, but without relinquishing their hold on the actual object". "Barbed Wire and Coming Through" in *The Achievement of D. H. Lawrence*, p. 264.

¹⁶ "Bibbles" in *Birds, Beasts and Flowers*. All references to poems in this study are to *The Complete Poems of D. H. Lawrence*, 3 vols, (London, 1957). Quotations correspond with lines in the later attempt at a definitive edition: *The Complete Poems of D. H. Lawrence*, collected and edited by Vivian de Sola Pinto and Warren Roberts, 2 vols. (New York, 1964).

C. Animal as creative symbol.¹⁷ This is comparatively rare. To adapt and paraphrase Eliseo Vivas, who prefers to say 'constitutive symbol', it is "a creative synthesis of empirical matter" in one commanding image which, irradiated from within, brings newness of perception and "manifests itself in dramatic and moral terms". Analysis does not exhaust the symbol's meaning since that to which it refers is, in some obscure way, itself identical with the object perceived and the experience of perceiving. In effect, the infinite is in the finite. Two powerful examples are Ursula's apocalyptic horses in *The Rainbow* and Bismarck the rabbit in *Women in Love*.

Such, then, are the aims and perspectives of the present study. It may be objected that an approach to the novels through expanding metaphor and nuclear episode does violence to the medium. This objection might be valid if Lawrence were a different type of artist to whom classical notions of plot, character, and closed form applied;¹⁸ but absorption rather than detachment, ecstasis rather than catharsis, a vibrant sense of process and incompleteness, make his romantic art adaptable to a Longinian analysis of parts. This analysis, further, is here controlled by historical considerations and by a framework traced out from Lawrence's own literary cosmos, not imposed from outside. Out of respect for Lawrence's well known opinions on 'fixity' I try not to be purely mechanical and schematic, and to respect the individual work.

¹⁷ Vivas, p. 275. Whereas the phrases quoted are from Vivas, I have attempted a creative synthesis of my own. I have called Lawrence's kind of symbol 'creative' rather than 'constitutive' since creative both sounds more like normal English and conveys a greater sense of dynamic shaping.

¹⁸ In this respect we have to remember his letter to Edward Garnett concerning *The Rainbow*: "You must not look in my novel for the old stable ego of character. There is another *ego*, according to whose action the individual is unrecognizable and passes through, as it were certain allotropic states which it needs a deeper sense than any we've been used to exercise, to discover there are states of the same radically unchanged element . . . don't look for the development of the novel to follow the lines of certain characters: the characters fall into the form of some other rhythmic form, as when one draws a fiddle-bow across a fine tray delicately sanded, the sand takes lines unknown".—*The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence*, ed. Harry T. Moore (London, 1962), I, 282.

I

TOWARD THE DEFINITION OF A *WELTANSCHAUUNG*

A. THE SACRED WILD

Civilization, as we normally imagine this condition in the West, is a City — a center of rational light surrounded by a formless wilderness of barbaric dark — in which man fulfills his human destiny as a social and political animal. This is, of course, a neo-classical idea; but in the 19th century's long dream of evolutionary progress and bourgeois humanism, a dream in which it seemed inevitable that secular light would eventually cover the face of the earth, we find an interesting confusion of our rational Rome with New Jerusalem.¹ Born in 1885, and passing through the nightmare experience of World War I, Lawrence, whom Horace Gregory rightly called *Pilgrim of the Apocalypse*,² rejected the rational City and the version of Christianity which tended to go with it.³ With all the marks of one fleeing from the wrath to come, he plunged into the rejected wilderness to find his salvation in a numinous dark where God was not yet dead — He had not even emerged in separate forms of gods. Let the City fall, let the machines run down, the robot men pass away. Better yet, help in the moral task of total slum clearance, confident

¹ A major prophet of the bourgeois and scientific Utopia was H. G. Wells, of whose progressive view Lawrence once said "Hadn't someone better write Mr. Wells's history backwards, to show how we have degenerated into stupid visionlessness since the Altamire cave-men?" *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine* (Philadelphia, 1925), p. 141.

² *Op. cit.*

³ The curious perversions of bourgeois, progressive Christianity are usefully summarized by W. H. Auden *op. cit.*, p. 483. They include radical fear and contempt of flesh, general belief in the redemption of society by scientific method.

that beyond this nihilism a new heaven and earth will be born, from darkness.

In London, New York, Paris
in the bursten cities
the dead tread heavily through the muddy air
through the mire of fumes
heavily, stepping weary on our hearts.⁴

The notion of the sacred wild receives its earliest and most direct exposition in Lawrence's "Study of Thomas Hardy", begun during the war that marked a great divide in modern European history, sundering 20th century man from the happier assumptions of the 19th. "What a colossal idiocy this war", Lawrence wrote his agent J. B. Pinker in September, 1914. "Out of sheer rage I've begun my book about Thomas Hardy. It will be about anything but Thomas Hardy, I am afraid — queer stuff — but not bad".⁵

The "queer stuff" includes, amidst such circling metaphysical discussion of man, God and art, the following significant passages.

This is a constant revelation in Hardy's novels: that there exists a great background, vital and vivid, which matters more than the people who move upon it . . . Upon the vast incomprehensible pattern of some primal morality greater than ever the human mind can grasp, is drawn the little, pathetic pattern of man's moral life and struggle, pathetic almost ridiculous. The little fold of law and order, the little walled city within which man has to defend himself from the waste enormity of nature, becomes always too small, and the pioneers, venturing out with the code of the walled city upon them, die in the bonds of that code, free and yet unfree, preaching the walled city and looking to the waste.

This is the wonder of Hardy's novels, and gives them their beauty. The vast, unexplored morality of life itself, what we call the immorality of nature, surrounds us in its incomprehensibility, and in the midst goes the little human morality play, with its queer frame of morality and its mechanized movement, seriously portentously, till some one of the

⁴ "In the Cities", *Last Poems*.

⁵ *Letters*, I, 290.

protagonists chances to look out of the charmed circle . . . into the wilderness raging round. Then he is lost, his little drama falls to pieces, or becomes mere repetition, but the stupendous theatre outside goes on enacting its own incomprehensible drama, untouched.⁶

Of tragedy in relation to this Lawrence wrote:

Oedipus, Hamlet, Macbeth set themselves up against, or find themselves set up against, the unfathomed moral forces of nature, and out of this unfathomed force comes their death. Whereas Anna Karenina, Eustacia, Tess, Sue and Jude find themselves up against the established system of human government and morality, they cannot detach themselves, and are brought down. Their real tragedy is that they are unfaithful to the greater unwritten morality.⁷

Here is a religiously based objection to the 19th century city and its conventional bourgeois ethics which remains constant. What is important is that the wild, the undefined, the *dark* is seen as the source of value.⁸ The human city and its laws are secondary. All through his writing, as the Italian philosopher Leone Vivante says, "Lawrence bears witness to the nonpragmatical, nonsocial, and not exclusively human, origin and nature of value".⁹ He is God-centered rather than man-centered (if we may use the term God in a naturalistic, pantheistic sense which rules out any notion of His presence

⁶ *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence*, edited and with an introduction by Edward D. McDonald (New York, 1936), p. 419.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 420.

⁸ Just how radical this archetypal turnabout is may be appreciated by what Mircea Eliade says of city and wild generally in *The Sacred and the Profane* (New York, 1959), pp. 48-49 in the Harper Torchbook edition: "... the dragon is the paradigmatic figure of the marine monster, of the primordial snake, symbol of the cosmic waters, of darkness, night and death — in short of the amorphous and virtual, of everything that has not acquired a "form" . . . victory of the gods over the dragon must be symbolically repeated each year; for each year the world must be created anew. Similarly the victory of the gods over the forces of darkness, death and chaos is repeated with each victory of the city over its invaders". Lawrence attempts a startling transvaluation, is on the side of potentiality, the "good" dragon against the now evil city. He accepts chaos as divine.

⁹ "Reflections on D. H. Lawrence's Insight Into the Concept of Potentiality", in *A Philosophy of Potentiality* (London, 1955), p. 119.

as in any sense personal.) The divine is conceived as a dark, living potentiality extended beyond any known limit.¹⁰ The human city of post-Cartesian reason, cut off from this creative mystery, is a city of the damned.

The condemnation was implicit in Lawrence's first novel *The White Peacock*, but he does not take responsibility for it there. It is put in the mouth of his *raisonneur*-gamekeeper Annable, a mordant misanthrope, who is fundamentally unhappy, comes to a bad end, and whose tale-within-a-tale is, in any case, far from the center of the book. Of Annable we remember the famous dictum, "When a man's more than nature he's a devil. Be a good animal, says I, whether it's man or woman". He had known what is normally taken as the desirable world of culture and intellect, but had left it. He was a man of one idea — "that all civilization was the painted fungus of rottenness".¹¹

In *The Rainbow*, begun in Italy before the world conflict, but completed in March 1915,¹² the city-wilderness contrast of the Hardy study appears again. His heroine Ursula meditates upon the world-picture of the ego-bound, mechanical citizens of Nottingham who deny that there is anything in the irrational dark worth knowing.

Nevertheless the darkness wheeled round about, with grey shadow shapes of wild beasts, and also with the dark shadow shapes of angels, whom the light fenced out, as it fenced out the more familiar beasts of darkness. And some having for a moment seen the darkness, saw it bristling with the tufts of the hyaena and the wolf; and some, having given up their vanity of the light, having died in their own conceit, saw the gleam in the eyes of the wolf and the hyaena, that it was the flash of the swords of angels, flashing at the door to come in, that the angels in the darkness were lordly and terrible and not to be denied, like the flash of fangs.¹³

We may note here the demonic inversion¹⁴ in this apocalyptic glimpse: the animals, identified with dark angels, seem agents of

¹⁰ Vivante, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

¹¹ "A Shadow in Spring", Pt. II, Chapter II.

¹² *Letters*, I, 519.

¹³ "The Bitterness of Ecstasy", Chapter XV.

¹⁴ Cf. Kingsley Widmer "Our Demonic Heritage: D. H. Lawrence", *Miscellany*, pp. 13-27.

divine destruction whose entry into the 'city' is not to be denied. In his essay on Benjamin Franklin in *Studies in Classic American Literature* (1923) Lawrence further clarifies matters in his satire of Franklin's deadly rational virtues.

Franklin "tries to take away my wholeness and my dark forest, my freedom".¹⁵ For how can man, put in the utilitarian "barbed-wire paddock" of production ethics, be free "without an illimitable background?"¹⁶ Man is a 'moral animal'¹⁷ not a moral machine, and as against the enlightened self-interest and social benevolence of the Philadelphian,¹⁸ Lawrence sets his own asocial creed in comic defiance.

"That I am I."

"That my soul is a dark forest."

"That my known self will never be more than a little clearing in the forest."

"That gods, strange gods, come forth from the forest of my known self, and then go back."

"That I must have the courage to let them come and go."

"That I will never let mankind put anything over me, but that I will try always to recognize and submit to the gods in me and the gods in other men and women."¹⁹

We must connect this notion of the soul as a dark, god-haunted forest with Lawrence's root ideas of 'blood' and 'phallic consciousness'. His credo was first announced from Gargnano by the lake in 1913 when Lawrence, in that important Italian phase of doctrine, was writing (along with sketches later published in *Twilight in Italy*), the first draft of what became *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*.

My great religion is a belief in the blood, the flesh, as being wiser than the intellect. We can go wrong with our minds, but what our blood feels and believes and says is always true.²⁰

¹⁵ Doubleday Anchor edition (Garden City, New York, 1955), p. 28.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

¹⁸ Lawrence, of course, is a priest of *eros* rather than *agape*. On the whole he seems far more benevolent towards most types of wild animal than toward man.

¹⁹ *Studies*, p. 26.

²⁰ *Letters*, I, 180.